ABSTRACT

**Objectives.** To demonstrate the applicability of historical methodology to current issues in the Canadian Arctic.

**Study Design.** This is a literature-based analytical historical study, which draws on material from database searches of MEDLINE, Anthropology Plus, POLARInfo, the Arctic Blue Books and Historical Abstracts. Material was also obtained from physical searches of the University of Alberta Libraries and Library and Archives Canada collections, as well as from field research in the records of the Inuulitsivik Maternities.

**Methods.** The historical technique of tracing epistemological change over time, pioneered by Michel Foucault and further developed by Ian Hacking, was applied to the history of Canadian authority in the Arctic. This was linked with epistemological changes occurring throughout Western/Southern culture in this period. The applicability of this historical analysis for current issues in the region was then evaluated.

**Results.** An epistemological shift in Western society has moved authority from traditional human actors in government, medicine and, increasingly, science to statistics, which is seen as both impartial and accurate. Human authorities now routinely appeal to statistical authority to validate policy decisions. This change is as apparent in the Arctic as elsewhere, but it has also opened a space for Inuit practices, rooted in traditional Inuit epistemology, to reassert themselves, provided they can satisfy demands for statistical validity.

**Conclusions.** Historical analysis provides a means to identify the spaces which epistemological change and historical contingency have opened in which social and cultural change can occur.
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INTRODUCTION

The Canadian Arctic is facing a period of profound and rapid change in the twenty-first century, both physical, as a result of climate change and resource development, and cultural, as a result of the spread of modern communications and technology that are drawing Canadian Inuit increasingly into southern society. The Inuit are faced with the prospect of integrating these developments, only the latest in a series of profound changes that have transported them from Stone Age hunter-gatherers to a modern industrialized society in as little as 50 years. For the Inuit, the challenge is to find ways to meet these developments while still maintaining cultural continuity with the past and achieving the necessary flexibility to deal with the ongoing pace of change.

It seems a truism to state that current public policy and practice in the Arctic is the product of historical development. However, inherent in this statement is the possibility of a subtle and effective historical analysis of present policy, one that could offer an effective guide to how policy and practice in the Arctic might be changed, but just as importantly, how it might not. In the felicitous phrase used by Foucault (1) and Hacking (2), what is needed is a “history of the present”; not in Butterfield’s (3) sense of a whiggish history of inevitable progress, but rather one which separates the historically necessary from the historically contingent in order to illuminate our present predicament and suggest reasonable possibilities for change.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Narratives, consistency and historical methodology

This study was performed using one of the most common tools of historical methodology: the construction of a narrative. A large database of literature on the Arctic and on relevant aspects of historical theory was accumulated. This involved database searches of MEDLINE, Anthropology Plus, POLAR-Info, the Arctic Blue Books and Historical Abstracts, as well as physical searches of the collections at the University of Alberta Libraries and the Library and Archives Canada and field research in the records of the Inuulitsivik Maternities. This mass of information was then analysed in order to create an internally and externally coherent and consistent narrative that reduced the data to a logical and comprehensible form. In order to do this, I chose to impose a metanarrative (4) on the data by using Foucault’s concept of epistemological change, because it offered a useful tool for making sense of historical events by subsuming them into a historical process that may be projected into the future. This process of ordering the historical data also rendered some of it irrelevant to the historical process I am delineating, necessitating a further step of determining which events and actions were historically necessary and which were historically contingent.

Epistemes, necessity and contingency

Historical necessity and contingency refer to the relationship between policy and practice and the underlying theoretical frameworks that inform modern society and government.
Some aspects of policy are rooted in the historical application of the epistemological foundations of modernism to the Arctic. Others are historically contingent. Their existence, while also undeniably modern, may only be incidental to the existence of modernism itself. This argument is not one-sided. Inuit culture and society have changed since contact, not so much from the gross effect of physical and technological change as from the impact of southern epistemology on Inuit self-definition. Both the southern perception of the Inuit and the Inuit perception of themselves have engaged in a subtle feedback loop, of the kind identified by Hacking (2). Thus, historical analysis must consider what is historically necessary to Inuit epistemology and what is historically contingent, in view of the evolving nature of Inuit epistemology itself.

This argument is crucially dependent on the theory of historical epistemology developed by Michel Foucault (5). According to his model, modern society and government has inherited a framework of epistemological assumptions, which Foucault called epistemes or systems of thought, that together constitute modern epistemology. These, Foucault pointed out, are historical entities. Their birth and development can be traced, and their influence on the institutional structure of modern society examined. By doing so, Foucault (6) stated, the possibility for evolutionary change can be identified and exploited. Applying historical methods to analysing the interaction of modern epistemology with the Arctic offers the possibility of determining how public policy and practice represent it, what aspects are open to transformation and how the prospects for change may be evaluated.

RESULTS

I. “Disenchantment,” natural history and European expansion

The changes in the epistemological foundations of Western civilisation began in the sixteenth century. Foucault (5,7) identifies this as the product of an epistemological shift in the sixteenth century, which Pickstone (8) refers to as the “disenchantment of the world.” Latour (9) defines this as the separation of nature from society and thus the belief that nature can be comprehended directly and objectively through science rather than through cultural representation. This, according to Latour (9), is the chief means by which “modern” Europeans, from about the seventeenth century on, distinguished themselves from “premodern” others. Premodern cultures, on the one hand, conflate nature and society so that nature-culture remains whole. Modernism, on the other hand, creates hybrids of nature and culture (such as the study of the stars, which in premodern societies conflates astronomy and astrology), which are then “purified” through dismemberment into natural and social entities. Thus, according to Latour (9), astronomy becomes a purely physical science, astrology declines into a fringe activity and human sciences, such as psychology, take over its social role. Moderns profit from the hybrid nature-culture networks that are still unavoidably created, by translating and purifying them into natural or cultural entities. The process is enormously beneficial, as it allows modern societies to treat nature as an objective, manipulatable sphere that is separate and distinct from humanity.

This perspective underlies the approach towards the Canadian Arctic through much
of the nineteenth century. After belief in the existence of a navigable North-west Passage had subsided in the wake of Vancouver’s expedition (10), much of the interest in the Arctic was linked to natural history. By mapping the Arctic, the British Admiralty in particular hoped to strengthen British claims to the region, while also gaining information on the economic potential of the region through understanding its geography and resources. Popular images of the last Franklin Expedition notwithstanding (11,12), most British (and later American) Arctic expeditions included a keen interest in the Inuit, both scientifically and as potential sources of supply, specimens and examples of how to survive in the harsh climate. As Ross described the Inuit, then referred to as “Esquimaux”:

*The Esquimaux ... could travel easier than we, could house themselves with a hundredth part of the labour, could outdo us in killing the seal, could regale on abundant food where we would starve because we could not endure it.* (13, p. 10).

*We could not well manage without aid of the natives and the assistance of their dogs.* (13, p. 510)

This practical interest in the Inuit became explicit scientific policy in the 1851 “Admiralty Manual of Scientific Enquiry” (14), which was specifically written to guide Arctic expeditions (as well as those to other parts of the world), with considerable input from veterans of Arctic science (10). The Manual outlines a broad program of scientific research in which the human sciences were accorded as much weight as the natural sciences, occasionally conflating them, as in the section on zoology concerning the human race:

*What is the average or general stature and weight of the individual and the extreme cases?*

*Does infanticide occur, and to what causes is it referred to?*

*What are the ceremonies and practices connected with marriage?*

*What is the general treatment of the sick, and the superstition, if any, connected with it?*

*How are the dead disposed of?*

*Note down any illustrative particulars of the government, policy, religion, superstitions, or sciences of the people; their mode of noting or dividing time, their mode of carrying on war, and favourite weapons.* (14, pp. 397–398)

Other sections that emphasized research on human beings included those on geography (political geography) and ethnology. The “Admiralty Manual of Scientific Enquiry” (14) made an existing informal research tradition part of public policy. Since the British showed little inclination to exert more than titular sovereignty over the Arctic, their scientific expeditions and the information they gathered became the foundation of the British claim to Arctic sovereignty.

As Latour (15) has pointed out, this European program of scientific investigation of non-European populations was intimately linked to the extension of European power. Each expedition provided Europeans with more information, while the Natives seldom gained much in return, leading to an increasing imbalance of knowledge in Europe’s favour. As a result, Europeans eventually disregarded Native knowledge and Native skills and, in doing so, increasingly disregarded Native concerns.
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as well. Whereas scientific explorers in the nineteenth century needed to make use of Inuit knowledge and abilities, this need (and desire) declined as Southern explorers gained confidence in their abilities.

Inuit marginalization in public policy reached its zenith after the Canadian government assumed control over the Arctic Archipelago in 1880 (16). Canadian interest in the Arctic focused on resource exploitation, and while the rhetoric of inclusion was occasionally deployed, interest in the Inuit was initially limited to their traditional role of assisting scientific expeditions, and in their use as a labour force for the fur trading companies penetrating the Arctic in increasing numbers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (17). Anthropological interest in the Inuit remained strong until at least the 1960s, although Balikci (18) has noted a distinct decline in anthropological fieldwork in the Arctic since then.

More recently, Traditional Environmental Knowledge (TEK) has become a focus of scientific interest, with suggestions that it has considerable relevance for the field of sciences, such as zoology, botany, ecology and studies of climate change. Procter (19) notes, however, that the pattern of Southern and scientific appropriation of Inuit knowledge still occurs. More promising is the development of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ). This has been variously translated as Inuit Societal Values, Inuit Traditional Knowledge and “the Inuit way of doing things” (20), but the concept has also been referred to as essentially untranslatable (21). Jaypeeete Arnakak, one of the original formalizers of the concept of IQ, has explicitly stated that it represents Inuit epistemology (as distinct from Southern epistemology) and acts as a “living technology” (22) through which Inuit mediate their interaction with the world around them in all its aspects. The Government of Nunavut has made the integration of IQ into all aspects of its operations a part of its official mandate (23), and both Arnakak (22) and the government (23) make explicit the necessity that IQ represent current Inuit epistemology and its evolution into the future, rather than any static vision of what the Inuit were at some “untouched” period in the past. IQ has the potential to realize, at the level of both everyday discourse and governmental operations, the goal of maintaining the Inuit world view as a dynamic alternative to Southern modernism. That there are challenges ahead is indicated by a tendency for Southern-directed studies, such as the IQ baseline study for the High Lake mining project near Kugluktuk (24), to claim that IQ is respected by purely historical studies of traditional knowledge and practices, while neglecting on various grounds (usually cost) to consult living Inuit about their views, as if the only valid traditional practices are safely in the past. However, as Wenzel (21) has pointed out, IQ does live within the social interactions of the Inuit, at a level largely below the horizon of Southern perception.

Even so, there are still lessons to be learned from these interactions between Southern and Inuit epistemologies. One of the more noteworthy examples of Southern appropriation of Inuit knowledge is cartography. Inuit facility with cartography was much remarked on by early explorers, and continued to make a favourable impression on Arctic explorers well into the twentieth century. Many of the early maps of the Arctic, according to Rund-
strom (25), were in fact drawn by Inuit and then transcribed by explorers. Modern epistemology considers maps to be artifacts, tools to guide exploration and eventually to establish political control. However, for the Inuit, according to Rundstrom (25), mapping was a mimetic act, a means of internalizing the epistemological identity of Inuit and the land that is fundamental to Inuit identity (26–28). As such, the act of mapping, of demonstrating knowledge of and identity with the land, was far more important than the map itself (which was usually an ephemeral artifact, drawn on snow or sand, in any case).

Science separated Inuit maps from their epistemological context, purifying them (to use Latour’s (9) terminology) of their connection with their specific local, human meaning. Once this had been done, Inuit maps became scientific knowledge, subject to verification and replication. It also led to a decline in interest in Inuit mapping skills, first by explorers and scientists, and finally by anthropologists (25).

This progression has another implication, however. Inuit mapping was derived from a fundamentally different epistemological foundation than that of Southern explorers. However, because it satisfied the requirements of both epistemologies, both Southern explorers and Inuit were able to recognize its value and both made use of Inuit mapping abilities, although for different reasons. This suggests that changes to policies and practices in the Arctic today must have value in the eyes of both Inuit and Southern culture, even if those values are not actually the same. It also suggests that the adoption of *Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit* within Nunavut, for instance, may proceed some distance while remaining transparent to Southern observers, who could interpret changes according to their own epistemological preconceptions.

**II. Power, Government and Sovereignty**

Public policies and practices in the Canadian Arctic owe much to the emergence of modern governmentality in southern Canada and its application to the Arctic. Foucault (6) identifies the crucial episteme of modern governmentality as emerging after a second epistemological shift in the late eighteenth century, producing the modern system of state power. Prior to this the state was responsible for maintaining order through the system of judicial power, in which malefactors, whether criminals or political opponents, were simply punished, usually publicly in order to demonstrate to others the power of the state.

Judicial power remains an essential element of state control and was, in fact, the first to be extended to the Arctic via the RCMP for punishment of serious infractions of Canadian law (29,30). Foucault (1) traces the process by which European states in the late eighteenth century adopted many of the powers and responsibilities of the Christian Church, particularly an interest in the moral and physical health of the citizenry as a means of ensuring the moral and physical health of the nation. The spiritual health of the populace has largely remained under the purview of the Church. He identifies this as a particular type of power, which he refers to as “pastoral power” (6), in which both the welfare of the community and the state of each individual are equally important. In essence, the state assumed the secular roles once occupied by the Church – such as running hospitals and social welfare schemes.
This power is manifested in a number of ways, but the models for its operation were originally the penal and health care systems. First, the penal system shifted from acting merely as an instrument of judicial power through punishing those who broke the law, to becoming a means of redeeming criminals, curing or healing them, through discipline and control (1). Health care changed in similar ways, but from a premodern system that saw the body as an extension of the natural world to one which focused on the body as a locus of disease. The eighteenth century also saw the development of the “clinical gaze” or “regard” (7) and the invention of the concept of public health. Again Foucault suggests that this process also involved the application of pastoral power, in which the institutions of state power assumed responsibility for both the health of the nation and the health of the individual members of it.

Hacking (31) has developed this argument by pointing out that the rise of statistics (literally the “science of the state”) provided the means by which state bureaucracies could apply this new form of power. Hacking (31) also identifies a change in the understanding of human nature in which, in the nineteenth century, the Enlightenment ideal of humanism was replaced by the ideal of the “normal” person: a statistical average that could be changed through the application of various social (or eugenic) reforms to populations. Hence normal, according to Hacking (2) leads to “normalization,” the conscious effort to force both populations and individuals to conform to desired standards, whether physical, social or cultural. It is important to remember that nineteenth-century ideals of the “normal” still owed much to traditional Christian ideology, which was simply applied to the social problems revealed by population statistics. This is merely a translation of the Christian mission of converting all people into Christianity into a social mission of creating the kingdom of God on Earth (32). Since the state focused on secular salvation, its mission became that of guiding the populace, and hence the nation, toward a cultural, physical and social norm.

British involvement in the Arctic never involved the extension of pastoral power as it was practised within Britain itself. It was, instead, a classic extension of colonial power, as described by Said (33), in which the subject population is assigned a place as irrevocably alien. Canada, however, was already engaged in exerting pastoral power and policies of normalization on its Aboriginal population when it assumed sovereignty over the Arctic. From the late eighteenth century, the unofficial and official policy towards the Indian population by both church and state was to assimilate them into the white population (34). Although methods may have varied, the overall objective was definitely that of making Aboriginals “normal” Canadians, mainly through education in either residential schools or industrial schools, usually under the supervision of a religious denomination, but ultimately under the control of the state (34,35). In 1920, the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, Duncan Campbell Scott (36), enunciated the principle behind this ongoing policy as follows:

Our objective is to continue until there is not a single Indian in Canada that has not been absorbed into the body politic, and there is no Indian question...(p. 50)
The Inuit were not initially included in this process of normalization. However, by the 1920s their significance for Canadian sovereignty over the Arctic was becoming apparent, as Diamond Jenness realized (37). This significance was both potentially positive and potentially negative. As Canadians, the Inuit constituted a Canadian population living in the Arctic and were a strong guarantor of sovereignty. However, as long as the Inuit remained nomadic hunter-gatherers with no social ties to Canada, their identity remained suspect, and possibly malleable (29). Hence the Canadian fear of Arctic exploration by both Danish and American expeditions (38) and worries that Greenlandic Inuit constituted a threat to Canadian sovereignty, because of their proximity to and potential influence over Canadian Inuit.

Thus, despite reservations over the necessity of assuming responsibility for the Inuit (16), the Canadian government did begin officially assuming more responsibility for them, transferring the responsibility for Inuit welfare to the Department of Indian Affairs in 1924 (although without applying Indian status to Inuit) and to the Northwest Territories Branch of the Department of the Interior in 1930 (36). However, much of the rhetoric of pastoral power remained only rhetoric. The only sustained government presence in the Arctic was that of the RCMP, which administered judicial power by punishing serious infractions of Canadian law (29). The Anglican and Roman Catholic churches built hospitals using government money in Aklavik, Chesterfield Inlet and Pangnirtung, while the Grenfell Mission provided some nursing services in northern Labrador. The Inuvialuit received the services of a government physician at Coppermine in 1929, but the position was terminated in 1931 (39). Vanast (39) has pointed out that considerable resources were spent on economic development, but far less on attempts to provide services to the Inuit. What minimal government presence was established was reduced even more by the financial economies of the Depression. Overall, throughout the first 40 years of the twentieth century, the Inuit were left largely free of both the benefits and the constraints of pastoral power; in effect, they were left to find their own way to negotiate the hazards of increasing penetration by Southern commerce and disease.

This pattern changed dramatically during and after the Second World War. The American military began building bases throughout the Arctic during the war, and the pace of construction and size of the American presence increased when the Distant Early Warning Line was built in the 1950s. Canadian government concerns about sovereignty in the North and about the role of Canadian Inuit led to the implementation of a policy of normalization. In essence, the Inuit were needed as Canada’s representatives in the Arctic, as Diamond Jenness (37) had suggested two decades earlier. However, to be Canada’s representatives they also had to be Canadians; that is, they had to receive the services other Canadians received and (implicitly) to share a similar lifestyle, however modified for the Arctic environment.

The Inuit were increasingly encouraged to abandon their traditional way of life and to settle in villages where government services, including welfare, health care and education could be provided (16). In addition, the govern-
ment began implementing mechanisms of surveillance and control. These included the Eskimo Disk List system (40), under which identity disks were issued to each Inuit entitling them to government services, including health care and welfare assistance. This proved difficult to administer to a nomadic population who were quite capable of using the disks as a form of informal currency. It was superseded by more effective instruments of social control, which focused on limiting movement by restricting welfare and health services to those Inuit who had a place of residence (40).

Other efforts by the government to normalize the Inuit included attempts to introduce a modern cash economy and to find a useful niche for the Inuit within it. Thus, the Inuit art industry was developed in the 1950s, while efforts were made to find work for Inuit in the resource-extraction industries springing up in the Arctic (16). As part of the efforts to make the Arctic “self-sufficient” (in the modern economic sense), government officials also encouraged the growth of the co-operative movement in the Arctic (41).

Meanwhile, health care emerged as one of the most contentious issues. One of the most effective charges against Canadian public policy in the Arctic was (and is) the dismal health statistics in the region (42). These became an effective means of measuring national differences in the standard of living in general after the War (43). In particular, infant mortality and morbidity statistics became the litmus test of a successfully modern nation (42). Critics of the government could (and did) point out that Inuit statistics were among the worst in the world and that infant mortality was particularly high. According to modern models of governmentality, the Canadian government had a responsibility to care for its citizens. If it could not prove that it cared for the Inuit, its authority over them and the Arctic could be questioned (40).

Thus, in order to normalize the Inuit, their health statistics, particularly ones seen as amendable to medical intervention – such as infant mortality – had to meet or even exceed Canadian norms. This led to significant reforms. Previous lackadaisical attitudes towards the health of the Inuit were replaced by a policy of providing primary health care through nursing stations staffed by nurse-midwives in each community, along with evacuation for severe cases (44). By the 1980s, as transportation technology improved, evacuation policies became more liberal and pregnant women across the Arctic, for instance, were routinely evacuated to southern hospitals for childbirth (45). This has resulted in a primary health care system that has been described (46) as one of the best in the world, better in fact than that available in southern Canada. However, it also resulted in social disruptions as the traditional Inuit way of life, with its own epistemological assumptions, was replaced with an imported one.

These policies were applied with little concern for Inuit wishes. Although often portrayed as colonial and exploitative (47), these measures in fact differ little from those used in southern Canada (or in most other modern states for that matter). Uniform public schooling, vital statistics registers, identity cards and a system of public health care are
all common aspects of modern governmentality. If the primary health care system in the Canadian Arctic is one of the best in the world, the problem is that it is one imposed from outside on a population that does not necessarily agree with its fundamental epistemological premises (48). As such, while the key indicator of infant mortality has reached Canadian norms, others indicators, such as addiction, violence and suicide, remain very high (49). Attempts to improve this system through inclusiveness, including training Inuit doctors, nurses and administrators, is unlikely to succeed if these attempts do not account for epistemological differences between the Inuit population and Southern health care and governmentality.

**DISCUSSION**

**Statistics and epistemological authority**

However, there has been another significant change in modernist epistemology in the twentieth century, one which is, arguably, still underway. Although statistics became the measure of populations in the nineteenth century, their use in individual cases was emphatically rejected. This was done on the grounds that statistical averages could not be applied to individual variation (31). However, this too began to change in the twentieth century. The development of modern significance testing by R.A. Fisher led to the application of statistics to experimental design. In 1946, the Randomised Clinical Trial was developed for drug testing. Since 1962, after public confidence in the medical profession was shaken by the thalidomide scandal (50), evidence-based practice – the application of the results of statistical analysis to health care practice – has become increasingly widespread. Porter (51) has identified the reliance on statistical evidence as the common means of publicly justifying the practices and, ultimately, the existence of a profession. Whereas, previously, modern institutions were assumed to possess an epistemological superiority because of their control of the natural world (9), this control has been shaken (by thalidomide and other medical scandals, global warming and so on) and institutions are now turning to statistics in an effort to shore up their power and authority. Thus, in the Canadian Arctic, the Nunavut government bases its authority in part on its ability to improve Nunavummiut social and health indicators to meet or exceed Canadian norms (23), despite evidence that the Inuit themselves are primarily concerned about the preservation of their culture (52). To some extent this process may also be seen as the response by the organs of power in modern society to the increasing challenges to state and expert authority by what Foucault identified as “subjugated knowledges” (6). These are the local practices and epistemologies of particular groups, which have been challenging the “modern” consensus since about 1960. Statistics, by appealing to the disinterested authority of numbers, offers a means of suppressing revolts against the hegemony of modernism. As shall be demonstrated, however, it also offers a similar opportunity to subjugated knowledges to compete with modernism on its own terms. Both of these factors have significant implications for the future of public policy and practice in the Arctic.
Conclusions

Inuit health, statistical validity and policy change

The ambiguous role of statistical authority may be seen in current issues in health care. Some aspects of health policy and practice, such as very low infant mortality rates, are crucial to Southern epistemology, in particular to Canadian claims of effective governmentality (53,54). Yet, because of the epistemological shift that has given statistics authority over both governments and professions, especially the medical profession, a system of health care that provides a similar level of statistical “normality” carries equal validity, whatever its epistemological foundations.

A single specific example drawn from the Canadian Arctic will illustrate how this argument applies in practice. The Inuulitsivik Maternities in Nunavik have successfully argued that their model of communally based birthing is valid because its outcomes are superior to Canadian norms and hence normal in the modern definition of the term (55–57), even though the epistemological foundations of the Maternities are, as has been argued elsewhere, profoundly non-modern (58). Yet, since the Maternities provide excellent statistical evidence of their success, they are by definition also fulfilling the crucial test of modern epistemology. Such a compromise between Inuit and Southern epistemologies is small and preserves the historical necessities in both epistemologies. However, it is the epistemological change itself that was responsible for the success of the Maternities. The interaction of modern systems of governmentality, statistical authority and Inuit epistemology created a space within which the Maternities could succeed. It is in identifying these spaces, the room for accommodation between epistemologies and the practical need for them that historical analysis has its place in shaping policy and practice.

Much of this argument has been dependent on a theoretical foundation originally laid by Michel Foucault. As such it may be appropriate to allow him the last word on the application of historical methods to understanding public policy and practice in the Arctic, as elsewhere:

I prefer the very specific transformations that have proved to be possible … in … our ways of being and thinking, relations to authority… I prefer even these partial transformations, which have been made in the correlation of historical analysis and the practical attitude, to the programmes for a new man that the worst political systems have repeated throughout the twentieth century. (6, p. 54)
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