ACADEMY OF PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES OF THE RSFSR

COMMUNIST EDUCATION IN THE SOVIET SCHOOL

A COLLECTION OF ARTICLES

PART ONE

PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE ACADEMY OF PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES OF THE RSFSR

MOSCOW • 1950

This is a publication of STC — SPC — DD(CP).

September 2026.

Source: КОММУНИСТИЧЕСКОЕ ВОСПИТАНИЕ В СОВЕТСКОЙ ШКОЛЕ, ЧАСТЬ ПЕРВАЯ,

ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО АКАДЕМИИ ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИХ НАУК РСФСР, МОСКВА • 1950

Language: Russian
Produced by transcription, manually edited and prepared as an e-book. Translated into English using Gemini, Google Translate and Yandex Translate.

This is a publication of STC — SPC — DD(CP).

September 2026.

Direct Democracy (Communist Party)
Doğrudan Demokrasi (Komünist Parti)
Άμεση Δημοκρατία (Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα)
Прямая демократия (Коммунистическая партия)
www.directdemocracy4u.uk

Kıbrıs'ta Sosyalist Gerçek
Σοσιαλιστική Πραγματικότητα στην Κύπρο
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus
Социалистическая правда на Кипре
http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk

Kıbrıs Sosyalist Partisi
The Socialist Party of Cyprus
Το Σοσιαλιστικό Κόμμα Κύπρου
Социалистическая партия Кипра
https://st-cyprus.co.uk/kibris-sosyalist-partisi

КОММУНИСТИЧЕСКОЕ ВОСПИТАНИЕ В СОВЕТСКОЙ ШКОЛЕ



ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО
АКАДЕМИИ ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИХ НАУК
РСФСР

МОСКВА • 1950

ACADEMY OF PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES OF THE RSFSR

COMMUNIST EDUCATION IN THE SOVIET SCHOOL

A COLLECTION OF ARTICLES

PART ONE

PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE ACADEMY OF PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES OF THE RSFSR

MOSCOW • 1950

Table of Contents

FOREWORD.....9
GENERAL QUESTIONS OF COMMUNIST EDUCATION 14
THE SOVIET SYSTEM OF EDUCATION IS THE MOST PROGRESSIVE SYSTEM.....15
Prof. P. N. GRUZDEV.....35
MARX AND ENGELS—FOUNDERS OF SCIENTIFIC PEDAGOGY 35
N. A. PETROV.....93
V. I. LENIN ON EDUCATION.....93
N. A. PETROV.....124
J. V. STALIN ON THE COMMUNIST UPBRINGING OF THE YOUNG GENERATION.....124
N. K. GONCHAROV.....148
Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences.....148
MARXIST-LENINIST DOCTRINE ON MORALITY—THE BASIS OF COMMUNIST UPBRINGING IN SCHOOL.....148
N. I. BOLDYREV.....170
Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences.....170
M. I. KALININ ON COMMUNIST EDUCATION.....170
Prof. N. A. KONSTANTINOV.....200
Full Member of the APN RSFSR.....200
N. K. KRUPSKAYA ON EDUCATION AND INSTRUCTION. 200
A. S. MAKARENKO — AN INNOVATIVE EDUCATOR.....228
A. G. TER-GEVONDYAN.....242
Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences.....242
THE IDEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL FOUNDATION OF A. S. MAKARENKO'S PEDAGOGICAL VIEWS.....242
CONTENT, ORGANIZATION, AND METHODS OF EDUCATIONAL WORK IN THE SOVIET SCHOOL....262
Prof. V. S. SHEVKIN.....263
ON COMMUNIST MORALITY AND EDUCATION.....263

N. I. BOLDYREV.....293
ON THE QUESTION OF MORAL EDUCATION IN THE SOVIET SCHOOL.....293
Fundamentals of Communist Morality.....300
The Ideal of the New Person.....302
Main Tasks of Moral Education in the Soviet School.....311
Main Ways, Means, and Methods of Moral Education in the Soviet School.....325
N. K. GONCHAROV.....337
Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences.....337
EDUCATION OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST WORLDVIEW. .337
E. I. MONOSZON.....356
Senior Research Associate at the Institute of Teaching Methods, Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR.....356
THE EDUCATION OF CONSCIOUS DISCIPLINE IN STUDENTS 356
I. THE ESSENCE OF DISCIPLINE IN THE SOVIET SCHOOL.....359
II. BASIC CONDITIONS AND METHODS FOR EDUCATING CONSCIOUS DISCIPLINE IN STUDENTS 368
1. The Decisive Role of the Teacher.....368
2. Properly Organized Instruction—The Foundation of Educating Student Discipline 370
The Role of the Children's Collective in Strengthening Conscious Discipline.....376
5. Application of Individual Methods and Techniques for Educating Conscious Discipline in Students.....384
Encouragement and Punishment.....394
Prof. I. A. KAIROV.....401

Full Member of the APN RSFSR.....401
SOME ISSUES REGARDING THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHILDREN'S COLLECTIVE.....401
From the History of Children's Self-Government 401
The Role and Characteristics of the Children's Collective in the Soviet School.....407
Methodology of Organizing the Children's Collective 418
A. S. SOLOMAKHA.....427
Director of School No. 349, Moscow.....427
NURTURING THE COLLECTIVE IN SCHOOL.....427
(From work experience).....427
L. N. LEONCHUKOVA.....449
Honored Teacher of the RSFSR.....449
FOSTERING A SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY IN SENIOR CLASS STUDENTS.....449
(From Practical Experience).....449
Studying the Students.....449
Tasks for Fostering Dutifulness.....451
Content of Educational Conversations.....455
Work in the 9th Grade.....457
Work in the 10th Grade.....470
N. I. BRAZHNIK.....476
ON THE QUESTION OF EDUCATING AND SELF-EDUCATING STUDENTS.....476
(From the experience of educational work in secondary school).....476
I.....476
II.....476
III.....500
O. I. RUTA.....502
Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences.....502
CHARACTERISTICS OF ETHICAL CONVERSATIONS IN PRIMARY SCHOOL.....502

I. Soviet Patriotism. Service to the Motherland. 503
II. Communist Attitude Toward Labor.....504
III. Communist Attitude Toward People.....504
IV. Attitude Toward Oneself as a Member of the
Great Collective of Soviet People.....505

FOREWORD

During the period of our country's transition from socialism to communism, the communist education of the younger generations acquires decisive importance. The struggle for communism is at the same time a struggle for the upbringing of new people—active and conscious builders of communist society.

Soviet young men and women graduating from school must become worthy participants in the great cause of building communism, highly educated, and highly principled people. They need to be instilled with the best moral and political qualities: communist consciousness, cheerfulness and optimism, fortitude and courage, and ardent Soviet patriotism.

The question of the education of Soviet children and youth is a question of our forward movement. The pace of our country's victorious advance on the path to communism depends to a significant extent on the quality of educational work carried out by the Soviet school, the family, the Komsomol and Pioneer organizations, and out-of-school institutions.

Therefore, it is no coincidence that in recent years in our country questions regarding the communist education of the Soviet people—and above all, the young generation—have been raised with particular urgency. The historic decrees of the Central Committee of the VKP(b) [All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)] on ideological matters, the statements of the party press against manifestations of vestiges of servility toward foreign culture, the struggle against bourgeois objectivism and rootless cosmopolitanism—all these are links in a single chain of measures aimed at educating Soviet people in the spirit of Bolshevik ideology and communist consciousness, in the spirit of life-affirming Soviet patriotism.

Questions of the communist education of the younger generations in recent years have been broadly and comprehensively covered on the pages of our pedagogical press, including on the pages of the journal *Soviet Pedagogy*. Almost all major questions regarding the educational work of the Soviet school have been raised in one form or another on the pages of the journal *Soviet Pedagogy* over the past 3–4 years. Some articles devoted to questions of communist education were published in the journal much earlier, in the late 1930s and early 1940s. However, despite the significant time that has passed since their publication, they have not lost their relevance in our day. Together with the articles published in recent years, they help to clarify more deeply the goals, tasks, content, and principles of organizing communist education in the Soviet school.

Therefore, the editorial board of the journal *Soviet Pedagogy* decided to provide its subscribers in 1950, as a supplement, with a collection of articles on communist education published in the journal over the past 10 years. Most of the articles included in the collection were published in recent years. This is explained by the fact that they reflect more fully the current tasks of communist education brought forward by life today.

The size of the collection did not allow for the inclusion of all articles on communist education published in the journal *Soviet Pedagogy* without exception.

When selecting materials for the collection, the editorial board proceeded from the need to cover, as far as possible, the main sections of educational work in the Soviet school. At the same time, along with theoretical articles, the editorial board strove to provide articles highlighting the advanced experience of educational work in schools and by teachers.

In recent years, a particularly large place on the pages of the journal *Soviet Pedagogy* was devoted to articles highlighting the best, most advanced experience in communist education. Many of these articles contain invaluable material on the organization of educational work and on the diversity of forms and methods of communist education used in the Soviet school. The inclusion of these articles in the collection will undoubtedly facilitate the acquaintance of pedagogical science workers and teachers with the concrete experience of educational work in our school.

In view of the vastness of the material, the collection is being published in two volumes. In the first section of the first volume, articles are provided that highlight the teachings of the founders of Marxism-Leninism on communist education, as well as statements on communist education by prominent figures of the Bolshevik Party and leading Soviet pedagogues.

These articles significantly facilitate the study of the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, as well as the statements of prominent Bolshevik Party figures and leading Soviet pedagogues regarding the communist education of the younger generation. At the same time, they help to clarify more deeply the goals, tasks, basic content, and principles of raising our children and youth into new people—active and conscious builders of communism. A serious and in-depth study of the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism and the statements of prominent figures of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state on communist education is one of the necessary conditions for the further development of Soviet pedagogical science. Therefore, articles propagating the pedagogical ideas of Marx and Engels, the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on communist education, and the pedagogical statements of M. I. Kalinin must become the property of pedagogical science workers and school staff.

The second section of the first volume includes articles highlighting general issues regarding the content, organization, and methodology of educational work in the Soviet school.

A particularly large place in this section is reserved for articles devoted to questions of educating Soviet schoolchildren in the spirit of communist morality. The problem of educating our children and youth in the spirit of communist morality is the problem of shaping the new human. V. I. Lenin back in 1920, defining the tasks of the communist education of youth, pointed out the necessity of subordinating the entire matter of youth upbringing, education, and training to their education in communist morality. Therefore, the education of the younger generation in the spirit of communist morality is the most important section of communist education and the paramount task of the educational work of our school. Meanwhile, in textbooks and teaching materials on pedagogy, this issue has not received sufficient coverage. Monographs comprehensively illuminating the question of the content, organization, and methodology of moral education in the Soviet school have not been published. This circumstance forced the editorial board to include in the collection a number of articles devoted to questions of educating Soviet schoolchildren in the spirit of communist morality.

In the second part of the collection, the material will be distributed among the following sections: communist education in the process of instruction; extracurricular and out-of-school work; content, organization, and methods of work of the homeroom teacher; work of Komsomol and Pioneer organizations in the school; family and school.

Thus, the collection will cover all the main sections of educational work in the Soviet school.

The articles published in the collection have been re-reviewed and edited. Some of them underwent significant reductions due to outdated material and were supplemented with new material reflecting the tasks of educational work at the present stage.

In the appendix to the second part of the collection, an index of articles on communist education published in the journal *Soviet Pedagogy* from 1937 to 1949 will be provided, including articles not contained in the current collection. This index will help readers become thoroughly acquainted with the most important issues of educational work highlighted in the journal *Soviet Pedagogy* throughout all the years of its existence.

Please address all comments regarding this collection to: Moscow, Lobkovsky Lane, House No. 5/16. Editorial Office of the Journal *Soviet Pedagogy*.

GENERAL QUESTIONS OF COMMUNIST EDUCATION

THE SOVIET SYSTEM OF EDUCATION IS THE MOST PROGRESSIVE SYSTEM[1]

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution "...means a radical turning point in the history of mankind, a radical turning point in the historical destinies of world capitalism, a radical turning point in the liberation movement of the world proletariat, a radical turning point in the methods of struggle and forms of organization, in the daily life and traditions, in the culture and ideology of the exploited masses of the whole world."[2]

The socialist revolution in Russia in October 1917 is not only the starting point and base for the construction of a socialist society in our country—it is simultaneously the beginning and precondition of the world revolution.

That is why, from the very beginning of the October Revolution, all the forces of world reaction united and joined together against it.

"The Soviet system, which we, creating it in October, followed the precepts of 1905, developing our own experience—this Soviet system turned out to be a world-historical phenomenon. Now two camps stand fully consciously against each other on a world scale, without the slightest exaggeration"[3]—so spoke V. I. Lenin at the 9th Congress of the RKP(b) [Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)].

The period between the two world wars was a period of sharpening contradictions in the camp of capitalism, a period of preparation and unleashing of war. It was a period of

---

[1] An editorial article dedicated to the 31st anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

[2] J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 175.

[3] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXV, p. 99.

weakening and decline of the forces of capitalism and the deepening of its general crisis, on the one hand, and the period of the emergence, growth, and victory of socialism in the USSR, on the other.

Looking back at the victorious path traversed by the Soviet people over the past 31 years, summarizing the results of the greatest transformations in our country, and pondering the content of the gigantic achievements in all areas of our life, we clearly see that the source of our historical victories and successes lies in the political, economic, and social conditions brought forth by the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The October Revolution is called Great and Socialist precisely because it destroyed the very foundation of the exploitative system of old Russia—landlord and capitalist property—executing through revolutionary means the great act of "expropriating the expropriators," and raised high the banner of public property, this granite foundation of the socialist social order. In this way, the October Revolution fundamentally and radically differs from all preceding revolutions, the result of which was merely the replacement of one form of oppression and exploitation of working people with another: slavery with serfdom, serfdom with capitalist slavery.

The October Revolution is Great and Socialist also because it broke and shattered the old state system, which was based on the political oppression of the working people and served as an apparatus of all kinds of violence in the hands of the ruling exploiting classes—landlords and the bourgeoisie—and established a new, Soviet system, which represents a higher and new type of democracy; it buried forever the old policy of national oppression and proclaimed a new national policy, a policy of equality and friendship among peoples.

Only through these conditions can one explain the all-around progress in the economic, political, and cultural life of our country, which in its scope, pace, and scale is unprecedented in history. However, these conditions did not automatically bring about radical changes in the life of our country. The October Revolution created opportunities for the development of the colossal forces of the people that were bound within the depth of the old system, but these opportunities were realized into actual reality only thanks to the heroic efforts of the great party of Lenin—Stalin, which united millions of the masses around itself, inspiring and mobilizing them to achieve the great goals of the socialist revolution. Only the party of Bolsheviks, led by the brilliant leaders V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, could call to life the invincible constructive energy of the Soviet people and direct this energy toward the construction of a socialist society in the USSR. Only the correct and far-sighted policy of the Bolshevik Party enabled Soviet people to overcome all the obstacles and difficulties that stood in the way of socialist construction.

The Soviet people, under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, armed with the advanced theory of Marx—Engels—Lenin—Stalin, in fierce clashes with internal enemies and in intense struggle with the forces of imperialism on the world stage, successfully solved the task of building a socialist society.

* * *

In the historical competition between the two systems, a most prominent place was occupied by the struggle in the field of educating the younger generation. Education has always been a powerful weapon in the struggle for influence over youth, a powerful factor in forming the worldview of the rising generation, its social ideals, and its political orientation. "Education is a weapon, the effect of which depends on who

holds it in their hands and who they want to strike with this weapon," said J. V. Stalin.

Elements of a proletarian system of education originate even within bourgeois society. However, a fundamental split of the system of public education into two systems—bourgeois and Soviet—occurred only as a result of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia.

"The October Revolution is not only a revolution in the sphere of economic and socio-political relations. It is at the same time a revolution in minds, a revolution in the ideology of the working class."[4]

The revolution, which raised the working masses to storm capitalist property and all other pillars of bourgeois society, could not make use of the bourgeois system of education, since this system was inherently unacceptable for the goals of the revolutionary education of children and youth. If one also considers that in pre-revolutionary Russia the bourgeois system of education was intertwined with remnants of the feudal-landlord educational system and served to strengthen the bourgeois-landlord order, it becomes completely obvious that in its content, methods, and direction, it stood in irreconcilable contradiction to the goals and tasks of the socialist revolution.

In the USSR, in the process of transforming all economic and social relations, during the construction of the socialist social and state order, a new Soviet system of education was established, reflecting the revolutionary aspirations of the Soviet people and serving the tasks of the struggle for the victory of socialism.

The bourgeois system of education was liquidated in our country and replaced by a new system of education.

---

[4] J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 180.

In characterizing the old system of education and its main link —the school—V. I. Lenin emphasized above all the class character of the bourgeois system of education, highlighting the fact that it serves as an instrument of oppression in the hands of the ruling exploiting class and is steeped in class spirit.

V. I. Lenin mercilessly exposed false claims that education in bourgeois society allegedly serves the interests of the entire people, stands outside politics, has humanism as its guiding principle, and has the comprehensive education of the individual as its goal.

The Soviet system of education began to take shape immediately after the October Socialist Revolution. It, like Soviet forms of statehood, Soviet culture, Soviet art, etc., went through a period of its birth and formation in the fire of sharp class struggle.

The new, emerging Soviet system of education had to pave its way in a decisive struggle against bourgeois pedagogy, against all reactionaries who tried to hold on to old positions and from these positions bombard the great pedagogical ideas of the October Socialist Revolution.

Relying on the teachings of Marx—Engels—Lenin—Stalin on the communist education of the younger generation, the advanced section of teachers through practical experience, and the most progressive representatives of pedagogical science in the field of theory, step by step created a new, Soviet system of education.

First of all, new goals and tasks of education were formulated theoretically and tested in practice—in the school. The Program of the VKP(b), demanding the transformation of "the school from an instrument of class rule of the bourgeoisie into an instrument for the complete abolition of the division of

society into classes, into an instrument for the communist regeneration of society," openly proclaimed the connection between education and the class struggle of the proletariat, with the tasks of reconstructing society on socialist principles.

Instead of abstract and vague goals—such as introducing "man to the eternal life of the spirit" or educating "wise and sensible people"—a concrete revolutionary goal was set: to educate the younger generation into ardent fighters for communism.

Along with this, the content of education was restructured, new principles and approaches to the selection of academic subjects were developed, as well as to curriculum design and the organization of educational work. For the first time, it was openly stated that the question "What to teach?" is, above all, a question of politics.

Lenin's principle of connecting theory with practice and school with life became the cornerstone of the Soviet system of education, the starting point for developing the main principles of teaching and upbringing.

The change in the content of education was accompanied by a restructuring of teaching methods. In contrast to rote learning, which reigned in the old school, a conscious attitude toward learning was cultivated, alongside the activity and initiative of students. The stale atmosphere of the barrack-like regimen of the old school was replaced by an organization of school life under which new relationships flourished within the children's collective, and new relationships formed between the children's collective and the teaching staff.

Relationships of subordination and blind obedience were replaced by relationships in which the guiding role of the teacher did not suppress the independence and initiative of students, but directed them into the channel of creative work toward mastering the necessary knowledge, skills, and habits.

Showing constant concern for the upbringing of the younger generation, the Bolshevik Party and government directed the work of the Soviet school along the path of achieving the goals of communist education. The decrees of the Central Committee of the VKP(b) on school, adopted in the period of 1931–1936, served Soviet teachers as a principled foundation for improving and perfecting the Soviet system of education.

Throughout the entire transition period from capitalism to socialism—in the heroic years of the war against invaders and internal counter-revolution, during the period of transition to peaceful work to restore the national economy, during the period of socialist industrialization of the country and collectivization of agriculture, and during the struggle to complete the construction of socialist society and implement the new constitution—in all this steady forward movement toward communism, the Soviet system of education was a powerful weapon in the hands of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state in the struggle for a new, socialist order, and in the world-historic transformation of our country from a backward nation into an advanced and powerful socialist power.

The consistent implementation of the Soviet system of education in school, in Pioneer organizations, in the family, and in out-of-school institutions ensured the education of our youth into selfless fighters for the great cause of the party of Lenin—Stalin, equipped with the fundamentals of science, ardent patriots, and bold innovators who, joining the constructive labor of the Soviet people, worked wonders in industry and agriculture, broke old norms and outdated scientific dogmas, paved new paths in science and technology, glorified the greatness of the Soviet land, and strengthened the power of the world's first socialist state.

The victory of socialism in our country and the implementation of the Stalin Constitution opened up unprecedented

opportunities for the further development and perfection of the Soviet system of education as the most progressive system.

"The feature of Soviet society at the present time," said Comrade Stalin at the 18th Party Congress, "unlike any capitalist society, consists in the fact that there are no longer antagonistic, hostile classes in it; the exploiting classes have been eliminated, while workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, making up Soviet society, live and work on the principles of friendly cooperation. Whereas capitalist society is torn apart by irreconcilable contradictions between workers and capitalists, between peasants and landlords, which leads to the instability of its internal position, Soviet society, freed from the yoke of exploitation, knows no such contradictions, is free from class conflicts, and presents a picture of friendly cooperation among workers, peasants, and intelligentsia. On the basis of this community, such driving forces have developed as the moral-political unity of Soviet society, the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, and Soviet patriotism."[5]

Under the conditions of the victorious socialist system, the humanistic character of our society was revealed with unprecedented force, and the diverse talents of Soviet people unfolded with unprecedented vigor; Soviet science and technology moved forward in giant leaps. All this could not fail to enrich, and indeed enriched, the Soviet educational system with features that gave it immense vital strength. We mean, first of all, Soviet patriotism, which has taken a paramount place in the Soviet educational system. We mean the cultivation of a Marxist-Leninist worldview based on the mastery of genuinely scientific knowledge—a worldview that illuminates the path of struggle for a new social order. We also mean the education of the younger generation in the spirit of

[5] J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 589.

communist morality, which stems from socialist social relations and is a powerful force in the further development of the new moral foundations of society and an instrument for fighting the remnants and "birthmarks" of capitalism in people's consciousness and social behavior.

Educating the younger generation in Soviet patriotism—a patriotism of a new, higher type—mobilizes all the spiritual and physical forces of the youth, all the best manifestations of their mind and will in service to the great socialist Motherland; arming youth with the basics of an advanced Marxist-Leninist worldview; instilling new moral qualities and principles; firm and conscious mastery of the foundations of science—all this bore abundant fruit during the years of great trials for our Motherland, during the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people against fascist Germany.

In the clash of two worlds and two systems, the Soviet social and state system won, as did the Soviet people, who created, under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, a new society and a new Soviet human—unyielding in labor and heroically courageous in battle.

We can boldly say that the victory over fascist Germany and imperialist Japan is not only a brilliant military victory, not only a decisive economic victory over the enemy, not only the greatest victory of the Soviet social and state system, but also a victory of Soviet culture over decaying bourgeois culture, of advanced socialist ideology over reactionary bourgeois ideology, and of the progressive Soviet system of education over the bourgeois system of education.

As a result of World War II and the defeat of German fascism, a further serious weakening of the positions of world capitalism occurred, alongside the strengthening of the forces of democracy and socialism. Countries of Central and

Southeastern Europe, whose population accounts for about 100 million people, fell out of the orbit of capitalism. Power in these countries passed into the hands of the working people of city and countryside. The peoples of these countries created a democracy of a new type, undermined the foundations of capitalism, and embarked on the path of radical economic and political transformations.

Around the Soviet Union, democratic and progressive forces of all countries united, having become convinced of the vitality and advantages of the socialist system compared to capitalism. Two camps formed: the imperialist, reactionary camp headed by the USA, striving to unleash a new war, and the democratic, anti-imperialist camp headed by the USSR, striving to undermine imperialism, liquidate all remnants of fascism, and fighting for lasting and enduring peace.

Under conditions of the polarization of forces on the world stage, the fundamental difference between the Soviet system of education and the bourgeois system of education, as well as its progressive character, manifests with greater force than ever before. The scope of influence of the Soviet system of education has expanded significantly. Its splendid experience, core principles and propositions, content, and organizational forms are borrowed and assimilated by the countries of the new democracy, who apply them taking into account the concrete historical features of each country. Its achievements are studied and propagated by advanced scholars all over the world.

* * *

The progressive character of the Soviet system of education lies primarily in the fact that it serves the great transformative goals of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, contributes to the growth and development of socialist society, and helps Soviet people successfully solve the task of building a

communist society on the basis of a gradual transition from socialism to communism.

At the present stage, the ideological and political orientation of the Soviet system of education is being significantly strengthened, and its militantly offensive spirit against all forms of influence of bourgeois ideology, against all types of subservience to bourgeois science and culture, is being raised.

"The young Soviet generation," said A. A. Zhdanov, "is called upon to consolidate the strength and power of the socialist Soviet system, to fully utilize the driving forces of Soviet society for a new, unprecedented flourish of our well-being and culture. For these great tasks, the young generation must be raised to be steadfast, cheerful, fearless of obstacles, marching forward to meet these obstacles, and capable of overcoming them."[6]

The decrees of the Central Committee of the VKP(b) on matters of ideological work and the brilliant reports by A. A. Zhdanov on issues of literature, philosophy, and art serve as the most valuable and guiding documents for Soviet teachers and Soviet pedagogy. Relying on them and putting them into practice, Soviet teachers raise the Soviet system of education to the highest level, developing its strongest aspects—its high ideolody, its subordination to the policy of the Communist Party, and its service not only to present, but also to future tasks.

While the modern bourgeois system of education, seeking to find support points for itself in the past that has already outlived its age, clings to the most reactionary pedagogical systems and tries to eliminate irremovable contradictions—the Soviet system of education is directed toward the future,

---

[6] Report by A. A. Zhdanov on the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*. Gospolitizdat, 1946, pp. 37–38.

leading an irreconcilable struggle against everything dying off, against everything that hinders forward movement.

The bourgeois system of education carries within itself the poisonous principles of decay caused by the breakdown and rot of capitalist society; it is internally unstable, full of irreconcilable conflicts, and ideologically helpless. The source of these incurable vices is the capitalist system itself, with its organic diseases, its historical doom, its desire to delay the course of historical development, and its role as a brake on all progress—economic, cultural, technical, etc.

The Soviet system of education, on the contrary, represents an internal unity of principles, goals, tasks, content, and methods of communist education; it knows no irremovable contradictions, for it fully corresponds to the vital tasks of the Soviet people. The source of its vitality and strength is the socialist system, which is devoid of antagonistic contradictions and ensures the unlimited development of the productive forces of society.

The progressive character of the Soviet system of education is also expressed in the fact that it serves in the hands of the socialist state as an instrument for the comprehensive development of younger generations.

While any variety of the bourgeois system of education contributes to reproducing the capitalist form of division of labor, which enslaves man and deepens the chasm between physical and mental labor, stultifies and corrupts the consciousness of the young generation, and deforms it morally and physically—the Soviet system of education, formed on the firm foundation of socialist social relations, is called upon to completely eliminate the absurd and monstrous one-sidedness of bourgeois education and to ensure the younger generation

the comprehensive development of its spiritual and physical forces, all its abilities and talents.

Only under the conditions of a socialist system, where political power and all material and cultural wealth belong to the people, are opportunities for creative, constructive labor created for the broad masses of the people.

Workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia have become masters and creators of life. Under the leadership of the party of Lenin —Stalin, they plan and organize work in industry and agriculture, advance science and technology in the interest of social production, improve technological processes, transform nature in the interest of man, and seek ways and means to increase labor productivity on the basis of nationwide socialist competition. Their interests are not limited to their own shop or factory. No, their outlook is much broader. Their interests are nationwide, state interests.

The vital functions of a Soviet person are not limited to the framework of their production activity. A Soviet person lives a full-blooded civic life. A new type of public figure has emerged here. Millions of people under the Soviet system perform various civic and state duties. These include deputies of the Soviets of working people's deputies and figures in various societies, associations, unions, and organizations.

Hence it is understandable that passing accumulated production, technical, and social experience to the younger generation and preparing them for life require a broad general education and the development of all sides of the growing human personality. The comprehensive development of the younger generation becomes a law of social education.

This is not only a goal, but the deepest and most essential feature of the Soviet system of education, defining the main content of instruction and upbringing and providing a criterion

for evaluating practical achievements in the field of education. The task of the comprehensive development of the young generation is carried out primarily by the Soviet school through mental education, moral, physical, and aesthetic education, and polytechnic training, which are constituent, interconnected, and interdependent parts or aspects of communist education.

The task of the comprehensive development of the younger generation finds its expression in study plans, curricula, and in all educational and upbringing work of the Soviet school, in the educational activities of out-of-school institutions, and in the work of Pioneer detachments and troops.

The progressive character of the Soviet system of education is also evident in the fact that the principle of socialist humanism is fully and consistently implemented within it.

Humanism was once the banner of the rising bourgeoisie's struggle for the liberation of the human personality and science from the shackles of feudalism and the church. But it ceased to be such a banner when the bourgeoisie came to power, when its main concern, goal, and meaning of life became the pursuit of profit. There was a time when bourgeois ideologists exalted man and human reason. But those times have sunk into eternity. The banner of humanism was cast down, and the black banner of inhumane exploitation of the working masses by the new bourgeois elite was unfurled on the basis of fierce competition with one another, which in the era of imperialism was replaced by the competitive struggle of giant monopolies.

Bourgeois philosophy has long raised the banner of misanthropy, deliberately stoking the lowest instincts in man. It poisons the social atmosphere with the spirit of pessimism and disbelief in humanity. It attempts to justify the social inequality of people through natural characteristics, through the "natural" division of people into smart and dumb, strong and weak. It

propagates deeply reactionary views on the eternity and unchangeability of human nature. It casts aside the slogans of the rising bourgeoisie's ideologists regarding human equality and personal freedom, glorifying the right of some to dominate over others.

The Soviet system of education is permeated with the spirit of socialist humanism, the spirit of equality of large and small nations. Any form of racist prejudice regarding the superiority of some races over others is foreign to it. It propagates peace and friendship among peoples. But its humanistic character does not consist only in this. It is humanistic at its core: in the formulation of the goals and tasks of education, and in the content and methods of educational work.

The Soviet system of education is a model of a humane attitude toward children, their needs, and individual interests. This does not in the least contradict the fact that it puts public interests above all else, cultivating the subordination of private interests to state interests, personal to public, because the socialist system has eliminated the contradictions between the individual and society. Stalin's words that "people must be carefully and attentively cultivated, as a gardener cultivates a favorite fruit tree" serve as a guiding compass in the educational work of schools, Komsomol, Pioneer organizations, and out-of-school institutions.

"We are tired of man"—these words of the philosophical forerunner of fascism, Nietzsche, are repeated in every way by the reactionary philosophy of imperialism.

"Everything in Man, everything for Man"—these words of the great proletarian writer and humanist M. Gorky reflect socialist humanism in our country.

Soviet socialist humanism does not exclude, but presupposes the cultivation of untamed hatred toward the enemies of the

people, to warmongers of new wars, to all forms of bourgeois barbarism, and to all those who brake the movement of the working masses toward their cherished goal—toward communism.

The progressive character of the Soviet educational system also finds expression in its democratic nature.

Defenders of the bourgeois order try to prove that only the bourgeois system provides true democracy, which is allegedly an inherent feature and main constitutive mark of bourgeois society. But we know what things look like in reality, for example, in the bourgeois democracy of the USA, with its racial discrimination against Black people, the corruption of its parliamentarians, the expulsion of dissenters from the state apparatus, and its policy of stifling any progressive movement and any free thought. These features are characteristic of modern social life in the USA, and they find their reflection in the system of education. In vain does one of the most prominent leaders of reactionary pedagogy, John Dewey, claim that the bourgeoisie realizes the interests of all the people through education, that the latter is called upon to preserve the unity of the American nation, and that education is the main method of developing democracy. His demagogic assurances that school education is capable of eliminating the defects of the bourgeois system, and that through the school one can "reorganize" bourgeois democracy and achieve social peace, cannot deceive anyone. In vain does he assure that his pedagogical recipes can prevent the chaos threatening the bourgeois world.

Only Soviet democracy means the participation of all the people in state administration and public production, truly reflects the interests of all the people, and is the highest, most consistent form of democracy. Therefore, it determines the democratic character of the educational system.

The democratic nature of the Soviet system of education consists above all in its service to all the people, rather than individual groups and classes. The primary channel of the Soviet educational system, its decisive link—the school—is at all levels a genuinely popular and most democratic school. We do not have some schools for the children of the wealthy and others for the children of the common populace, as is the case in England, the USA, and other bourgeois countries. In our country, the school is unified for all the people; unified are the goals, principles, content, and methods of Soviet education. Inclusiveness for all the people is a distinctive feature of the Soviet educational system, inherent to it and to it alone.

The democratic nature of the Soviet educational system is also expressed in the fact that education covers all ages of the younger generation—children, adolescents, and youth. Only in the USSR do virtually all children and adolescents, before entering the process of social production, go through school where they master the fundamentals of science and the basics of the most advanced Marxist-Leninist worldview, assimilate moral norms of behavior in a socialist society, and receive an impetus toward the further development of all spiritual and physical sides of the human personality.

There is not a single bourgeois country in the world where the school serves the entire younger generation, despite laws on universal compulsory education.

In the USSR, over 32 million children, adolescents, and youth (which equals the population of a large state) are studying this year in the Soviet school.

Millions of students are covered during leisure hours by out-of-school education. In the RSFSR, there are 562 Pioneer houses and 59 Pioneer palaces, 289 young technicians' stations, 189 young naturalists' stations, 84 children's parks, and 40

excursion-turist stations. In the Moscow and Leningrad Pioneer Palaces alone, tens of thousands of students participate in societies of young historians and geographers, technical and naturalist circles, and music and painting studios.

Finally, the progressive character of the Soviet educational system is manifested in the fact that, built on the basis of the most advanced Marxist-Leninist theory, it is the only scientific system of public education. The scientific nature of the Soviet educational system is ensured primarily by the fact that the goals, principles, content, and methods of education, as well as the organizational forms of the educational process, are developed and formulated on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on social development, its driving forces, the conditions and ways of forming the human personality, the role of the social environment and hereditary factors, and the decisive importance of education in forming the younger generation.

The Soviet system of education strives to ensure that the approach to all studied phenomena and events in school and out-of-school institutions is strictly scientific, that academic subjects are indeed constructed on a scientific basis, and that theories and conclusions forming the content of school education reflect the most advanced views of modern science and are free from any idealistic and religious influences.

* * *

The Soviet educational system, having grown on the base of socialist social relations and constructed on the foundation of the most advanced Marxist-Leninist science about society, immeasurably surpasses all preceding systems of education; it possesses indisputable advantages and represents a qualitatively new and higher stage in the development of public education.

However, it would be a greatest error to believe that the Soviet educational system is a finished and complete building.

Great Stalin teaches that self-satisfaction, self-infatuation, and conceit are the most dangerous enemies.

Now, when the Soviet people, successfully fulfilling the plan of the post-war Stalin five-year plan, are taking new steps forward on the path of gradual transition from socialism to communism, exceptional importance is acquired by the education of Soviet people in the spirit of communist consciousness and the raising of their ideological and political level.

Remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of people in Soviet society are still far from being completely eradicated. The consciousness of the masses, as is known, lags behind changes in the material living conditions of society in its development. Forms of social consciousness, once emerged and passed down from generation to generation, acquire the force of tradition and habit.

Assimilated from an early age, these habits possess great vitality. Old views, ideas, habits, and customs inherited from the past system brake the development of our society. That is why the Bolshevik Party and Comrade Stalin personally in questions of education have always paid and continue to pay great attention to the struggle against remnants of the old order in the consciousness of the younger generation.

Soviet teachers and workers of Soviet pedagogical science face a task of immense state importance—to educate youth into a comprehensively developed generation, devoted to the cause of the great party of Lenin—Stalin, and confident in the victory of communism.

This task can be solved only on the condition of a further increase in the effectiveness of the Soviet system of education, through its further improvement and refinement. Formalism in teaching, poor academic performance of a portion of students, cases of penetration into the consciousness of our youth of old habits and views, in particular religious influences, testify to the fact that the Soviet educational system has not been brought to full in accordance with the tasks facing the Soviet school. This is largely explained by the lagging of Soviet pedagogy behind the pressing practical tasks of modernity.

In order to eliminate its lagging more quickly, Soviet pedagogy, like advanced Michurinist agrobiology, must ensure the dissemination of best practices, organize on a larger scale the experimental testing of new methods and techniques of educational and teaching work.

The Party and the Soviet government have created exceptionally favorable conditions for the flourish of pedagogical sciences in our country. It is the duty of scientists to respond to this care of the Party and government with a new surge in Soviet pedagogy at the level of the tasks facing our people.

"*Sovetskaya Pedagogika", 1948, No. 11*

Prof. P. N. GRUZDEV

MARX AND ENGELS—FOUNDERS OF SCIENTIFIC PEDAGOGY

Before setting forth the system of pedagogical views of the founders of Marxism, it is necessary to give, at least briefly, a critical evaluation of that pedagogical literature in which these issues are somehow illuminated.

In pedagogical literature, the views of Marx and Engels on education and instruction are expounded very incompletely, superficially, and often incorrectly. Moreover, enemies of the people have spared no effort to diminish and belittle in every way the role of the founders of Marxism in the creation and development of genuinely scientific pedagogy. It was they who wreckingly asserted that Marx and Engels did not create a system of pedagogical views, leaving only fragmented thoughts fitting into a few lines. All this, of course, is enemy slander against Marxism, repeating the assertions of the most reactionary bourgeois educators. In particular, the harmful view was propagated that social-reformists are direct continuers of the cause of Marxism in the field of public education, that social-democrats Schultz, Seidel, and others justify their pedagogical platform from the standpoint of Marxism.

In historical-pedagogical literature, we encounter the absurd "discovery" that the first theorists and practitioners of the proletarian labor school were the anarchist-Proudhonists—specifically, Paul Robin, a known opponent of Marx in the First International and a follower of Bakunin—as if he had put into practice the idea of the all-around development of the human personality.

The exposition of Marx's and Engels's pedagogical views is sometimes limited to a brief description of isolated thoughts without a definite system, without an in-depth analysis of individual problems of Marxist pedagogy, without linking these thoughts to contemporary vital issues of pedagogy.

From this results an emasculation of the pedagogical heritage of Marxism, of its vital, revolutionary significance.

In educational-pedagogical literature, when expounding the views of Marx on education, the position is formulated that Marx was the first to reveal the class essence of education, and in this they see the main merit of Marx. In reality, predecessors of Marx had written about the class character of education even before him.

The main point belonging to Marx's teaching on education remains, essentially, bypassed. This is the question of the radical transformation of education after the victory of the proletariat in the socialist revolution, the question that only after the proletarian revolution are the contradictions of bourgeois education removed, and that this revolution is a natural, necessary prerequisite for new, unprecedented spiritual growth and the flourishing of the popular masses. Lenin pointed out more than once that the bourgeoisie and its petty-bourgeois echoers always try to obscure and quiet down the question of educational tasks and the significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"He who recognizes only the class struggle is not yet a Marxist... he may turn out not to have gone beyond the framework of bourgeois thinking and bourgeois politics. To limit Marxism to the teaching of class struggle means to curtail Marxism, to distort it, to reduce it to what is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. A Marxist is only one who extends the recognition of class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the

proletariat... On this touchstone must be tested the genuine understanding and recognition of Marxism."[7]

These words of Lenin also apply to the characterization of the Marxist teaching on the class nature of education given in some works on pedagogy.

Sometimes the crucial question of all-around development is also illuminated incorrectly and in a non-party spirit. A great deal has been written on this topic in bourgeois and petty-bourgeois pedagogy. However, authors of Soviet textbooks on pedagogy and the history of pedagogy do not show the radical, principled difference between Marxist teaching and the bourgeois understanding here. The correct illumination of this question is logically and inevitably connected with the preceding question.

In the draft resolution of the Geneva Congress of the First International, Marx wrote about three constituent parts of education: mental, physical, polytechnic.

Some authors, clinging to the letter, conclude from this that Marx assigned first place to mental education, second to physical, and third to polytechnic—which is completely absurd.

Instead of penetrating into the essence of the matter, understanding in what connection and in what period a particular draft was written, isolated phrases are snatched from a work regardless of when that work was written.

In studying Marxism, one must be guided by those principled tenets expressed with exceptional depth and clarity in the *Short Course of the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)*.

---

[7] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXI, p. 392.

"To master Marxist-Leninist theory does not mean at all to memorize all its formulas and conclusions and cling to every letter of these formulas and conclusions. To master Marxist-Leninist theory, one must, above all, learn to distinguish between its letter and essence"[8]. Mastering Marxist-Leninist teaching, as stated further in the *Short Course*, includes assimilating the essence of this teaching, applying and developing this teaching further under new conditions.

Comrade Stalin has repeatedly pointed out that studying Marxism-Leninism should be done not by isolated quotes, but in essence, studied seriously and thoughtfully, tirelessly.

A serious and deep study of Marxist teaching on education cannot be limited solely to mastering the pedagogical statements of Marx and Engels. It requires the study of Marxism as a whole, the assimilation of its materialist theory and its dialectical method. Without this, there can be no further real development of scientific pedagogy.

Marxism is not only a system of science, but also its method. Revealing the essence of dialectical materialism, Comrade Stalin characterizes it as a dialectical method or way of studying and knowing, and as a materialist theory.

In the philosophical discussion, Comrade Zhdanov emphasized with special emphasis the significance of method in Marxist philosophy: *"Marxist philosophy, unlike previous philosophical systems, is not a science above other sciences, but constitutes an instrument of scientific research—a method penetrating all sciences of nature and society, enriching itself with the data of these sciences during their development. In this sense, Marxist philosophy is the most complete and decisive negation of all preceding philosophy."*

---

[8] *History of the C.P.S.U.(B). Short Course*, p. 339.

Marx and Engels, conscious of the huge scientific significance of their method, wrote about this method as a tool for the most accurate cognition of reality, pointing out the radical difference between this method and all preceding methodology.

The application of the dialectical method to the study of education and instruction revealed the real laws governing education, thereby transforming pedagogy into a genuine science capable not only of correctly explaining phenomena, but also of foreseeing the future development of education. Such a science is precisely the Marxist teaching on education, representing a new period in the development of scientific pedagogical theory, radically differing from all previous theories of education.

Even before Marx, there were attempts to explain the essence of education and instruction, their connection with the conditions of social life. Predecessors of Marx—French Enlightenment thinkers and utopian socialists—wrote much about education and its connection with various economic and political phenomena. But while sometimes correctly describing reality and uttering deep thoughts and brilliant guesses, the predecessors of Marx could not reveal the actual laws of the development of education because they did not possess the method of dialectical materialism. The method used by the predecessors of Marxism in explaining social phenomena was the direct opposite of Marx's method; it was, in essence, metaphysical.

****

The great teachers of the proletariat, founders of scientific communism, Marx and Engels, in studying and revealing the laws of social development—particularly the development of capitalist society—did not pass by that "sphere of practical social relations" which, in Marx's phrase, constituted education

and instruction. In his first major work, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, Engels devotes many pages to the education and instruction provided by the bourgeoisie to the workers and their children. In the main work of Marxism, *Capital*, Marx devotes significant space to child labor in factories, the impact of this labor on the physical and spiritual development of children, as well as the education received by workers' children in the form of pitiful hand-outs from capitalists. Not a few pages relating to issues of public education are found in other works of Marx and Engels.

Taken together, these pedagogical statements—some brief, others more extensive and rich in thought—constitute a definite system of views and ideas organically arising from the Marxist teaching on society. The works of Marx and Engels provide brilliant examples of applying Marxist dialectics to issues of education, as well as concrete material relating to these issues.

Marx and Engels, with their characteristic scientific depth, studied the state of public education in various countries across different historical periods, and their conclusions are of exceptional importance for the development of scientific pedagogy.

In a letter to Kablukova in 1880, Engels, responding to her request for material on public education in England, writes that he and Marx follow with keen interest everything happening in the field of public education, particularly in Russia.

In 1892, Engels wrote that to refute Dühring, he had to deal with the most diverse subjects, including issues related to the education of youth in future society.

In accordance with the method of revolutionary dialectics, Marx and Engels viewed issues of education and instruction in their development. Through the works of Marx and Engels, one can trace how education changed across various historical

periods in connection with changes in the economic and political structure of society, and how class interests were reflected in pedagogy. In their works, Marx and Engels revealed with maximum clarity the basic laws and factors of human education and development, as well as the contradictions and tendencies of further educational development.

In Marx and Engels, we find answers to a whole range of fundamental pedagogical problems, such as: the relationship between circumstances and education; politics and pedagogy; the role of education and the school in class struggle; factors of children's mental and physical development; scientific and polytechnic education in a socialist society; conditions for all-around human development, and others.

Marx and Engels detail the characteristics of education in bourgeois society, exposing the class limitations, deformities, and incompleteness of the education provided by the bourgeoisie to workers and their children.

At the same time, Marx showed the main contradictions of bourgeois education as a reflection and consequence of the general contradictions of capitalism—and, on the other hand, how seeds of a new education emerge under capitalism to develop further in socialist society after the revolutionary capture of political power by the proletariat. Along with analyzing bourgeois education, Marx and Engels, as leaders of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, formulated requirements and principles of proletarian education, which later entered the program of the C.P.S.U.(B) in a fully developed form.

****

The revolutionary-materialist views of Marx and Engels on education were not formed overnight. As is known, before

becoming proletarian revolutionaries, founders, and leaders of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels passed through a stage of development when, in politics, they were revolutionary democrats, and in philosophy, were under the influence of Hegel and Feuerbach, though critically overcoming the weaknesses and developing the progressive principles of those teachings.

To this period (prior to 1844) belongs a series of works by the future founders of Marxism in which they often speak on issues of education and instruction for the younger generation.

Marx's first work relevant to pedagogy can be considered his essay *"Reflections of a Young Man on the Choice of a Profession"*, written upon graduating from gymnasium in 1835 when Marx was 17 years old. This essay was written in an abstract-idealist spirit and, of course, one cannot yet see in it elements of a materialist worldview, as some Marx biographers claim. However, it is interesting for characterizing Marx's youth views and as a document providing an idea of gymnasium essays of that time. In this essay, Marx repeatedly asserts that in choosing a profession, the "main guide" should be the welfare of humanity, the happiness of millions of people; working for their benefit, we shall not bend under the burden of our chosen profession and will experience not limited, selfish joy, but the highest human dignity. Here Marx also raises several questions that have not lost their significance today: about profession and standing in society, about calling and aptitude for a profession, and about the main goals of human activity when selecting a life path.

Of greater significance are subsequent works of Marx and Engels written between 1839 and 1844. During this period, Engels speaks on educational matters more than Marx. In *"Letters from Wuppertal"*, the 19-year-old Engels describes the state of school education in provincial Prussian towns. These

schools were under the reactionary influence of religious mysticism and pietism, especially primary schools. In the *Realschule*, "that terrible system of copying into notebooks reigns, which in six months can turn a student into a blockhead turn a student into a blockhead." In the industrial school, "students spend half their lives slaving over drafting."

Engels describes the spiritual interests of provincial youth, children of merchants, with biting irony. Children follow in their fathers' footsteps. Their interests are extremely limited and low. The conversations of these burgher youths revolve mostly around horses, dogs, and beautiful women. About literature, Engels ironizes, young people speak once every fifty years, and even then about third-rate writers.

In subsequent articles from this period, Engels speaks even more harshly of the school, characterizing it as a school-dungeon and a barracks where young sprouts wither, where rote learning and scholasticism reign, and outside school, the "goddess of our century is the police."

Observing new phenomena in the social life of Germany, which was then pregnant with bourgeois revolution, Engels places all hopes for the victory of the new on the younger generation, on whom the future depends.

During this period, Engels was not yet free from the illusions of utopian socialists regarding the peaceful transformation of society through the re-education of man. In the *"Elberfeld Speeches"*, to the question of how to put communist theory into practice, Engels replies that the first way to do this is universal education. Engels justifies the necessity of introducing it by stating that this measure would be an act of justice toward the destitute—since everyone has a right to the full development of their abilities—and that only from an educated working class can one expect the composure and prudence necessary for the

peaceful transformation of society. Therefore, the main principle of the association of communists in Elberfeld was the recognition that *"...all people have an equal right to education and must equally enjoy the fruits of science."*[9]

During his first stay in England, observing firsthand the class struggle of English proletarians against the bourgeoisie, Engels gradually frees himself from utopian sentiments. Describing the cultural level of the ruling classes and workers, Engels concludes that in England the progressive class with a future is the proletariat, not the upper classes of society, despite their "educatedness." "The educated classes in England are deaf to all progress, and only under the pressure of the working class do they move slightly." Engels shows how spiritually fallen the ruling classes in England were, how entrenched they were in prejudice, conservatism, and ignorance despite their education. The spiritual castration of the ruling classes is aided not a little by their education, which from generation to generation passes down political and religious prejudices. The education received in schools for children of the ruling classes is simple: they are uselessly tortured in school over Greeks and Romans. Such a "student," who possesses so many thousands of pounds sterling in income, needs nothing more than to find a wife, writes Engels. Later, Engels exposes even more clearly the class nature of educating wealthy children, pointing out its one-sidedness and narrowness due to adapting education to the specialty of doing nothing.

When Engels wrote about the spiritual flabbiness of the ruling classes in England, he was not yet a proletarian revolutionary, although in the struggle of the English proletariat against the bourgeoisie, he sided with the former. But even then, Engels showed the contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the

---

[9] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, vol. II, p. 424.

proletariat, particularly in education, exposing the class character of bourgeois "concern" for worker enlightenment, thereby laying the initial elements of his future Marxist worldview, later developed in his major work *The Condition of the Working Class in England*.

Turning to Marx, we focus on his articles published in the *Rheinische Zeitung*. Strictly speaking, two articles pertain to our topic: *"Debates on Freedom of the Press"* and *"Leading Article in No. 179 of the Kölnische Zeitung"*, written in 1842.

Polemicizing with the reactionary *Prussian State Gazette*, Marx calls it a newspaper-child and speaks of the peculiarities of child thought. A child's theoretical thinking flows in categories of quantity, while its judgment is of a practical-sensory nature. A feature of a child's perception is that it sees only the particular, unaware of the existence of those invisible threads connecting the particular to the general. A child connects itself to the external world through sensory properties of objects and phenomena.

In another article, *"Leading Article in the Kölnische Zeitung"*, Marx explains the fundamental difference between the educational tasks of the state and the school. In this article, Marx criticizes the view of the reactionary author who saw in the Prussian state an educational institution differing from an ordinary school only in size. How did Marx view the difference between school education and the educational impact of the state as a whole during that period?

The state fulfills its educational role not by constantly patronizing the individual as is done in school, but by its rational existence—when the state represents an association of free people educating one another, and when such a state transforms private interests into the interests of all society.

Such an understanding of the state in the spirit of Feuerbach did not reconcile with the Prussian landlord-bureaucratic state against which Marx fought as a supporter of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany at that time.

Later, over 30 years later, criticizing the draft of the Gotha Program, Marx returns to this issue, sharply objecting to the clause on "education of the people by the state," by which was meant the Prussian-German state. This will be discussed in more detail later.

Such are the main pedagogical statements of Marx and Engels during this period. The future leaders and teachers of the proletariat criticize the state of school education in individual countries (Prussia, England), write about the paucity of funds allocated for public education, the church's influence on the school, outdated methods of educating youth, and the deprivation of working people's education by the ruling classes, reaching for the first time a characterization of the class essence of education and instruction.

*****

Subsequent years (1844–1848) were years of formation for Marxism. During this time, Marx and Engels developed the philosophy of dialectical materialism and became leaders of the communist movement of the proletariat. To this time belong classical works of Marxism: *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1845), *The German Ideology* (1845–1846), *The Poverty of Philosophy* (1847), and *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (1848).

Marxist pedagogy dates its origin from these works, as in them we find rich material on education and instruction illuminated from the perspective of dialectical materialism. In these works, Marx and Engels laid the foundations of Marxist pedagogy,

which were subsequently developed and specified in later works: *Capital*, *Anti-Dühring*, etc.

The pedagogical views of Marx and Engels represent a critical processing and development of the heritage received from their predecessors, especially utopian socialists. Marx and Engels repeatedly pointed out the connection between their teaching and that of their predecessors—materialists of the late 18th and early 19th centuries.

In *Capital*, we frequently encounter Marx's references to those predecessors whom he valued highly. For instance, in one place Marx speaks of the 17th-century English thinker Bellers, calling him a true phenomenon in the history of political economy and sympathizing with his ideas on labor education. John Bellers considered it necessary to build a system of youth education where learning would be tied to productive labor. Naturally, Bellers conceived productive labor in craft forms. But Marx especially highly valued the pedagogical heritage of R. Owen and Fourier, the great utopian socialists. Fourier's views on education, in Marx's evaluation, *"...represent the best that exists in this field and contain brilliant observations."*[10]

Even before Marx, utopian socialists, especially Fourier and R. Owen, launched sharp criticisms against the ruling classes for keeping the masses in ignorance, thereby intensifying their poverty and misery. Drawing plans for education in a future society where exploitation and poverty would not exist, utopian socialists expressed a number of tenets that later entered Marxist pedagogy in a developed form. For example, they spoke for the necessity of public education, which should ensure the right of all children to education and the development of all their spiritual and physical powers. This right to education could not be provided by the family, which

[10] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, vol. IV, p. 510.

was then decomposing due to the involvement of women and children in capitalist production. Therefore, utopian socialists insisted on the idea of public education. A second tenet of utopian socialists was the requirement to combine productive labor of children with compulsory instruction in public schools —a cause for which R. Owen fought, demanding relevant legislation from the English Parliament. The requirement for public education and its combination with productive labor later entered, in a developed form, the program demands of the Communist Party formulated by Marx and Engels in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*.

R. Owen attempted to realize his ideas in practice at New Lanark. At his factories, he created new conditions for the life and labor of workers, taking special care of good nutrition for the rising generation. He organized nurseries, kindergartens, and schools for workers' children, implementing new methods of education and instruction based on visual clarity and active student participation.

However, R. Owen's main merit was that he practically proved the necessity of combining productive labor with instruction. Although, as Marx notes, the bourgeoisie mocked his experiment of a new education as a communist utopia, this idea of R. Owen nevertheless appeared in every Factory Act of the English government regarding child labor education. Not without reason does Marx state in *Capital* that from the factory system, as can be traced in detail in R. Owen, arose the germ of education for the future society.

While pointing out the connection between scientific socialism and preceding theories of 18th-century French materialists and utopian socialists, Marx and Engels at the same time reveal the inconsistency and contradictions of those teachings, in which materialist tendencies coexisted alongside idealist positions. While expressing the fundamentally correct idea that human

education and character depend on the social environment, utopian socialists sought to change this environment and people through philanthropic propaganda, re-education of people, and the organization of isolated producer associations.

Thus, changing the social environment itself depended on the consciousness of individual people, on their enlightenment and reason. This stance found clear reflection in the formula of Voltaire, the major representative of 18th-century French Enlightenment thinkers, who wrote: "People become freer as they become more enlightened."

Utopian socialists failed to understand the importance of revolutionary activity in transforming society, or class struggle of the proletarian masses as a factor in transforming society and people. Recognizing capitalism as a useless system, utopian socialists could not correctly explain the laws governing the development of capitalism.

The experiment of R. Owen's new education did not spread beyond his factories and those new human settlements structured as isolated communes organized by R. Owen and his followers. Capitalist society, which R. Owen wished to change, remained without any change in relations between capitalists and workers. The education received by workers in bourgeois society also remained intact. R. Owen's attempts did not radically transform either the social order or the education of working masses, nor could they do so. In the capitalist factory, the same abominable exploitation of workers and children continued.

Questions that could not be correctly resolved by the predecessors of Marxism received a clear and precise resolution from the founders of Marxism. Marx and Engels proved with scientific irrefutability that in capitalist society it is impossible to realize the right of all children to education or to

their spiritual and physical development. Impossible because education reflects the selfish interests of capitalists, in whose hands public education becomes a weapon for the spiritual enslavement of the working masses.

But it was not only a matter of Marx and Engels showing the class nature of education and instruction in bourgeois society—they also exposed the contradictions of this education, indicated the only correct way out of these contradictions, and substantiated the paths and principles of new socialist education in the era of the dictatorship of the working class in a socialist society.

"*Marx's teaching is omnipotent because it is true,"* wrote Lenin. Marx discovered the laws of social development and, in particular, of capitalist society. Applying the method of revolutionary dialectics, Marx scientifically explained the origins, development, and inevitable downfall of capitalist society, as well as the necessity of creating a new socialist society.

The application of materialist dialectics made it possible, for the first time in the history of pedagogical thought, to correctly characterize education and instruction in capitalist society, expose its main contradictions, and show that education in a class society is an instrument of oppression and spiritual enslavement of working people. But even greater is the merit of Marx and Engels in human history in that they indicated the only correct path for the revolutionary transformation of this education into a genuinely popular, scientific, all-around developing human personality education.

Marx and Engels, like their predecessors, repeatedly spoke of the great role of education in social life. Engels wrote in his very first works that the future depends on youth, as they will have to resolve all contradictions in modern society. In *The*

German Ideology, Marx and Engels express the position that education is a factor in the development (or non-development) of people, their abilities, and talents—although education itself depends on a whole range of determining social conditions: the state of productive forces, division of labor, interests of social classes and their relations, level of culture, and science.

Unlike their predecessors, Marx and Engels resolved the question of education's role and its actual significance under specific socio-historical conditions, revealing the diverse aspects and connections of education with core features of a given society on concrete historical material. Education acquires a particular significance depending on which social class carries it out, when and in what country it is carried out, and under what specific conditions.

This position of Marxism is expressed with extreme clarity in the famous words of Comrade Stalin: *"After all, education is a weapon whose effect depends on who holds it in their hands and who is to be struck with this weapon."*[11]

Under some conditions, education is organized to hold back the progressive course of social life, and then it reflects the interests of society's dying classes; under other conditions, education promotes the victory of new progressive principles and tendencies in social development. Consequently, to understand the real significance of education, one must know *which* education is being discussed.

The relative weight of education, for example, in the Middle Ages—when the school was an extremely rare phenomenon and inaccessible to the people—was completely different from that acquired by the primary school with the introduction of compulsory education centuries later. The role of education

[11] J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 10th ed., p. 610.

rises even higher when it changes qualitatively, when its regressive elements are replaced by new content that better meets the demands of the working masses and promotes their cultural development.

What, for example, was the significance of elementary rural education in Germany, which Engels in 1865 called "miserable school education"? It consolidated and reinforced, along with other circumstances, the dependent position of landless peasants on the landlord. What significance did compulsory elementary education, introduced in the second half of the 19th century in several advanced capitalist countries, have for the bourgeoisie?

In supporting this measure, the bourgeoisie viewed it as a means of training literate workers whose labor turned out to be more productive than that of illiterate workers—thus bringing more surplus value to the capitalist. Public education and its methods are adapted to capitalist production and represent the cheapest way to train and reproduce various professional cadres (commercial workers, clerks, technicians, etc.). Educating workers' children is a means of reproducing labor power.

Public education is of considerable importance in military matters, in preparing soldiers and officer personnel.

The development of military technology, the transition to new tactics, the moral education of soldiers and officers—all this requires a certain level of education. Describing the condition of armies in various Western European countries, Engels analyzes in connection with this the state of education in those countries, viewing it as an important condition for training military personnel. In particular, the problem of officer personnel rests on the general secondary school.

Ruling classes under capitalism use education and instruction as a means of oppressing the people, as a tool to consolidate and strengthen their hegemony in all spheres: economic, political, military, cultural.

Pointing out the reasons for the failures and mistakes of the revolutionary-minded and courageous workers of Vienna during the 1848 revolution, Marx and Engels considered these failures to largely depend on the extremely weak political development and education of workers—which in turn was explained by the government keeping the masses in ignorance and darkness.

In instructions to delegates of the Geneva Congress of the First International on child and adolescent labor, Marx wrote: *"...The most enlightened part of the working class fully realizes that the future of its class, and consequently of humanity, entirely depends on the education of the rising working generation."* Such education, combining mental education, physical development, and polytechnic instruction, *"raises the working class significantly above the level of the upper and middle classes,"* Marx writes in the same instructions[12].

In the era of the dictatorship of the working class, education grows into a task of world-historical significance. The education of youth is tasked with preparing a generation capable of finally establishing communism. "Youth is our future, our hope, comrades. Youth must replace us, the old folk. It must carry our banner to a victorious conclusion."[13]

From this stems the significance of education as a decisive factor in preparing builders of a communist society. It is no coincidence that Marx wrote in *Capital* that education in the

---

[12] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, vol. XIII, part 1, p. 199.

[13] *Lenin and Stalin on Youth*, Partizdat CC C.P.S.U.(B), 1936, p. 206.

future society will be the sole method for producing all-around developed people.

On how to correctly understand the interrelationship of education and social relations, pedagogy and politics, Marx and Engels provide an exhaustive answer when characterizing the essence of bourgeois education. They cover this question in great detail in *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, and *Capital*.

Even in his first major work, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*—"one of the best works in world socialist literature" (Lenin)—Engels, after a detailed study of public education in England, arrives at the conclusion that if the bourgeoisie grants the worker only as much living as is profitable to it, it grants him only as much education as serves its interests.

In *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, Engels describes in detail the changes in culture and worker education resulting from the Industrial Revolution in England. The Industrial Revolution created new population classes differing from previous ones in cultural, moral, and intellectual development. The introduction of machinery led to the involvement of women and children in factory production, radically altering relationships between parents and children, and replacing previous home-based family education.

Prior to the Industrial Revolution, the education of the younger generation of artisans working at home took place mainly in the family. This education, close to nature, says Engels, produced physically strong, religiously minded, and morally stable people. After the introduction of machinery and the breakdown of the worker's family, family education lost its former relative weight and significance in the life of the younger generation. Deprived of family education, children at

the same time received no education outside the family, being occupied from an early age at work. Factory labor, exhausting and crippling children's health without any limits or breakdown, led to moral corruption and mental savagery. This intellectual savagery—"artificially produced by transforming immature people into simple machines for manufacturing surplus value"—"is easily distinguished from that primitive ignorance which leaves the mind uncultivated without harming its capacity for development or its natural fertility," writes Marx in *Capital*.

Intervention in such a social order was necessary, and therefore the English proletariat demanded that the bourgeoisie introduce compulsory schooling for children, backing this demand with years of strike struggle. The persistent and prolonged struggle of English workers finally forced the English Parliament in 1834 to pass a law prohibiting factory owners from employing children under 14 years old without a certificate of school attendance. The same law introduced compulsory school attendance for two hours daily for children working in factories up to age 14. Under threat of fines, factory owners were obligated to send working children of specified ages to school (day or evening) for several hours a week. How this law and subsequent enactments were carried out will be discussed later.

The development of large-scale industry objectively creates the prerequisites for transitioning from family to public education. The historical transition from family to public education as a consequence of the Industrial Revolution was undoubtedly a progressive trend; it is no accident that the proletariat, as the historically progressive class of society, fought for the public education of children, demanding compulsory school education from bourgeois organizations.

The bourgeoisie, under various pretexts, resisted carrying out this ripe educational reform. It hypocritically declared that

communists, in advocating this demand, wanted to destroy the affectionate relations between parents and children in the family.

In the *"Manifesto of the Communist Party"*, Marx and Engels expose with all persuasiveness this hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie, which causes all the more disgust as under capitalism, family ties are destroyed and children are turned into objects of commerce and instruments of labor.

L. Tolstoy once wrote vivid words about childhood: *"Happy, happy, irretrievable time of childhood! How not to love, not to cherish memories of it! These memories refresh, elevate my soul, and serve as a source of the best delights for me."*

There is no such happy childhood for a proletarian child under capitalism; capital, in pursuit of profit, has deprived the children of the working masses of their childhood. *"Forced labor for the capitalist not only took away the time for children's games, but also took over the time of free labor in the home circle, within the limits established by customs, for the needs of the family itself."*

Millions of proletarian children found themselves in the position described here by Marx.

The situation of children changes radically under the conditions of a socialist society, where there is no exploitation of man by man and where children are given back their childhood, free and joyful, surrounded by the care of parents and the state.

This conclusion is especially important to bear in mind in order to better understand all the reactionary nature of petty-bourgeois ideologists, such as Proudhon, who called workers back to family craft education, as if to a saving remedy for all the evils of capitalism. These petty-bourgeois philanthropists shed cheap tears over the fact that the "social whirlwind"

carries away the domestic hearth, decomposes the family and children, and, seeing no real way out of this, would like to turn the wheel of history back to the "good old times." They therefore react negatively to the modern development of science and technology, to public-state education in schools, condemning all this from the point of view of the moral ideas of the petty bourgeois, the craftsman. From the fact that the material position of the workers as a whole deteriorated after the introduction of machines into capitalist production, it by no means follows that one must... look back with longing at the (also very meager) flesh pots of Egypt, at small rural industry that raised only lackey souls. The way out lay precisely in something else, as Marx and Engels taught. Only the proletariat, "...freed from all inherited chains, including those that bound it to the land, ...is capable of accomplishing the great social upheaval that will put an end to all class exploitation and all class dominance."[14]

Under capitalism, the decomposition of the bourgeois family occurs. *"On what is the modern bourgeois family based? On capital, on private gain,"* wrote Marx and Engels in the *"Manifesto of the Communist Party"*.

"The bourgeoisie gives a family historically bourgeois character to the family, in which boredom and money are the binding link and to which bourgeois decomposition of the family also belongs, which does not prevent the family itself from continuing to exist. To its filthy existence corresponds a sacred concept of it in official phraseology and in general hypocrisy." [15]

What Marx and Engels wrote a hundred years ago applies to an even greater extent to the modern bourgeois family, in

---

[14] F. Engels, *On the Housing Question*, Works, vol. XV, p. 12.

[15] K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, Works, vol. IV, p. 161.

connection with the decomposition of the entire fabric of bourgeois society: everyday life, morals, philosophy, etc.

The proletariat of England fought to gain knowledge. The English Parliament, under pressure from the labor movement, passed laws on the compulsory education of children working in factories. But how were these laws implemented by factory owners and the state authority that issued them?

Engels in his work *"The Condition of the Working Class in England"* and Marx in *"Capital"* characterize the state power that passed the laws, but from the very beginning had already predetermined for itself that it was not going to enforce these laws. The factory owners, of course, understood this very well and therefore, despite fines and various penalties provided for by factory legislation, sabotaged the implementation of legislation on education in every way: opened few schools, lacked them for a significant number of children, invited teachers who had lost their working capacity, people who were completely illiterate, did not require mandatory presentation of certificates of education upon employment, etc.

Why did the bourgeoisie disrupt factory legislation on the education of young workers? *"Education of workers can promise nothing good to the bourgeoisie; it can only inspire certain fears,"* answers Engels to this question. The bourgeoisie fears the enlightenment of workers because it can open the eyes of workers to their real situation and can become a weapon of the proletariat's struggle against capitalist oppression and lack of rights.

Realizing such significance of education, the working class demands universal free compulsory education, while factory owners reject or sabotage such demands in every way. The working class demands secular education, while the bourgeoisie instills religious instruction in every way into that

miserable school it creates as a result of its concessions to the demands of the workers. *"Is there not,"* wrote Engels, *"a ministry that would fulfill the demands of the workers for compulsory education, since the ministry is a obedient tool of the bourgeoisie."*

In the same work, Engels describes the educational activities of workers' organizations. In contrast to bourgeois "care" for workers, workers' organizations create various forms and means to raise the level of their spiritual development: schools, reading rooms, clubs, subscribe to newspapers, journals, books. In these schools and reading rooms, workers and their children receive proletarian education, free from the influence of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie realizes for itself the danger of these proletarian institutions and strives through new methods and forms to instill bourgeois ideology into the consciousness of workers: it tries to eliminate proletarian influence in workers' clubs, schools, and reading rooms and turn them into organs for spreading useful knowledge for the bourgeoisie: natural sciences, political economy, *"the ideal of which is free competition"* and from which *"the worker can draw only that single conclusion, that the most reasonable thing for him is to die of hunger in quiet reconciliation with everything existing." "Here,"* says Engels, *"education teaches humility; here everything is flexible and adapted to the needs of the ruling policy and religion."*

Marx and Engels speak about the nature of bourgeois education in many other works and letters.

In the work *"The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte"*, Marx writes about the school legislation of the French bourgeoisie during the reign of Louis Bonaparte after 1848. The counter-revolutionary government of Louis Bonaparte issued special laws on public education, lowering the previous level of education of the masses. The school legislation of this

government boiled down to preserving the ignorance of the people as a necessary condition for its rule, to neutralizing the revolutionary role of the rural peasantry, which the bourgeoisie subjected to the clergy. Since teachers during the bourgeois-democratic revolution together with the risen peasantry were active participants in the revolution, the government extended its "care" to them as well, placing them in the hands of the clergy, subjecting them to prefects (i.e., police) and surrounding them with a system of espionage. Teachers were subjected to systematic persecution by agents of authority, and, as Marx says, these proletarians of intellectual labor, ideologists of the peasantry, were transferred from place to place like hunted game. Thus, here too, just as in the example of England, we see confirmation that the bourgeoisie for its self-serving goals tries to deprive the working masses of elementary knowledge and that class interests of the bourgeoisie completely determine the goals, content, and methods of educating the younger generation.

How the bourgeoisie "cared" for public education is shown, among other things, by an example cited by Marx in the report of the General Council to the fourth congress of the International Workingmen's Association in 1869: "In one of the large cities of Switzerland (Basel), primary schools were in such a state that children literally lacked air in the classrooms, and they left there with frequent headaches, pale and anemic. If in the open air per 10,000 parts there are only 4 parts of carbon dioxide gas, and in closed rooms there should be no more than 10 parts, then in Basel primary schools its quantity increased to 20.81 parts before noon and to 53.94 after noon. On this occasion, a representative of the bourgeoisie in the municipality cold-bloodedly declared: 'Do not worry! Parents

went through *the same bad school premises as the present ones, and yet came out of them alive."*[16]

In a letter to Kablukova in 1880, Engels gives a description of the education of adult workers and craft schools in England. In essence, the picture here is the same as in the 1840s, when Engels first described the state of public education in England. Craft education here is neglected to an even greater degree than in continental countries. Craft schools represent penal institutions rather than educational ones, where homeless children are sent by court decisions. In schools for the continuing education of workers, charlatanism and deadly routine reign.

In a series of articles (*"The Polish Question in the German Revolution"*, *"Future Results of British Rule in India"*), Marx and Engels characterize the educational policy of the governments of individual countries (Germany, England) that they conduct in seized and conquered territories. In Poznań, which went from Poland to Prussia under the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the Germans destroyed the culture of the Polish people in every way, expelled the Polish language from schools, Germanized Polish noble youth in higher schools, and Polish peasants in lower ones. Clearly mocking the Polish people, German rulers in Poznań claimed that the Polish language was the main obstacle to the spread of education among the people. Assessing the educational "benefactions" of the Prussian government, Marx concludes that they all boiled down to providing Prussian non-commissioned officers in Poznań.

Essentially the same policy of national oppression and destruction of national culture (language, schools, etc.) was and is conducted by the bourgeoisie of any other country in its

[16] K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, vol. XIII, part 1, p. 323.

colonies. Marx writes on this issue: *"The profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization lie unveiled before our eyes, turning from its home, where it assumes respectable forms, to the colonies, where it goes naked."*[17]

Thus, the English bourgeoisie in conquered India destroyed national civilization, *"...destroying native communities, uprooting native industry to the ground, and leveling everything that rose above the general level in native society."*[18]

Education in bourgeois society is accessible only to the possessing classes, for it requires significant resources. Marx reveals this characteristic feature of education under capitalism in particular when analyzing educational privileges given in parliamentary elections to persons with a degree in education—scholars, clergy, lawyers, educators. Marx evaluates these educational privileges as one of the means of strengthening the class-bourgeois monopoly on education and depriving workers and broad masses of working people of the right to participate in elections.

Marx wrote about this ninety years ago. But even now his characterization of bourgeois education remains in full force. The principle proclaimed in modern bourgeois constitutions and literature that the state provides "equal opportunities for all" is in reality not implemented and remains a hypocritical phrase. Such a gap between right and reality is recognized by some bourgeois figures, for facts are stubborn things. Criticizing the application of the principle (and not the principle itself) of "equal opportunities for all," one such figure wrote in 1943 that this principle remains an illusion due to sharp economic inequality and the existence of privileged schools that give the factual right to their graduates to occupy

---

17 K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, vol. IX, p. 367.

18 K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, vol. IX, p. 363.

"key positions" in society. "Rarely do class distinctions manifest themselves so openly as in the English system of public education. Here privileges and inequality are elevated to a dogma of faith, social differences, considered as an essential feature of this system, are carefully supported and preserved."[19]

We have seen how Marx and Engels characterize the class essence of education and its contradictions in capitalist society. Objecting to bourgeois ideologists who asserted that the education of children generally does not depend on class influences, Marx and Engels back in the *"Manifesto of the Communist Party"* wrote that public education is determined by social relations and that the bourgeoisie interferes in education, pursuing its interests.

Therefore, education in a capitalist society is organized in such a way as to distance working people in every way from the sources of culture and science. Covering up with general phrases about the universal human character of education, the bourgeoisie in practice conducts class-limited education for its own self-serving goals.

The class character of bourgeois education remains and even intensifies in those cases where the bourgeoisie conducts certain reforms of public education, in particular compulsory primary education and secular teaching.

Only naive idealists and people hostile to Marxism can see in these reforms the selfless efforts of the bourgeoisie to raise the cultural level of the people, without noticing or denying the class limitation and political meaning of these reforms.

Marx and Engels here too fully exposed their class essence and destroyed the democratic illusions maintained by the

---

[19] Dent, *Education in a Transition Period*, London, 1943.

bourgeoisie, the more eagerly the greater success they have among the masses.

The introduction of universal education, as well as its secular character, in some countries is a certain concession to the demands of the working class, and the bourgeoisie uses these measures for demagogic purposes as an expression of "paternal care" of capitalists for the "little ones."

Such is the social, class meaning of these public education reforms. Engels in the work *"The Role of Violence in History"*, characterizing the attitude of the bourgeoisie toward universal education, writes that it agrees to certain material expenses, introducing universal education, calculating, however, to more than pay off these sacrifices with increased profits.

Fearing the enlightenment of workers and their children, the bourgeoisie was nevertheless forced under the pressure of workers' demands and industry needs to give a certain education. Therefore, the more strongly it seeks an antidote, in the expression of Engels, which it finds in the form of religious instruction and so-called "moral" education, by which the bourgeois understands, in the expressive characterization of Marx, the "instilling of bourgeois principles." "More than ever it was important now to keep the people in check by moral means. The first and most important means used on the masses remained all the same religion. Hence the priestly tyranny in school administrations, hence the growing self-taxation of the bourgeoisie for all kinds of methods of pious demagogy, starting with ritualism and ending with the 'Salvation Army',"[20] wrote Engels in 1892 about the English bourgeoisie. These words apply to any bourgeoisie. Lenin wrote that bourgeois democracy nowhere in the world brought to completion the

[20] F. Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, pp. 32–33.

separation of school from church " thanks to multifaceted factual ties of capital with religious propaganda."[21]

The development of scientific knowledge under capitalism left absolutely no room for religion. Even the famous astronomer Laplace, to Napoleon's question why his *"Celestial Mechanics"* did not mention the name of the creator of the world, brilliantly replied: *"I had no need for that hypothesis."* However, many bourgeois scientists, instead of coming out in defense of scientific teaching, being servants of the bourgeoisie, consciously distort the data of their science and openly defend the religious obscurantism of their masters. Engels thus characterizes educated people and scientists from the bourgeois class in England in the middle of the 19th century: *"...Almost all educated people in England believed in all sorts of incredible miracles and even geologists, like Buckland and Mantell, distorted the data of their science so that they would not strike too hard at the myths of the Mosaic legend of the creation of the world."*[22]

The existence of religion is incompatible with science. But the bourgeoisie, in its class interests, instills the dogmas of religion into teaching and falsifies scientific education. All this reflects the duality, hypocrisy, and bigotry inherent in bourgeois education.

In *"Dialectics of Nature"*, Engels writes about the gap between the achievements of science and what is taught in school: *"although the progress of science has completely shaken this* outdated view of nature[23], the entire first half of the 19th

---

[21] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. XXIV, p. 100.

[22] F. Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, p. 14.

[23] The view according to which the world is unchangeable, created once and for all by the creator. — *P. G.*

century was still under its rule, and essentially it is still taught now in all schools."[24]

Here we come across the main contradictions of bourgeois education, consisting in the fact that, on the one hand, the bourgeoisie is forced in one way or another to give elements of new knowledge in school—natural science, geography, history, etc., and on the other hand, to more strongly and thoughtfully instill religious-moral bourgeois education of the younger generation as a kind of antidote to such learning. This contradiction of bourgeois education reflects the fundamental contradictions of the class struggle in capitalist society.

Hence it becomes clear that the struggle of the proletariat for enlightenment and education, being an integral part of its entire political struggle, was inextricably linked with the struggle against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, against the capitalist system.

* * *

After the book *"The Condition of the Working Class in England"*, Engels's next major work was *"The German Ideology"*, written jointly by Marx and Engels in 1845–1846. In this work, a critique of Feuerbach and especially the idealism of Hegelian epigones, petty-bourgeois German socialists Bauer and Stirner, is given. In *"The German Ideology"*, Marx and Engels act as leaders of the nascent communist party, as representatives of dialectical materialism. In *"The German Ideology"*, fundamental questions of Marxist philosophy are covered, among them: the factors of education and development of people, the role of heredity and social conditions in this development, the conditions for the all-around development of people, the development of man under

[24] F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, 1948, p. 9.

capitalism and communism, and the role of revolutionary activity in the re-education of people.

All these questions before Marx were resolved ultimately from the positions of idealistic philosophy. We have already seen what the mistake of utopian socialists was in the question posed by them on the interaction of circumstances and education. For utopian socialists, it turned out that the educator, educating or changing people, thereby became a factor in changing society, and therefore rose above it.

In the theses on Feuerbach, Marx wrote: "The materialist doctrine concerning the changing of circumstances and upbringing forgets that circumstances are changed by men and that it is essential to educate the educator himself. It must, therefore, divide society into two parts, one of which is superior to society (Engels adds: 'For example, with Robert Owen'). — P. G.)

'The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-change can be conceived and rationally understood only as revolutionary practice.'[25]

Man as an object of education was considered as an abstract entity, not historically, but isolated from real social relations, as an individually self-developing person inside himself, whose development was not affected by economic and political living conditions.

Criticizing in *"The German Ideology"* the inconsistency and abstract-contemplative nature of Feuerbach's materialism, the authors of *"The German Ideology"* write: *"In individuals, no longer subject to the division of labor, philosophers saw an ideal to which they gave the name 'Man', and the entire process of development depicted by us was presented in the form of the*

[25] K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, vol. IV, p. 590.

development process of 'Man', wherein in place of individuals existing up to now in each historical epoch, they substituted this 'Man' and depicted him as the driving force of history."[26]

This exact method is applied by Stirner to his "Man" and to his development. When Stirner speaks of age stages of man (child, youth, adult, old man), he distinguishes them only by consciousness, wherein this consciousness is the life of the individual. Stirner does not take into account physical and social changes occurring in man that give rise to his consciousness. Human consciousness is taken not in its development, but in the form of ready-made categories attached to a given age stage, such as that a child is realistic, a youth is idealistic, and an adult is a negative unity of both.

Stirner does not care about the real, living person of a specific historical epoch, nationality, or class. To avoid such a method, Marx and Engels say, one must *"...compare 'one's' youth with the first youth clerk that comes along, with a young English factory worker, with a young Yankee, not to mention a young Kirghiz-Kaisak."*[27]

Answering the question why some people are musicians, others poets, third school teachers, Stirner explained this by heredity, lineage. Everyone does what is written in his fate. This same mysterious lineage explains all physical and intellectual defects existing in the majority of people.

In reality, existing defects in human development arose historically and can be destroyed as well by historical development. As if for modern racists in some bourgeois countries, Marx and Engels wrote the following expressive lines: *"Even naturally arisen lineage differences, such as*

---

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 58–59.

[27] K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, vol. IV, p. 108.

racial, etc., ...can and must be eliminated by historical development."[28]

Even vulgar materialists had long freed themselves from the reactionary-idealistic view of German "socialists," point out the authors of *"The German Ideology"*. Even before them, Adam Smith wrote that the division of labor is not a consequence of lineage, but the cause of natural abilities.

Essentially, the same reactionary views of Stirner are inherent in modern bourgeois educators and pedologists. One cannot help but quote one remarkable passage from *"The German Ideology"* that fully applies to these educators: lineage — *"...is that same mysterious force to which other bourgeois attribute the nature of things and to which they ascribe all relations independent of them as bourgeois, and therefore incomprehensible to them in their interconnection."*[29]

The question of the role of heredity and external circumstances in human development was raised even before Marx by 18th-century French enlighteners and then by utopian socialists.

Marx's predecessors solved this question metaphysically in the sense that they opposed heredity to external environment, seeing no connection between them. If circumstances changed, heredity remained something unchangeable. One excluded the other, as was the case, for example, with Helvétius. In *"The German Ideology"*, Marx and Engels for the first time in history correctly resolve this question in the direction that heredity itself is variable and depends on certain conditions of the surrounding environment. More specifically and in developed form, this issue was later illuminated by Engels in his classic work *"Dialectics of Nature"*. Here Engels convincingly reveals the interconnection between labor and

---

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 413.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 413. Italics ours. — *P. G.*

heredity, which manifests in human development. The human hand reached its high development due to increasingly complex and perfected operations in the process of labor from the stage when the hand of primitive man transformed a cobblestone into a knife, to the level reached in Raphael's paintings, Thorvaldsen's statues, Paganini's music, wrote Engels in his work *"The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man"*. Dexterity, flexibility, special development of muscles and ligaments acquired in labor were transmitted by heredity and developed in the process of new operations.

Human development depends, as Marx and Engels show in this and many other works, on the totality of socio-economic conditions of their life: division of labor, range and nature of activity, social relations, education. Raphael created his paintings not simply because he possessed the talent of a painter, but his talent developed due to a series of conditions: the division of labor that existed then in Rome, technical successes in art, Raphael's homeland communicating with other countries, and the level of education and enlightenment of people created by these conditions.

The exceptional concentration of artistic talent in an individual person, write the authors of *"The German Ideology"*, and the associated suppression of it in the broad mass is a consequence of the division of labor in an exploitative society.

Not on lineage, but on the material activity of people depends any other activity: spiritual, political, religious, etc.

Marx and Engels show that the history of physical and spiritual development of people is inevitably determined by the history of the development of productive forces. The development of human five senses is a result of the development of all world history.

Human development depends on the structure of real relations, on their practical relation to the world. To Stirner it is indifferent where various properties of man originate. He has no need to think about external relations on which depends how far a given person can develop.

Human thinking is determined by his individuality and living conditions. If a person has a broad range of diverse activities, a multifaceted life, this contributes to the development of universal thinking. If his activity is limited to any single narrow specialty, beyond which he does not see the surrounding world, then his thinking also becomes one-sided.

Under favorable conditions, individual people manage to overcome their local limitation and reach consciousness of world relations, but not by virtue of their reflection, but thanks to practical activity and needs.

The petty-bourgeois philosopher in the person of Stirner, seeing the difference between a bourgeois and a proletarian, wants to eliminate this difference or contradiction not by changing social class relations, but only by changing consciousness about this contradiction. Stirner expresses the pious wish of a philistine that the bourgeois would not have "advantages" over the proletarian, but simply enter into personal relations with the proletarian as a private individual. But personal relations in a class society, point out Marx and Engels, *"necessarily, inevitably develop into class relations and are consolidated as such."*

The authors of *"The German Ideology"* focus on how man develops in connection with the division of labor in a class society.

Society has always developed within the framework of a certain opposition between free and slaves — in antiquity, between nobility and serfs — in the Middle Ages, between

bourgeoisie and proletariat — in modern times. This opposition created generally limited development of man, made this development one-sided and incomplete. The development of oppressed classes was extremely limited by ruling classes, and intellectual development, in turn, was also limited and incomplete. In a class society, "some individuals satisfied their needs at the expense of others, and therefore some — a minority — received a monopoly on development; others, however — the majority — as a result of constant struggle for satisfaction of the most necessary needs, were temporarily (i.e., until the generation of new revolutionary productive forces) deprived of the opportunity for any development whatsoever."

Intellectual (and physical) human development depends not on "good will" and heredity, as Stirner thought and as petty-bourgeois ideologists thought in general, but on being, not on thinking, but on life, on circumstances, on division of labor in society. If circumstances, say Marx and Engels, in which an individual lives, allow him to develop only one-sidedly, as has always happened in a class society, then a person cannot go further than one-sided, deformed development. No moral sermon, as all petty-bourgeois philistines do, will help here.

The issue of the impact of division of labor on man is illuminated in greatest detail in *"Capital"*.

Marx, analyzing the situation of the worker and features of his labor in manufacturing, speaks also of the impact that labor in manufacturing has on physical and spiritual development of the worker.

Division of labor in manufacturing, when a worker performs only a partial production function, inevitably causes spiritual and physical maiming of the worker, determines his one-sided development, i.e., development in the worker of only one special skill at the expense of suppression of all his other

abilities and talents. Manufacturing thus turns the worker into a monstrosity, *"it utilizes the worker as livestock is utilized in the La Plata state, where they kill an animal only to get its skin or its tallow."*

It should be noted that individual representatives of bourgeois science wrote about the disgusting impact of manufacturing on the spiritual and physical development of the worker even before Marx. *"Manufactories flourish best where spiritual life is most suppressed, so that a workshop can be considered a machine, parts of which are composed of people,"* wrote Ferguson in 1767. His student, famous economist Adam Smith, describing the crippling effect of manufacturing labor on worker development, even reached the materialist conclusion that spiritual development of a significant majority of people is inevitably determined by their daily occupations. Somewhat later, in 1816, R. Owen formulates this same thesis, but in other words: "Inhabitants of a country are formed by great causes directing its general life. Causes forming the character of lower classes of Great Britain are closely linked to the development of trade and industry."

"To prevent," writes Marx, *"— complete maiming of the popular mass resulting from division of labor, A. Smith recommends state organization of public education, however, in the most cautious, homeopathic doses."*

A. Smith's proposal meets the most decisive resistance from industrialists, who through the mouth of the Frenchman Garnier very frankly and consistently, as Marx notes, prove the necessity of separating physical labor from mental labor to increase society's wealth, i.e., capital, land ownership and their state — decodes Marx.

In this fact clearly shines through the class interest of capitalists in leaving workers without any education.

Manufacturing is replaced by large-scale machine production. What impact does the new environment have on worker's labor, on his development? Machine labor does not need those skilled workers who were necessary in manufacturing. The machine gives opportunity to employ female and child labor.

Labor conditions in a capitalist factory enslave the worker to an even greater degree than under manual to replace each other as modes of life activity[30]. But in its capitalist form, it is in full contradiction with this tendency, reproducing the old division of labor with its rigid specializations.

However, not only workers, but exploiters as well are enslaved by the instruments of their activity: some by their passion for profit, others by their rigid views, and third by their upbringing and education. Engels wrote about this in *"Anti-Dühring"*.

The indicated contradiction is also revealed when under capitalism the germs of combining physical labor with mental labor arise in the form of various technical, agricultural, and other schools, where workers' children receive elementary instruction and some acquaintance with general technology. In capitalist society, certain rudiments of connecting labor with instruction are created. In this, Marx saw the germ of education in future society.

But under capitalism, by virtue of these indicated contradictions, the opposition between mental and physical labor remains and even intensifies, for scientific knowledge of production is concentrated among engineering and technical personnel—who are separated from workers by their whole way of life, system of education, and views—while workers are separated from scientific knowledge, which has been turned into a power that enslaves them.

---

[30] K. Marx, *Capital*, 1937, vol. I, p. 535.

These contradictions between the nature of large-scale industry and its capitalist form disappear after the proletarian revolution, and then the connection of labor and instruction, as a factor in the all-around development of people, begins to be implemented most fully and consistently.

* * *

In capitalist society, the free development of man is impossible because material relations reign over people here, along with the oppression of individuality. Private property and the division of labor in capitalist society, as is well known, are fetters for human development.

Even earlier, these thoughts on the impact of private property on human development were expressed by Marx in his *"Preparatory Works"* for *"The Holy Family"*: "Private property has made us so stupid and one-sided that an object is only ours when we have it, i.e., when it exists for us as capital, when we directly possess it, eat it, drink it, wear it on our body, live in it, etc., when we, in short, consume it... Therefore, in place of all physical and mental senses, there has come the simple estrangement of all these senses, the sense of possessing. To such absolute poverty human essence had to be reduced, so that it could give birth from itself to its inner wealth!"[31] And further: *"A man in need, full of cares, is incapable of understanding the finest play; a mineral dealer sees only the monetary value, but not the beauty and peculiar nature of minerals: he has no mineralogical sense."*[32]

People must abolish private property because productive forces and forms of intercourse have developed so far that under the rule of private property they have become destructive forces, and because the opposition between classes has reached

---

[31] K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, vol. III, pp. 625–626.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 628.

extreme limits. This destruction of capitalist property occurs only after the proletarian revolution, when the proletariat takes political power into its own hands. Only then, after the proletarian revolution, are the necessary prerequisites created for the all-around development of people, for transforming culture and science from a monopoly of the bourgeoisie into a property of all the people and a factor in the further powerful development of society.

Therefore, Marxism considers that the proletarian revolution is necessary not only because there is no other way to overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie, but also because man can free himself from all the filth of old society only in revolution.

Proletarians, by changing social life through revolutionary means, change themselves, re-educate themselves, as is clearly confirmed by all the experience of the socialist revolution in Russia. *"In revolutionary activity, the changing of oneself coincides with the transformation of circumstances."*

The proletariat, even while still in bourgeois society, fights for new education against bourgeois upbringing. In this struggle, the proletariat formulates its demands in the sphere of public education.

In *"Principles of Communism"* and in the *"Manifesto of the Communist Party"*, Marx and Engels wrote about how the party fights for public, free, secular education for all children, for the abolition of factory labor for children in its present form, and for combining education with material production.

The proletariat demands that the state power of the bourgeoisie implement these measures through legislation.

Marx, in the draft resolution for the Geneva Congress of the First International, formulates demands for establishing statutory limits on the working day for children and

adolescents depending on their age, and for combining labor with instruction.

Here, too, a demand is formulated to prohibit parents and employers from using child labor unless it is combined with education.

These demands of the vanguard of the proletariat stemmed from the necessity of protecting children from the horrors of capitalist exploitation and served as a certain antidote "...against the tendencies of a social system that degrades the worker to the level of a mere instrument for accumulating capital and transforms parents, crushed by need, into slave-owners selling their own children."[33]

We have already seen how inconsistently, with various evasions, the bourgeoisie "implements" these progressive-democratic demands.

From this, it is clear that only after the proletarian socialist revolution can these democratic educational reforms—belonging to the first minimal measures carried out by the victorious proletariat under the leadership of the Communist Party—be implemented most fully.

This historical regularity is confirmed both by the experience of the Paris Commune and especially by socialist construction in our country. In the very first days of its revolutionary-state activity, the Paris Commune conducted the greatest democratization of public education, cleansing the education of the people from religious-clerical elements and bourgeois influences.

Marx, in his classic work on the Paris Commune, evaluates with great sympathy the educational activities of the Paris Communards. The Commune, as expressed by Marx,

---

[33] K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, vol. XIII, p. 198.

immediately set about breaking the instrument of spiritual oppression—the power of priests: it separated church from school, taking all measures to ensure that school was truly secular. The Commune "replaced the priest who stultified the peasant's mind with an enlightening school teacher". The Paris Commune conducted free instruction, offering teachers to provide students with educational materials free of charge.

By freeing public education from church dominance and making it accessible, the Paris Commune transformed former education from an instrument of enslavement into genuinely scientific education. It turned science from an instrument of class rule into a force of the people, and scholars from former "servants of class prejudices" into "allies of thought". Therefore, Marx wrote that "science can fulfill its true role only in a republic of labor".

How did Marx and Engels more specifically reveal the tasks of education in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat and in a classless communist society?

Marx and Engels indicated in the *"Manifesto of the Communist Party"* that among the first measures that the proletariat as the ruling class will carry out should be "Public and free education of all children. Abolition of factory labor for children in its present form. Combination of education with material production, etc., etc."[34]—that is, those demands for which the proletariat fought in bourgeois society, but which the bourgeoisie could not and would not want to fully implement.

In *"Anti-Dühring"*, Engels left no stone unturned of Dühring's bourgeois philosophy. Dühring, dreaming of a future society, speaks at the same time about a school of the future. What does

[34] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, 1948, p. 79.

this school of the future look like in the mind of this bourgeois reformer?

In Dühring's school, subjects are taught that are learned easily, without special effort or strain. It is easy to study these sciences because Dühring in his school of the future does not provide genuinely scientific knowledge, but a so-called complex jumble instead of individual scientific subjects. Dühring, while eliminating a whole series of scientific disciplines, introduces instead of them a single school discipline. Thus, in his school of the future there is no botany, morphology, or zoology; instead, there is one science—natural science. Dühring also threw chemistry out of school education. He eliminates philological education in school and liquidates the study of language in its historical development, limiting himself to formal grammar. Instead of scientific mathematics, Dühring provides a mix of the rudiments of higher mathematics and elementary mathematics, containing differential and integral calculus, where students do not differentiate or integrate.

In his polemic with Dühring, Engels expresses his views on a whole range of teaching issues. He speaks of the great importance of studying ancient and modern languages. Ancient languages develop a person's general outlook. Without modern languages, progressive development of scientific knowledge is impossible, and local national narrowness remains. Right here, Engels expresses thoughts on aesthetic education for the younger generation using examples of works by brilliant masters of the artistic word, as well as on the historical study of language and its grammar.

Is it necessary to say that the person of the future is, above all, a highly educated person?

Let us cite another highly characteristic thought of Engels in this regard regarding so-called integral education. In notes to

"Dialectics of Nature" in the period 1881–1882, Engels writes about the encyclopedic hierarchy of natural sciences written by Saint-Simon and used by Auguste Comte: *"...for the sake of arranging teaching material and for purposes of instruction, thereby leading to the absurd enseignment intégral (integral education), where each science is exhausted before one even begins another, where an essentially correct idea is mathematically exaggerated to the point of absurdity."*[35]

The founders of Marxism attached immense importance to teaching genuinely scientific knowledge in school—studying each individual scientific discipline, rather than integrally combining them based on arbitrary criteria. Engels expressed the idea of a connection between individual sciences, but not a connection that erases the boundaries between them and thus lowers the level of youth scientific education.

In a letter to the International Congress of Socialist Students in 1893, Engels emphasizes the importance of new cadres for the proletarian revolution. If previously bourgeois universities trained bourgeois lawyers, then after the revolution specialists are needed—agronomists, engineers, doctors, etc.—to manage all branches of the state, and here solid knowledge will be required instead of loud phrases.

We have seen how Marxism understands intellectual education. As for physical education, Engels writes about it in a number of his works. In the article *"Can Europe Disarm?"*, Engels devotes several pages to the physical education of children in school. He writes primarily that physical education in school is necessary to improve, rationalize, and shorten military training in the country. Military training is thus closely tied to physical education in school.

---

35 F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, 1948, p. 201.

Engels also outlines specific measures for physical development of youth in school. In school, students can be taught closed and open formation drill of platoons and companies, and military marches/outings can be organized for students, which will bring them huge benefits. And what is interesting to note is this connection of physical development, in particular military outings, with expanding the mental horizons of students. What is difficult for a 20-year-old youth drafted into the army—whose muscles are less flexible than a child's—is acquired by a schoolchild playfully, with great interest, and eagerly.

* * *

Marx and Engels write about polytechnic education in the instruction to delegates of the Geneva Congress of the First International "On Child and Youth Labor", in *"Critique of the Gotha Programme"*, *"Capital"*, *"Anti-Dühring"*, *"Principles of Communism"*, and other works. In the instruction to delegates of the Geneva Congress "On Child and Youth Labor", Marx elaborates his understanding of polytechnic education or training. Polytechnic training, being an integral part of education in general, "...acquaints with the basic principles of all production processes and at the same time gives the child or youth skills in handling the simplest tools of all production."[36]

Known prerequisites and rudiments of polytechnic education arise even under capitalism, as was said earlier. But some groups of socialists advocated for prohibiting child labor in enterprises, seeing in this the only way to protect children from the horrors of exploitation. Marx decisively objected to such a demand, considering it a pious wish.

[36] K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, vol. XIII, part 1, p. 199.

In *"Critique of the Gotha Programme"*, Marx, objecting to the clause of the program on prohibiting child labor in factories, writes that child labor should not be prohibited, for involving children in labor is progressive and lawful; rather, the proletariat must fight against terrible forms of child exploitation by capitalists and for expanding education for children combined with labor.

Marx concludes his remarks on this point with an idea repeatedly stated in his works: that combining labor with education will be a powerful means for restructuring society in the future.

Engels expresses these same thoughts in 1880 in a letter to Kablukova, who, as a Zemstvo figure in Russia, took an active part in organizing technical education among the peasantry and turned to Engels for advice and information on the status of such education abroad.

To properly understand Engels's thoughts set forth in the letter, some clarifications must be made. In Russia during this period, the development of large-scale industry threatened the existence of craft/cottage industry. The process of large-scale industry displacing small industry was inevitable in Russia, as in other capitalist countries. The Zemstvo in Russia strove through various measures to support craft industry and, in particular, opened various craft schools. Kablukova and her husband, a well-known Zemstvo figure at the time, took an active part in organizing such schools.

Engels writes that all these primitive production methods must ultimately perish, giving way to highly developed industry. But since this process generally proceeds slowly, and all the more so in Russia, craft schools in Russia—being generally small and miserable palliatives—could help the people "...preserve their industry until they themselves get the opportunity to say

their word. And these schools, perhaps, might to some extent help them understand what exactly they will need to say." Further, Engels formulates a thought on the tasks of technical education: *"Perhaps technical education would reach its goal most surely if it tried, on the one hand, to organize production more rationally, at least in the most viable of the most widespread branches of industry, and on the other hand, gave children such general technical knowledge as would facilitate their transition to other branches of industry."*[37]

From this it is clear that Marx and Engels fought in every way for all possible development of elements of polytechnic instruction under capitalism, using the slightest opportunities for this without sitting idly by in expectation of the arrival of future society. At the same time, the founders of Marxism repeatedly emphasized that in bourgeois society, full and consistent implementation of polytechnic education is impossible, as it will be under socialism.

Marx wrote that only after the proletariat conquers political power will proper space be provided in schools for workers' polytechnic instruction, both theoretical and practical.

This foresight of Marx is fully realized in our socialist country by organizing various schools, courses, technical colleges, and institutes where all new strata of workers and collective farmers receive general and technological education—theoretical and practical—without interruption from production, progressing from basic levels of education to higher ones.

Back in *"Principles of Communism"* (1847), Engels, answering the question "what will be the consequences of the ultimate abolition of private property?", wrote that substantial changes

[37] K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, vol. XXVII, p. 91.

would also occur in the field of education. The new system will require new people and will create them. The victorious proletariat will face the task of educating new cadres for managing social production. And just as former peasants and workers before the industrial revolution differed in their psychology from workers after the introduction of machine production, so too the new people of the new social order will differ from people of the preceding era. Young people will move from one production branch to another, thoroughly acquainting themselves with it according to both their own inclinations and production considerations.

Engels here refers to the higher phase of communist society, when division of labor disappears, and the opposition between mental and physical labor, between town and country, vanishes.

Bourgeois ideologists talk a lot about how communists want to create a featureless collective where everyone will be equal, instead of a bright individual personality. Marx, and later Lenin and Stalin, pointed out that this is one of the vulgarities of bourgeois ideology, presenting communism as a dull, monotonous collective. Only in a collective does a person receive huge opportunities and conditions for developing the brightest individuality. Marx in *"The German Ideology"* says that in a communist society, the free and original development of individuals is not just a phrase. What determines this development? Their development will be determined by the connection of individuals consisting partly in economic prerequisites, partly in the necessary solidarity of the free development of all, and finally, in the universal character of the activity of individuals.

In a communist society, conditions are created for all-around development to ultimately eliminate the gap between physical and mental labor. Man will not be restricted to any single

narrow circle of activity. The life activity of a collective member at the highest stage of communism will encompass a broad range of diverse activity, and therefore human thinking will bear a universal character, allowing a person to develop all their abilities, aptitudes, and talents. Not everyone can create like Raphael, but everyone in whom Raphael resides must have the opportunity to develop unhindered, write Marx and Engels in *"The German Ideology"*. In a communist society there will be no profession of painters, but there will be people who will engage in painting while manifesting and developing their abilities in other areas of art and science as well. If in capitalist society human life is dominated by relations and chance, then in communist society man will master relations and chance.

Such human development will be fully realized in communist society in the second, higher phase of its development, when with high labor productivity society achieves such an abundance of products that it can implement their distribution according to the formula: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs".

The necessary prerequisites and conditions for such human development are created in the era of building a socialist society under the dictatorship of the proletariat. And now in our socialist country we observe numerous facts confirming this prediction of Marxism. Before our eyes, new people are being educated who are not crushed by specialization, but who move from specialization to broader mental horizons and higher cultural levels. More and more diverse cultural and scientific interests awaken and develop in man through our social system, promoting their all-around development.

The great socialist revolution destroyed the abominable influence of the former division of labor that bound workers like convicts to a wheelbarrow to a specific labor function—

without any prospect, as Marx expressed it, for the play of physical and intellectual forces.

* * *

Marx and Engels waged a decisive struggle in the First International against petty-bourgeois views on education.

The struggle of Marx and Engels against various petty-bourgeois reformists in matters of pedagogy is reflected in pedagogical literature. The instigators in the struggle against Marxist guidelines on enlightenment were the French section led by a certain anarchist, Guillaume—a supporter of Bakunin and an enemy of Marx and Engels.

What did petty-bourgeois ideologists oppose to Marxism in matters of education?

Paul Robin, a supporter of Proudhon, a member of the First International, and a French teacher, promoted the idea of so-called multi-trade education, which could not and did not lead to all-around human development. Paul Robin, proceeding from his principles, organized a school near Paris where 20 trades were taught—bookbinding, box-making, carpentry, etc.—and where, as it seemed to its founder, a person would develop in an all-around manner.

In reality, Robin's view on educational reform resurrected Proudhon's so-called "integral", "synthetic" education, the reactionary nature of which Marx exposed back in *"The Poverty of Philosophy"*. The reactionary nature of the multi-trade education of Proudhon and Robin consists in the fact that they denied the role of large machine industry as a necessary prerequisite for future polytechnic education and oriented the proletariat toward backward craft/cottage labor—doomed by historical development to extinction—as the source for all-around human development.

Another opponent of Marx in the First International, the famous anarchist Bakunin, devoted a series of articles to issues of public education.

As a true anarchist, Bakunin opposes any interference of state power in public education. Education must be free, independent of conscious human activity expressed in laws governing conduct in society. From this stems Bakunin's following demand: the independence of education from parents and teachers, since "children become wiser only thanks to their own experience and never thanks to the experience of others".

In his absurd negation of everything connected with modern society, Bakunin reaches a direct cult of ignorance and obscurantism. In his appeals to Russian revolutionary youth, he called on the latter to abandon universities, schools, science, and theoretical work, and go to the people for the sole purpose of destroying the existing social order. "Here thought and science are decisively forbidden to youth as worldly pursuits capable of instilling doubt in all-destroying orthodoxy."[38]

Petty-bourgeois ideologists talk a lot about all-around education. But can one seriously speak of all-around education if the mastery of scientific knowledge is thrown out of it on the simple ground, as Bakunin wrote, that science in modern society bears an official character? Apparently, proceeding from such absurdity, Bakunin objected to organizing a university in Siberia[39], which Siberian merchants asked the government for during the period when Bakunin lived in Siberia.

Bakunin's arguments about science in a socialist society bear the same deeply reactionary character. Under socialism, in his opinion, science will degrade, although public literacy will

---

[38] K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, vol. XIII, part II, p. 605.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 638.

increase. Needless to say, what a fine "socialism" this is in the mind of an "enraged petty bourgeois".

Bakunin considered himself a socialist and even a national revolutionary. But the people, in his view, remain a dark, ignorant mass even under socialism, incapable of producing talented and brilliantly gifted people from their midst. In essence, such a view of the people differed in no way from the views of any reactionary.

Engels's remarkable article *"On Authority"*, written in 1874, belongs to this same period of Marx and Engels's struggle against Bakunin's petty-bourgeois anarchism. The article is directed against those socialists and anarchists who, like Bakunin, generally denied the principle of authority.

These anti-authoritarians, as Engels calls them, demanded that the authoritarian state be abolished before the social relations that engendered it are abolished. The first act of social revolution, in their opinion, must be the abolition of authority. Defining authority in this case as the imposition of another's will and submission, Engels clarifies that such authority is necessary regardless of any social organization, by virtue of the material conditions of production. Modern production, in which a multitude of people cooperate, is impossible without each person fulfilling a certain order dictated by the production process itself—by objective conditions independent of individual wills. Disruption of this order by individual people would inevitably lead to the destruction of modern civilization and a return from the machine to the spinning wheel.

What would happen to large industry, to railway traffic, or to a ship moving in the open sea at a moment of danger, if there were no absolute submission of each and every one to a certain authority, regardless of the form in which this authority is represented?

Submission to a certain authority, and consequently discipline, is necessary in any endeavor where combined human activity is carried out. These propositions of Engels have a direct bearing on certain problems of pedagogy, in particular to the principles of educating school discipline.

Marx and Engels also fought decisively against petty-bourgeois views on education that had become widespread in the German Social Democratic Party. A critique of these views is given in Marx's remarks on the draft Gotha Programme and Engels's remarks on the draft Erfurt Programme of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. The draft Gotha Programme, which drew harsh and just evaluation from Marx and Engels, suffered from a large number of crude theoretical errors, reflecting the reformist, petty-bourgeois views of its authors, especially the Lassalleans. The spirit of reformism was also evident in the formulation of demands regarding public education. These demands boiled down to universal, equal-for-all education in the hands of the state, compulsory and free, and to the prohibition of child labor.

As we can see, the most important principle and demand of Marxism on combining productive labor with education—which was already formulated in the *"Manifesto of the Communist Party"* in 1848 and in the instruction to delegates of the Geneva Congress of the First International in 1866 with such clarity and rich content—is completely absent here. Instead, the Social Democrats introduced a reactionary and utopian demand: the prohibition of child labor, which Marx called a pious wish.

The same lack of substance, covered up by democratic chatter, is exposed by Marx in the demand for "equal public education for all, located in the hands of the state". In modern bourgeois society, there can generally be no education equal for all classes. It would also be absurd to demand reducing the higher

classes to the modest level of public education of workers and peasants.

"Public education through the state is completely worthless," writes Marx. What is the issue here? Was Marx denying the role of state power in public education altogether, thereby slipping into anarchist positions on this issue?

Such a assumption would, of course, be incorrect. In the program, the issue was essentially about the state in the modern Prussian-German empire. It was to this very state that the authors of the Gotha Programme addressed their demand for equal education "in the hands of the state", thereby expressing subject-like faith in the state. Marx distinguishes here two types of state power interference in the education of the people. One type is when the state defines through general law the expenditure on public education, qualification of teaching personnel, curriculum, etc., and monitors compliance with these laws through state inspectors. Such interference is "...something completely different than appointing the state as the educator of the people". Another matter is state interference in the Prussian-German empire, which, like the church, needs to be removed from any influence on school, for this "state, on the contrary, itself needs very stern education on the part of the people". From this it is clear that Marxism considers the question of the role of the state in public education not in abstract, but under specific conditions.

Sixteen years after the adoption of the Gotha Programme, Kautsky, on behalf of the Social Democratic Party, drafted a new program, which was adopted at the party congress in Erfurt in 1891. This draft, according to Engels's remark, largely avoided the errors of the Gotha Programme, but was still not free from many major opportunistic errors, which Engels points out in his extensive comments. Among these comments are those relating to clauses on public education. Some of these

comments by Engels apparently found reflection in the final text of the program. However, a comparison of these comments with the clauses of the program shows that the Social Democrats were far from heeding all of Engels's remarks, discarding, for example, Engels's clear proposition on the complete separation of church from state and the associated clause on secular school, which they placed as before in a rather general, neutral formulation ("secular character of school"), without mentioning the separation of school from church. This was one of the conscious omissions of opportunists led by the program's author, Kautsky, with the major omission being the absence of the thesis on the dictatorship of the proletariat, about which Engels wrote with indignation.

Thus, the Social Democrats clearly broke with Marxism and did not go beyond bourgeois reforms of public education even in their programmatic guidelines. Therefore, those pedagogical historians who claim that social-reformists are continuers of Marx and Engels's work in educational matters are completely wrong.

In reality, Social Democrats in various countries have long betrayed the principles of Marxist pedagogy, and their pedagogical views represent a variety of bourgeois pedagogy... "Socialism in words, imperialism in deeds"—this characterization by Lenin of socialists of Kautsky's type and similar applies fully to their views on education.

Pseudo-socialists of various shades (Labourites, democratic socialists, Social Democrats, Schumacherites, etc.) deny the class opposition between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and the class character of bourgeois education. School in modern bourgeois "democratic" society is allegedly universal, independent of bourgeois politics. These "socialists" pass off bourgeois morality as eternal, universal morality, and viewing

its rejection or struggle against it as a mortal sin, as a rejection of morality in general. They consider the struggle against the rule of the bourgeoisie as a struggle against all culture and civilization in general.

Marx and Engels outlined only the main milestones and direction in which education will be carried out in a socialist society. The further development of these foundations and the elaboration of the tasks and content of communist education are given in the works of V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, and in the decrees of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks).

"*Soviet Pedagogy", 1939, No. 1*

N. A. PETROV

V. I. LENIN ON EDUCATION

Great utopians of all times and peoples could only dream in abstract concepts about the all-around harmonic development of man in the future ideal society. Lenin's teaching on communist education posed this question practically—not as a task of the distant future, but as a task that must be solved today, tomorrow, daily, and hourly, educating the young generation of the Soviet state in the communist spirit, instilling in them new concepts and habits, developing in them a new, socialist attitude toward labor, toward socialist property, and a new attitude toward people.

Without setting ourselves the goal of fully expounding Lenin's teaching on communist education, we would like to draw readers' attention to Lenin's main pedagogical ideas and show the role they have played and will play in implementing the practical tasks of communist education in school and in the further development of Soviet pedagogical science.

One of Lenin's fundamental pedagogical ideas, which determines the main principled distinction between Soviet pedagogy and any bourgeois pedagogy, is the doctrine of the class nature of education.

In his work *"Gems of Narodnik Project-Mongering,"* written in 1897, V. I. Lenin reveals one of the main regularities of education in a class society. Developing the Marxist proposition regarding the dependence of education on the specific social relations within which education takes place, Lenin provides a classic definition of the essence of class education under conditions of a class society. *"The essence of this...,"* says Lenin, "consists in the fact that education is organized equally and is equally accessible to all the wealthy.

Only in these last words does the essence of the class school lie, as opposed to the estate school... The essence of a class society (and of class education, consequently) consists in full legal equality, in full equal rights for all citizens, in full equality and accessibility of education for the wealthy. An estate school requires the student to belong to a certain estate. A class school knows no estates, it knows only citizens. It requires of each and every student only one thing: that he pay for his education. A difference in curricula for the rich and for the poor is not needed at all by a class school, for those who do not have the funds to pay for tuition, expenses for learning materials, and for the maintenance of the student throughout the entire study period—those the class school simply does not admit to secondary education."[40]

Equal accessibility of education for all the wealthy—such is the Leninist formula defining the essence of class education and, consequently, of the school in a capitalist society, as opposed to the estate-based school characteristic of a slave-owning and feudal society.

To bring complete clarity to the definition of the essence of the class school, V. I. Lenin considers it necessary to make the following additional clarification:

"... in modern society, even that secondary school which charges no tuition fees is not in the least bit restored from being a class school, for the expenses of maintaining a student over 7–8 years are immeasurably higher than the tuition fees, and these expenses are accessible only to an insignificant minority."[41]

Having established that in a class society the school cannot fail to be a class school, and having defined the essence of the class

---

40 Lenin, *Works*, Vol. II, 3rd ed., pp. 281–282.

41 Lenin, *Works*, Vol. II, 3rd ed., p. 282.

school under the conditions of capitalist society, Lenin determines the fundamental difference in the class nature of the Soviet and bourgeois school.

Lenin says that the bourgeois state lies, "...asserting that the school can stand outside politics and serve society as a whole. In actual fact, in a bourgeois society the school '...is entirely turned into an instrument of class domination of the bourgeoisie; it was completely permeated with a cast-like bourgeois spirit...', and pursues the goal of '...giving the capitalists obedient lackeys and capable workers.'"[42]

To the hypocrisy and lies of the bourgeois state on school matters, V. I. Lenin counterposes the complete and open truth about the class nature of the Soviet school: *"We say: our cause in the sphere of the school is also the struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie; we openly declare that a school outside of life, outside of politics—is a lie and hypocrisy."*[43]

Proceeding from the class nature of the Soviet school, which in the Soviet state turns from an instrument of class domination of the bourgeoisie into an instrument for the complete destruction of the division of society into classes, an instrument for the destruction of any exploitation of working people, and an instrument for the communist transformation of society,—Lenin formulates the most important principle of Soviet pedagogy: the connection of the school with politics. This Leninist principle is of exceptionally vital importance, since without it, a correct resolution of not a single theoretical problem of Soviet pedagogy is possible, just as a correct resolution of practical issues of upbringing, education, and instruction in school is impossible. Lenin emphasized that the connection of the school with politics is a main principle,

---

42 Ibid., Vol. XXIII, 3rd ed., p. 199.

43 Ibid.

warning educators, however, about possible errors and distortions with an unskilled, clumsy application of this principle in the practice of upbringing: "Of course, the matter of restructuring the school is a difficult one. And, naturally, there have been and are currently observed errors and attempts to misinterpret the principle of connecting the school with politics and distort it into a crude and ugly meaning, when they attempt to introduce this politics into the minds of the still young growing generation, which ought to be prepared. And undoubtedly, we will always have to fight against this crude application of the main principle."[44]

The experience of building the Soviet, socialist school and communist upbringing, accumulated by us over more than three decades, irrefutably testifies to the huge role played by the practical implementation of the main principle of Soviet pedagogy—the principle of connecting the school with politics.

Experience has shown that, proceeding from this fundamental principle, it is possible to successfully resolve both theoretical and practical questions of communist upbringing, education, and teaching. Experience has also shown that the slightest deviation from this main principle, or forgetting it, or, finally, an erroneous understanding and incorrect application leads to the grossest errors and distortions.

V. I. Lenin did not limit himself to stating the connection of the school with politics and putting forward this proposition as the main principle that should guide the construction of the new, socialist school and the creation of Soviet pedagogy. Lenin revealed the essence of this principle and indicated the main paths for its implementation in the practice of school work.

[44] Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXIII, p. 475.

The school is a state institution. In the Soviet state, the school represents one of the most important instruments of cultural and educational work carried out by the Soviet state on a grandiose scale. It goes without saying that the school is not the only institution for this purpose in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But it is such an important instrument, the role and significance of which grow especially during the current stage of gradual transition from socialism to communism.

At present, the primary task of the Soviet state inside the country is peaceful organizational-economic and cultural-educational work, while the Soviet, socialist school has transformed into a genuinely all-people's school, for all the growing generation of the Soviet people is educated and raised in it.

Over the course of three decades, the system of public education in the USSR, while retaining at its foundation those qualities that characterize it as a system of truly public education—which is possible only under the Soviet state system—has not remained unchanged, however. Changes have occurred and are occurring in it that are conditioned by the needs of the development of Soviet socialist society.

The policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state in the field of public education finds its expression in such a system of public education that allows for the most successful and thorough resolution of the task set by Comrade Stalin: to make all workers and peasants cultured and educated people. In resolving this historical task, the general education school, in which all the young growing generation is taught and raised, is called upon to play a very important role.

In the system of public education, the principle of connecting the school with politics finds its expression primarily in *whom*

the school serves, which children study in it, what volume of education they receive, in the hands of which class the system of public education resides, and whose politics it reflects.

In application to the content of upbringing, education, and instruction, the principle of connecting the school with politics finds its expression in determining *what is taught and how the growing generation is educated in school, what ideology and worldview are formed in students, and for what the growing generation is prepared*.

The Leninist principle of connecting the school with politics found its further development in historical decisions of the Party and government concerning the school and teacher, which are the main guiding documents in all educational and upbringing activities of the teacher and school.

Two main propositions run like a red thread through all decisions of the Party and government regarding the school and teacher. The first is that the school must provide students with deep and solid knowledge of the fundamentals of sciences; and the second—the school must provide a firm, well-grounded communist upbringing to generations of builders and defenders of communism.

Only that teacher and that school truly realize the Leninist principle of connecting the school with politics who successfully solve this dual task: preparing highly educated and communistically raised young citizens of a socialist society.

The preparation of fully literate, educated people meeting the requirements of secondary and higher professional schools, meeting the requirements of practice and life, is a task of immense state and political importance. That is why, if a teacher does not ensure high quality in instruction, they fail to implement one of the most important political tasks facing them.

When it comes to a deep and solid mastery by students of the fundamentals of sciences under the guidance of the teacher, one must bear in mind that it refers to deep and solid knowledge that the teacher must ensure for all students with whom they work. This proposition needs to be emphasized due to the following circumstances.

In the Soviet socialist state, **the attitude of the state and the broad working masses toward the quality of instruction, education, and upbringing of children in school changes fundamentally** in comparison to capitalist countries.

In a bourgeois society, academic performance in school is primarily a private, personal matter of the students' parents. **In a socialist society, the quality of instruction and education is a matter of great state and political importance**, the significance of which grows especially during the period of gradual transition from socialism to communism.

This historical period in the development of socialist society is linked with the elimination of the opposition between mental and physical labor. It is linked with such a growth in labor productivity that would ensure an abundance of consumer goods necessary for implementing the principle of communism: *"From each according to their ability, to each according to their needs."* The elimination of the opposition between mental and physical labor, as Comrade Stalin teaches, can be achieved only by raising the cultural and technical level of the working class to the level of engineering and technical workers.

In this regard, the question of the quality of school instruction and education acquires especially vital importance. The role of the school and the increase in the volume of education for the growing generation in a socialist state continuously increases. The labor productivity of any worker and in any branch of the

national economy depends on the degree to which this worker has mastered the technology of their trade. And in order to master the technology of one's trade, master science, one needs solid and deep knowledge of the fundamentals of sciences, which the school must provide.

In our country, where tens of millions of children, adolescents, and youth study in general education schools, every single percent of failing students and grade-repeaters translates into several tens of thousands of people. If these several tens of thousands of young men and women graduate from school with shallow and weak knowledge of the fundamentals of sciences, it will be a very significant detriment to the national economy of our socialist state.

That is why complete and high academic achievement of students in school is a matter of great state and political importance. That is why the daily and persistent struggle of the teacher for high academic achievement of every child, adolescent, and youth entrusted to them by the people and the state is a real and genuine realization of the Leninist principle of connecting the school with politics.

Thus, the realization by the teacher in their daily practical activity of the Leninist principle of connecting the school with politics finds its expression primarily in the struggle for high and complete academic achievement of students.

Secondly, the realization of the Leninist principle of connecting the school with politics finds its expression in a persistent and tenacious struggle for a firm communist upbringing of student youth.

"In the period of socialism, as emphasized by the CC VKP(b) [Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)] in its resolution on the school on September 5, 1931,—when the proletariat is carrying out the final

destruction of classes under conditions of intensified class struggle, exceptionally vital importance is attached to a firm communist upbringing in the Soviet school and the strengthening of the struggle against any attempts to instill elements of anti-proletarian ideology into Soviet school children."[45]

This idea of the exceptionally vital importance of a firm communist upbringing of studying youth was reflected in all subsequent decisions of the Party and government regarding the school, as well as in the resolutions of the CC VKP(b) on ideological matters.

The Central Committee of the VKP(b) in the most categorical manner emphasizes: *"The Soviet system cannot tolerate the upbringing of youth in a spirit of indifference to Soviet politics, in a spirit of a 'couldn't care less' attitude and lack of ideology."*[46]

The CC VKP(b) demands from everyone connected with the cause of raising the young generation to *"...help the state correctly raise youth, answer their questions, raise the new generation to be cheerful, believing in their cause, not fearing obstacles, and ready to overcome any obstacles."*[47]

To raise the young generation in the spirit of the policies of the Party and the Soviet state means to teach youth not only to know and understand the foundations of the policies of the Party and the Soviet state, but also to fight with all their strength for their implementation in that diverse practical activity for which the young generation is preparing.

---

45 *"Resolutions of the CC VKP(b) and SNK USSR on the School."* Partizdat CC VKP(b), 1936, p. 12.

46 *Bolshevik*, 1946, No. 15, p. 12.

47 Ibid.

The time has come when our further successful progress toward communism depends primarily on the level of communist consciousness of the working people.

The place and role of communist consciousness in the development of Soviet socialist society, as well as the significance of upbringing in the spirit of the policies of the Party and the Soviet state in forming communist consciousness, were brilliantly revealed by A. A. Zhdanov:

"The tasks of great construction," he said, "—the fulfillment of plans for the reconstruction and further development of the national economy of our country require a high ideological level and a broad scale of educational and cultural work. To be a conscious Soviet citizen means to understand the policy of the Party and the Soviet state and to strive with all one's strength for its realization."

"Socialist consciousness accelerates the movement of Soviet society forward, multiplies the sources of its strength and power. Therefore, a steady increase in the political and cultural level of the people constitutes a vital need of the Soviet system."[48]

If increasing the political and cultural level of the people constitutes a vital need of the Soviet system, i.e., in other words, represents one of the most important regularities in the development of Soviet socialist society moving toward communism, then it is entirely natural that questions of the communist upbringing of working people, and especially of the younger generation, acquire decisive importance.

It goes without saying that the communist consciousness of the younger generation can be formed only on the firm foundation

---

[48] A. A. Zhdanov, *29th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*. Gospolitizdat, 1946, p. 16.

of a deep, conscious mastery of the fundamentals of sciences. Without students mastering the fundamentals of sciences, it is impossible to form a dialectical-materialist worldview in them, impossible to expand their political horizon, and impossible to have knowledge and understanding of the foundations of the policy of the Party and the Soviet state.

What questions, then, should one focus on first when it comes to raising the ideological-political level of educational and upbringing work in school, when it comes to a firm communist upbringing of students?

First, a teacher ensures a firm communist upbringing through a genuinely scientific, Marxist presentation of the fundamentals of that science which they teach students. The elementary nature and accessibility of the presentation in accordance with the characteristics of school age can have nothing in common with vulgarization and oversimplification. An elementary and, at the same time, strictly scientific presentation of the fundamentals of a particular science requires from the teacher not only deep knowledge of their subject, but also pedagogical mastery, pedagogical art in presenting this subject to students.

Knowing one's subject to perfection, mastering the art of presenting one's subject in a form accessible to the understanding of students, while avoiding primitivism oversimplification, and vulgarization—is one of the necessary conditions for a firm communist upbringing in school, for only on such a basis can students' foundations of a scientific, materialist worldview be formed.

Secondly, a firm communist upbringing in school presupposes systematically familiarizing students, especially those of older school age, with **the policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, which is the vital foundation of the Soviet system**.

In doing so, it should be emphasized that a necessary condition for the correct organization of political education of students, both in lessons (where it naturally stems from the content of educational material) and in extracurricular work, **will be a deep knowledge and understanding of the policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state by the teacher themselves**.

A deep knowledge by the teacher of their subject, alongside knowledge and understanding of the policy of the Party and the Soviet state, is the only true guarantee against errors and distortions in organizing the political education of students.

Thirdly, a firm communist upbringing in school means continuous and systematic cultivation in students of **Bolshevik ideolodgy, adherence to principles, conviction in the correctness of our cause, in raising a passionate desire to dedicate all one's strength, knowledge, and skills gained in school to achieving the noble and elevated goals of building a communist society**.

In connection with this, questions of cultivating Bolshevik traits of will and character in students, high conscious discipline, comrade-like mutual assistance, and a socialist attitude toward one's duties at school, at home, and in accessible socially useful labor acquire exceptionally vital importance.

Finally, fourthly, a firm communist upbringing in school presupposes a systematic and **unswerving struggle of the school against the forces and habits of the old, bourgeois society, against remnants of capitalism** in the consciousness of people, which can sometimes penetrate into the consciousness of the younger generation: against philistine individualism, religious prejudices and superstitions, against indiscipline and carelessness, against small-scale bourgeois

licentiousness, apoliticalness, and other moods alien and hostile to us.

The teacher's lesson in the classroom is the main form of educational and upbringing work in school. In lessons, day in and day out, the teacher presents the fundamentals of sciences to children. Here, primarily, they form a scientific worldview in students and help youth develop correct views on life. Primarily in lessons, the teacher cultivates a communist attitude toward labor and toward one's duties in students. Here, primarily, the communist foundations of friendship and comradeship among students are laid by the teacher. In lessons, the teacher cultivates in children, adolescents, and youth a noble and elevated sense of Soviet patriotism and Soviet national pride, conscious discipline, and other remarkable qualities that characterize the Soviet person.

In every lesson, checking and evaluating students' knowledge, teaching them to work, instilling in them a love for work, a culture of work and behavior, the teacher step by step forms and raises new, young Soviet citizens—builders and defenders of communist society.

That is why improving the methods of preparing and conducting lessons must be a matter of constant concern for the teacher. But if the lesson is the main form of organizing educational and upbringing work in school, it does not follow at all that it is the *only* form. Successful resolution of the educational and upbringing tasks of the school **necessarily presupposes the widespread use of diverse forms and means of extracurricular and out-of-school work, as well as systematic assistance by the teacher to Pioneer and Komsomol organizations in school**, which are active helpers to the teacher in the struggle for high quality educational work and a firm upbringing of students.

From all that has been said, it is not difficult to see how great for the success of teaching, education, and upbringing of students in school is a correct understanding and implementation of the Leninist principle of connecting the school with the policy of the Party and the Soviet state, which found its further development in the works of Comrade Stalin and in the decisions of the Party and government regarding the school and teacher.

The second most important proposition of Leninist doctrine on upbringing is the definition of the essence of polytechnic education and the definition of specific paths to its realization. Every time when discussing the problem of polytechnic education, we turn to the well-known Leninist notes on N. K. Krupskaya's theses *"On Polytechnic Education"* and to a number of other Leninist documents. And despite the fact that we cite them frequently, we are still far from fully utilizing Lenin's ideas in resolving the problem of polytechnic education.

Developing the Marxist proposition that in a communist society combining education with productive labor will be not only a method for increasing social production, but also the only method for creating fully developed people, Lenin wrote in 1897: *"...It is impossible to imagine the ideal of a future society without combining the education of the young generation with productive labor: neither education and instruction without productive labor, nor productive labor without parallel education and instruction could be raised to the height required by the modern level of technology and the state of scientific knowledge."*[49]

Depicting the ideal of education in a future communist society, Lenin intentionally speaks not only about combining education

[49] Lenin, *Works*, Vol. II, 3rd ed., p. 288.

with productive labor, but also about combining productive labor with education. We draw attention to this classic formulation because it reveals that essential connection between the development of education and socially productive labor—without clarifying which it is impossible to understand the real process of the development of the polytechnic school and that cultural-technical rise of the working class that occurs during the period of transition from socialism to communism.

With this formulation, Lenin emphasizes that the implementation of the idea of educating, instructing, and training fully developed people is not a narrow school task that could be solved by a one-sided process of combining education with productive labor. Any attempt to solve the problem of educating a fully developed person solely within the framework of the school will inevitably lead to project-mongering, since combining school education with socially productive labor for the purpose of the full development of a person and increasing social production requires such a level of societal development under which it would be possible to combine universal compulsory productive labor from a certain age with universal education; and this is possible only under conditions of a communist society, when the opposition between town and country is destroyed, when agricultural labor becomes a variety of industrial labor, and when the opposition between mental and physical labor is destroyed.

What specific direction and form should education take in order to successfully solve the problem of raising fully developed and educated people? We find the answer to this question in the program of the VKP(b), in the development of which Lenin played an active role. In the sphere of public education, the program sets the task: *"Conducting free and compulsory general and polytechnic education (acquainting students in theory and practice with all main branches of*

production) for all children of both sexes up to 17 years of age." And further, the program demands that the school be *"conducting a close connection between education and socially productive labor, preparing fully developed members of a communist society."*[50]

Thus, polytechnic education must ensure that students are acquainted in theory and practice with the main branches of production. Polytechnic education must be provided through a compulsory general education school for all children of both sexes up to 17 years of age, maintaining a close connection between teaching and socially productive labor, acquainting them with the elementary tools of production, thereby preparing fully developed members of communist society. At the 3rd session of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee (VTsIK) of the seventh convocation on September 26–27, 1920, following the report of the People's Commissariat for Education (Narkompros), Lenin made the following note:

"The polytechnic principle does not require teaching everything, but requires teaching the fundamentals of modern industry in general." With this note, Lenin emphasizes that acquainting general education school students in theory and practice with all main branches of production must in no way lead to the professionalization of the school.

How and to what extent can and should polytechnic education be implemented in our Soviet general education school? In resolving this issue both in theory and in the practice of building our Soviet school, very serious mistakes were made. One of the main reasons for errors in resolving the issue of polytechnic education is, in our opinion, the following two circumstances. First—when people cite the program of the VKP(b) in the field of public education and demand immediate

[50] *Program and Charter of the VKP(b)*. "Moskovsky Rabochy", p. 117.

implementation of polytechnic education in the full volume written in the program, without taking into account that the program defines not only what we must implement immediately, but also what is our task over a relatively long period of time. Second—citing Lenin's doctrine on polytechnic education and the raising of fully developed people, they demand the immediate implementation of this doctrine in full volume, forgetting that Lenin warned against project-mongering in this field and warned against the danger of detachment from concrete, real reality.

Lenin did not limit himself to a theoretical solution to the problem of raising fully developed members of a communist society. After the working class won power, under the conditions of the Soviet system, Lenin developed concrete paths for solving the problem of polytechnic education. In doing so, Lenin proceeded from real reality, from that concrete heritage of culture and popular education that we received from Tsarist Russia. He proceeded from the task of transforming Russia—which was backward in cultural and technical terms—into a powerful, cultured socialist power.

In 1920, in his notes on N. K. Krupskaya's theses *"On Polytechnic Education,"* Lenin categorically protested against an abstract approach to solving the problem of polytechnic education. Considering it necessary to temporarily allow the professionalization of the senior classes of secondary school, Lenin demanded: *"To state clearly that in no way can we renounce the principle and immediate implementation, to the extent possible, of education that is precisely polytechnic."*[51] Moreover, while allowing the professionalization of the upper classes of the general education secondary school as a temporary measure, Lenin warned against turning education

[51] Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 418.

into handcraftsmanship/trade-schooling. To avoid this, he demanded establishing the following precise rules:

"1) avoid early specialization; draft an instruction on this.

2) expand general education subjects in all vocational-technical schools...

3) set as an unconditional task an immediate transition to polytechnic education or, rather, an immediate implementation of a series of steps accessible right now toward polytechnic education..."[52]

Defining the first steps toward polytechnic education—among which he included excursions to power stations, state farms, factories; lectures with experiments; practical work; establishing small museums for polytechnic education; trips on trains and steamships; involving all engineers, agronomists, and physics-mathematics university graduates in conducting lectures and practical sessions on electricity and polytechnic education—Lenin outlined a draft of what he understood by polytechnic horizon and the fundamentals (rudiments) of polytechnic education that a graduate of professionalized second-stage upper classes should possess:

"(aa) basic concepts of electricity (define precisely which ones),

(bb) on the application of electricity to mechanical industry,

(vv) — " — also to chemical industry,

(gg) also on the electrification plan of the R.S.F.S.R.,

(dd) visited no fewer than 1–3 times a power station, factory, or state farm,

(ee) knew certain fundamentals of agronomy, etc.

---

[52] Ibid., pp. 418–419.

Work out a detailed minimum of knowledge."[53]

Speaking of the foundations or rudiments of polytechnic education, V. I. Lenin assigns the main and decisive role in defining the foundations of polytechnic education to familiarizing students in theory and in practice with electricity. He pays main attention to the practical, technical application of electricity in mechanical and chemical industries, to familiarizing students with the plan for the electrification of the country so that they have an idea of that great and beautiful future of our Motherland, which is connected with the comprehensive electrification of the entire national economy of the Soviet socialist state.

The leading and decisive role of theoretical and practical familiarization of students with electricity, the mastery by students of electrical engineering in the broad sense of the word, when defining the foundations of polytechnic education in the Soviet school, stems from the role that the electrification of the country must play in the transition to communism. "Communism," Lenin said, "is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country".

Such are the main tenets developed by V. I. Lenin on the question of the immediate implementation, to the extent accessible, of steps toward polytechnic education, meaning the gradual implementation of the problem of educating comprehensively developed builders and defenders of communist society.

V. I. Lenin develops the teaching of Marx–Engels on the education of comprehensively developed people under the conditions of building the world's first Soviet socialist state,

---

[53] Ibid., p. 419.

under the conditions of the emergence and development of the Soviet socialist school.

The education of comprehensively developed builders and defenders of communist society is considered by V. I. Lenin not as an accidental phenomenon, but as a necessary, law-governed phenomenon of social life, conditioned by the entire totality of social relations at a certain stage of development of human society.

Material prerequisites for the realization of the education of comprehensively developed people take shape even under the conditions of capitalist society, at the highest stage of its development, and are determined by the nature of large-scale industry and the involvement into the socially organized process of production of adolescents and children of both sexes.

The practical implementation of the education of comprehensively developed people in capitalist society is impossible, since it is built on the basis of private ownership of the means and instruments of production, on the basis of exploitation of man by man. It is impossible because in capitalist society there exists, develops, and deepens an opposition between town and country, an opposition between mental labor and physical labor, by virtue of which the involvement of children and adolescents into the socially organized process of production takes on ugly and hideous forms of the harshest exploitation of child labor.

If the one-sided development of the human personality is engendered by the emergence and development of the opposition between town and country, the opposition between mental and physical labor, then the comprehensive development of the human personality grows on the basis of the struggle for the elimination of this opposition. In

connection with which the sole means of educating comprehensively developed people is the combination of instruction and gymnastics with productive labor, and productive labor with instruction and gymnastics.

From this it follows that the education of comprehensively developed people is not merely a specifically school task. The real process of educating comprehensively developed builders of communism carries a two-sided character. It is accomplished, firstly, by combining school instruction and gymnastics with productive labor of the growing generation from a certain age. Secondly, it is resolved by combining productive labor of workers with instruction, with education.

The polytechnic principle does not replace and does not eliminate that main tenet that the sole means of preparing comprehensively developed people is the combination of instruction and gymnastics with productive labor, and productive labor with instruction and gymnastics. The polytechnic principle means such a new basis for the organization of school instruction that provides the opportunity to avoid early specialization and craft-learning, and at the same time allows raising technical instruction and education to a higher level. Furthermore, the implementation of the principle of polytechnism facilitates the solution of the task—to provide those graduating from secondary school with at least some practical preparation for life, for practical activity in industry or in agriculture.

Such are the main tenets regarding polytechnic education developed by V. I. Lenin, without taking which into account it is impossible to successfully solve those new tasks that now face the Soviet socialist school during the period of completing the building of socialism and the gradual transition from socialism to communism.

****

Let us turn now to the pedagogical ideas of V. I. Lenin in the field of moral education. One of the most important principles of Soviet pedagogy is the position on the unity of instruction and education.

V. I. Lenin was the first to define the foundation upon which instruction and education in the Soviet school must be carried out. He expressed this position in the following concise formulation: "It is necessary that the whole task of education, training, and teaching of contemporary youth should be the education in them of communist morality"[54]. Closely linked with the definition of the content of the basis of instruction and education in the Soviet school is also the task that Lenin posed before the new, Soviet pedagogy in his speech at the All-Russian Congress of Internationalist Teachers on June 5, 1918: "The teacher army must set itself gigantic educational tasks and, above all, must become the main army of socialist enlightenment... The task of the new pedagogy is to link teaching activity with the task of the socialist organization of society"[55].

The task set by Lenin before Soviet pedagogy, and his definition of communist morality as the basis of the whole matter of teaching, raising, and educating the growing generations, opened before pedagogy the possibilities for a genuinely scientific development of the principle of the unity of instruction and education and the creation of methods for communist upbringing. Soviet pedagogy, guided by Leninist positions, has already accumulated significant practical experience in teaching and educating in the spirit of communist morality.

---

[54] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXX, pp. 409–410.

[55] *Ibid.*, vol. XXIII, p. 66.

And now school teachers are right to expect from Soviet pedagogical science a scientifically substantiated methodology of moral education. The task of creating a methodology of moral education is urgently dictated by the necessity of further improving the organization of education, upbringing, and teaching. If in terms of teaching various academic subjects the school teacher is armed with appropriate methodological manuals, then as far as moral education is concerned, apart from general guidelines, the teacher lacks systematic, serious methodological instructions. If earlier the absence of such a methodology could be explained by our having extremely little practical experience, now such an explanation becomes completely unconvincing. The Great Patriotic War against the German-Fascist invaders showed what wonderful youth our Soviet schools educate. It is enough to mention the names of such representatives of the youth educated in our Soviet schools as Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya, Liza Chaikina, Sasha Chekalin, as well as the wonderful heroes of Krasnodon, Aleksandr Matrosov, and many others, to be convinced that the Soviet school has accumulated the richest practical experience of genuine communist upbringing. This experience has long been awaiting scientific generalization; it opens up the possibility of creating a scientifically substantiated methodology for the moral education of growing generations that is justified by experience.

Having defined the basis of the unity of teaching, upbringing, and education in the Soviet school, V. I. Lenin further sets such concrete and clear tasks before the school that introduce fundamentally different content into such a crucial section of Soviet pedagogy as didactics. Emphasizing that as long as schools remain in the hands of landlords and capitalists, the generation of youth remains blind and ignorant, Lenin says: "Our school must give the youth the foundations of knowledge, give them the ability to work out communist views for

themselves, must make educated people out of them. It must, during the time that people study in it, make them participants in the struggle for liberation from exploiters"[56].

Such is the range of tasks of the Soviet school, in contrast to the bourgeois school. It is not difficult to see what exceptional importance these four tasks have for a radical reworking of the most important section of pedagogy—didactics.

The elaboration by Soviet pedagogy of these most important pedagogical ideas of Lenin, which determine the content and direction of didactics and the methods of moral upbringing, is facilitated by the fact that Lenin does not limit himself to stating the above general principal tasks, but also gives clear and explicit instructions as to how and in what direction solutions to the tasks he set should be sought. The first task of the Soviet school—to provide the youth with the foundations of knowledge, the foundations of the sciences—can, according to Lenin's thought, be successfully accomplished under the following conditions:

1. If the school ensures the development and perfection of the memory of every learner with knowledge of the fundamentals of the sciences.

2. If this mastery of the fundamentals of the sciences is organized in such a way as to ensure a conscious, critical assimilation of knowledge, a conscious processing of all received knowledge, and not the cramming and drill characteristic of the old, bourgeois school.

3. If a firm mastery of the fundamentals of the sciences is ensured, guaranteeing against superficiality, which is disastrous for a communist.

---

[56] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXX, p. 413.

It is not difficult to see that these Leninist instructions are a concrete program of work in the field of Soviet didactics and methods of teaching school subjects. They require the scientific development of such curricula, school syllabi, and textbooks that would not burden the memory of students with unnecessary material, but at the same time would ensure a precisely outlined scope of such basic knowledge that is necessary from the point of view of modern education and those requirements that are placed on our Soviet school by the modern tasks of socialist construction. They also give a definite direction for didactics and specific methodologies, which are obliged to develop such methodological instructions for the teacher that would ensure a conscious and firm mastery of the fundamentals of the sciences, without which there can be no talk of communist upbringing and education. Overloading school students with academic studies, the presence of formalism, weak cultivation of skills for independent work among students—these defects have not yet been eliminated dependent work—these defects have not yet been eliminated in our school and bear witness to the fact that we have far from fully implemented Lenin's most important instructions.

The second task of the school—to instill the ability to work out communist views for oneself—can be successfully resolved, according to Lenin's thought, if the gap between books and practical life is eliminated, if the gap between theory and practice characteristic of the bourgeois school is removed.

"Without work, without struggle, bookish knowledge of communism from communist pamphlets and works is worth absolutely nothing, as it would continue the old gap between theory and practice, that old gap which constituted the most repulsive feature of the old bourgeois society"[57].

[57] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXX, pp. 404–405.

Lenin warns that the ability to work out communist views for oneself requires the most serious, difficult, and extensive independent effort of thought, rather than the mechanical memorization of ready-made conclusions, formulas, slogans, and recipes. Pointing out the legitimacy of hatred toward the old school and the desire to destroy the old school, Lenin says: "...We must understand that in place of the old study, the old cramming, the old drill, we must put the ability to acquire the entire sum of human knowledge, and to acquire it in such a way that communism is not something learned by rote for you, but is something thought out by yourselves, is those conclusions that are inevitable from the point of view of modern education"[58].

The problem of connecting theory with practice as applied to the educational and upbringing activities of the school is one of the most complex problems, since it includes not only a large number of questions related to the structure and content of textbooks, curricula, and syllabi, with the organization of the educational-upbringing process in school, and the choice of teaching and upbringing methods, but must also provide for a correct solution as applied to the various ages of students.

Much work has been done by Soviet educators in this direction much work has been done. But, as school practice shows, we are still far from a satisfactory solution to this most important pedagogical idea of V. I. Lenin.

The third task of the school—to prepare educated people—was posed by Lenin not only to school workers, but also to studying youth itself. Lenin warns school workers and bodies of public education against possible errors and distortions associated with the destruction of the old, bourgeois school and the creation of a new, Soviet socialist school.

---

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 408.

In the history of the construction of the Soviet school there were such facts when, along with the rejection of the old school and old education, the necessity of education itself was rejected. There were facts when studying youth's hatred for the old school and the desire to destroy the old school were linked with an underestimation of education in general.

Exposing the harmfulness of such sentiments, V. I. Lenin with maximum clarity linked the task of communist upbringing with a serious, modern education, which the school must provide: "One can become a Communist only when one enriches one's memory with a knowledge of all the riches that humanity has worked out"[59].

The task—to prepare educated people—not only retains all its importance and significance for our school to this day, but acquires even greater significance. For it is beyond doubt that without a full-fledged modern education, our youth will not be able to take an active part in solving the task of the final construction of communist society in our country.

The fourth task of the school—to raise from among the youth, while they study, active participants in the struggle for building a communist society.

This task is, as it were, a synthesis of the first three tasks, for in it the solid foundations of modern education acquired by the young growing generation and the communist views worked out by the students themselves under the guidance of educators —a communist worldview—are practically realized. How does Lenin concretize this task of the school?

Before the growing generation stands the task of building a communist society, for which it must be prepared already at the moment when it studies and is educated in school. Our school

[59] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXX, p. 407.

must not teach sciences in general, must not engage in some abstract "comprehensive, harmonious" development of the human personality, as the bourgeois school claims. We prepare active participants in the building of communist society, and we entirely subordinate the work of our school to this task. Hence the task of the school—to teach the young generation to transform communism into a guide for practical activity.

V. I. Lenin also points out the concrete ways by following which this task can be accomplished. This is, first, to organize the education, training, and instruction of youth in such a way that every step of this education, training, and teaching is connected with the struggle of the working people for building a communist society, so that education, training, and instruction are directed toward overcoming the habits of the old society, toward overcoming the bourgeois psychology of egoists and small property owners. Secondly, the independent activity of youth must be directed toward the practical solution of tasks of socialist construction in forms accessible to the young generation.

For the successful solution of the task—to prepare active participants in the building of communism—Lenin sees the necessity from early years to instill in the young generation a love for labor.

"In the old society, labor was carried on by separate families, and no one combined it except the landlords and capitalists, who oppressed the masses of the people. We must organize every labor, no matter how dirty or difficult it may be, in such a way that every worker and peasant looks at himself like this: I am a part of the great army of free labor and I myself can build my life without landlords and capitalists, I can establish a communist order.

It is necessary that the Young Communist League educate everyone from an early age, from twelve years old, in conscious and disciplined labor"[60].

V. I. Lenin not by chance combines the tasks of educating conscious discipline and educating through labor, for a socialist attitude toward labor is unthinkable without conscious discipline, just as conscious discipline finds its concrete expression in conscious, disciplined labor.

That is why Lenin draws the attention of youth to the fact that communist upbringing consists in giving one's work, one's strength to the common cause. Only in such work does a young man or woman turn into a real communist. Summarizing his instructions to youth on how to learn communism, how young people should prepare themselves to be communists, V. I. Lenin summarizes in such a remarkably clear and distinct formulation: "...They must set all the tasks of their learning in such a way that every day in any village, in any city, the youth should practically solve one task or another of common labor, let it be the smallest, let it be the simplest"[61].

These Leninist ideas represent initial, starting tenets for the development by Soviet pedagogical theory of the problem of educating conscious discipline, the problem of education in conscious, disciplined labor, and the problem of preparing the young generation as an active participant in building a communist society.

One of the most important questions of moral education in Lenin's teaching is the question of educating love for the Motherland. Back in 1914 V. I. Lenin wrote: "Is the feeling of national pride alien to us, Great-Russian conscious proletarians? Of course not! We love our language and our

---

60 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXX, p. 417.

61 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXX, p. 417.

motherland, we, more than anyone, work to raise its working masses (i.e., 9/10 of its population) to the conscious life of democrats and socialists"[62].

At the same time, V. I. Lenin understands the patriotic feeling of love for the Motherland not as an abstract admiration for one's native language and native nature, but as such a deep feeling that is organically linked with the struggle for a free, strong, and independent socialist Motherland.

An effective, active, and non-contemplative character of patriotism—such is the Leninist directive in educating love for the Motherland. That is why in his speech at the III Congress of the RKSM [Russian Young Communist League], addressed both to the young generation and to educators, V. I. Lenin demands that all upbringing, education, and instruction of youth be closely linked with the tasks of socialist construction, with the struggle of the working people to build a communist society. Only by linking every step of upbringing, education, and instruction with the practical tasks of socialist construction can young people become true communists, devoted and loyal sons of their Soviet Motherland.

All of Lenin's statements on issues of upbringing, education, and instruction of growing generations are imbued with a desire to emphasize the decisive role of the teacher in implementing the construction of a new, Soviet socialist school, called upon to solve such a responsible state task as the upbringing, education, and instruction of future builders and defenders of communist society. V. I. Lenin expresses this idea repeatedly in his articles and speeches.

We, of course, have not exhausted all the richness of V. I. Lenin's pedagogical ideas. This task cannot be solved within

---

62 *Ibid.*, vol. XVIII, p. 81.

the framework of a journal article. The main tenets of Lenin's teaching on upbringing set forth above allow us to draw a conclusion about the necessity of developing Lenin's pedagogical ideas in their full scope, for without a deep, comprehensive mastery of the Leninist heritage, further radical improvement of the educational work of the school and the successful development of Soviet pedagogical science are impossible.

«Soviet Pedagogy», 1946, No. 1–2.

N. A. PETROV

J. V. STALIN ON THE COMMUNIST UPBRINGING OF THE YOUNG GENERATION

In the grand plan for building communism, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin assign a large place to issues of the communist upbringing of the young, growing generation.

"One of the essential tasks of the Party in the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat," says J. V. Stalin, "consists in developing work on re-educating old generations and educating new ones in the spirit of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. Old skills and habits, traditions and prejudices inherited from the old society are the most dangerous enemy of socialism. These traditions and habits hold millions of masses of working people in their grip, they sometimes sweep over entire layers of the proletariat, they sometimes create the greatest danger for the very existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, the struggle against these traditions and habits, their obligatory overcoming in all spheres of our work, and finally, the education of new generations in the spirit of proletarian socialism—are those immediate tasks of our party, without carrying out which the victory of socialism is impossible"[63].

The greatest victory of Leninism, achieved under the leadership of our leader and teacher Comrade Stalin, is the building of a socialist society in the USSR. This is a world-historic victory of which we are rightfully proud, in which we see the living embodiment of the immortal ideas of V. I. Lenin, in which we see the embodiment of the genius of Stalin.

---

63 J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 6, p. 248.

This victory was achieved because, along with other most important conditions for ensuring this victory, such an important condition as the re-education of the broad masses of working people and the education of the growing generation in the spirit of communism was realized.

The Communist Party and the Soviet government educated in the process of socialist construction a new, Soviet person. Soviet people have become the most advanced people of our epoch with a new, socialist consciousness, with a new, socialist attitude toward labor and public property. In solving this task, a significant role belongs to the Soviet socialist school, in which the young growing generation is taught and educated.

The teaching of V. I. Lenin on communist upbringing, developed and enriched by J. V. Stalin, poses and solves the question of the role and place of educating the young generation in the life of society in a completely new way.

Never in the history of humanity has any of the ruling ruling exploiting classes posed or could pose the question of an organized and planned re-education of working people and the upbringing of the young generation as a necessary condition for the creation and development of a given exploiting society.

The conditions for the emergence and development of slave-owning, feudal, and capitalist systems are fundamentally different from the conditions for the emergence and development of socialist society. Every new social order based on private ownership of the means of production and the harshest exploitation of working people arises spontaneously, maturing in the womb of the preceding social order. To such spontaneously arising and developing societies, the concept of building a new social order is inapplicable. This concept is applicable only to socialist society.

Prior to the Great October Socialist Revolution, new social relations during the transition from one social system to another were established without the participation of multi-million masses of working people. Thus, the serf-owning state was created by landlord-serfowners, relying on the power of the stick. The capitalist state was created by factory owners and plant owners, threatening working people with starvation.

The socialist social and state system is an entirely new type of society which, for the first time in the history of nations, is built consciously, in an organized manner, according to a plan. The building of such a society is, by its very essence, unthinkable without the creative, constructive activity of multi-million masses of working people organized and led by the working class and its party—the party of Lenin–Stalin.

In all socio-economic formations preceding socialism, from the moment classes emerged, as well as in modern capitalist countries, the upbringing of growing generations is entirely subordinated to the interests of the exploiters. The ruling exploiting classes turn the school into an instrument of their class rule. They are interested not in spreading education and enlightenment among working people, but on the contrary, in depriving working people of culture, light, and knowledge.

Thus, for example, in the USA, according to 1940 census data, among the adult population there were 10 million illiterate and 20 million who had not finished elementary school. Currently, more than 6 million children of working people there are left outside elementary school and are doomed to illiteracy.

Using the example of England, which set out on the path of capitalist development earlier than other countries, one can trace at what, to put it mildly, snail's pace (and even that contrary to the subjective desire of the English bourgeoisie) the

process of spreading education among working people takes place.

For the English bourgeoisie it took about 250 years (1649–1893) to pass a law on the introduction of initial compulsory education for all children from 7 to 11 years of age.

But even this meager concession, wrested from English capitalists as a result of a long and persistent struggle by the working class, turned out in reality to be a fiction. In modern England, where a law on the introduction of universal compulsory initial education has existed for 56 years, a vast number of children of the working population are actually deprived of the opportunity to receive even this meager education.

As a result of the imperialist policy of the ruling classes of modern Great Britain, the population of its colonies is doomed to illiteracy. According to official data from a report by the British government, in Cameroon 95% of the population are illiterate. On the Gold Coast—80% are illiterate. In Tanganyika, only about 10% of native children attend school.

If one takes into account that in the colonies of England, the population of which exceeds the population of the metropolis many times over, only 7–8% of school-age children receive elementary education, the role of the imperialist bourgeoisie of England as a suppressor of culture and enlightenment among the working population will become completely obvious.

A completely different picture exists in Soviet socialist society. "Previously, the entire human mind," said Lenin in 1920, "all its genius created solely to give some all the benefits of technology and culture, and to deprive others of the most necessary—enlightenment and development. Now all the wonders of technology, all the achievements of culture will become nationwide property, and henceforth human mind and

genius will never be turned into means of violence, into means of exploitation. We know this—and is it not in the name of this greatest historical task that it is worth working, worth giving all our strength? And the working people will accomplish this titanic historical work, for within them lie dormant the great forces of revolution, rebirth, and renewal"[64].

That which V. I. Lenin predicted in 1920 has come to pass: the working people of the USSR under the leadership of J. V. Stalin have accomplished this titanic, historical work, the name of which is the cultural revolution.

The greatness and historical significance of the cultural revolution in the USSR, accomplished under the leadership of Comrade Stalin in such a short period as 20 years, will become even more obvious if one considers that in Russia on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution, 67% of the population was illiterate, and among non-Russian peoples the population was almost entirely illiterate.

In doing so, it should be kept in mind that out of those 20 years, three years fell on the mortal struggle of the young Soviet state against the combined forces of foreign military intervention and domestic White Guard counter-revolution.

Moreover, after the victory over the combined forces of its external and internal enemies, the Soviet state had for a number of years to overcome exceptional difficulties in restoring the national economy.

The Soviet state from the very first days of its existence showed tireless care for raising the material and cultural level of the working people; however, owing to the circumstances mentioned above, it was able to proceed directly to carrying

---

64 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXII, p. 225.

out decisive measures in the field of the cultural revolution only starting in 1930.

By this time, literacy in the USSR had risen to 62.6% compared to 33% in pre-war times. The number of elementary, secondary, and higher schools in the country had increased significantly.

"The main thing now," said Comrade Stalin in his historic report at the XVI Party Congress in June 1930, "is to transition to universal compulsory primary education. I say 'the main thing', because such a transition would mean a decisive step in the matter of the cultural revolution. And it has long been time to transition to this matter, for we now have everything necessary to organize compulsory universal primary education in all regions of the USSR.

Until now we were forced to 'save on everything, even on schools' in order to 'save, restore heavy industry' (Lenin). Recently, however, we have already restored heavy industry and are moving it further. Consequently, the time has come when we must undertake the full implementation of universal compulsory primary education"[65].

The introduction of universal compulsory education in the native language in all regions of the USSR was considered by Comrade Stalin to be a primary, crucial measure, without which the cultural development of the country is impossible, without which the cultural revolution in a great multinational socialist state is impossible.

Comrade Stalin teaches that the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the building of socialism in the USSR is a period of the flourishing of national cultures, socialist in content and national in form. A huge role in the development

---

65 J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 12, pp. 299–300.

of national, socialist cultures belongs to the Soviet school, in which the growing generation receives education in its native language.

Exposing those deviating toward Great-Russian chauvinism, Comrade Stalin in his historic report at the XVI Congress of the VKP(b) [All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)] said: "They obviously do not understand that the development of national cultures must unfold with new force with the introduction and rooting of universal compulsory primary education in the native language. They do not understand that only under the condition of developing national cultures will it be possible to truly involve backward nationalities in the cause of socialist construction"[66].

Realizing this Stalinite directive, the Party achieved exceptional success in a short time in the field of the cultural revolution, in the field of developing cultures national in form and socialist in content in the USSR.

Just six years after the historic report of J. V. Stalin at the XVI Congress of the VKP(b), a cultural revolution was accomplished in our country which, in its scale and tempo, not to mention the fundamental difference of its content, is completely inaccessible to any other non-Soviet state.

If in 1914 the number of students in elementary and secondary schools was 8 million, in the 1936/37 academic year 28 million students were studying in the elementary and secondary schools of the USSR. In 1914, there were 112 thousand students in higher educational institutions, and in the 1936/37 academic year the number of students in higher educational institutions amounted to 542 thousand people.

---

[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 368–369.

As a result of the cultural revolution carried out on the basis of Comrade Stalin's instructions, the Soviet Union turned into a country of the most advanced culture.

Guided by the Leninist-Stalinist teaching on culture and communist upbringing, the Party considers the systematic and steadfast development of culture and enlightenment as a most important condition for the victorious construction of a communist society. With every year, the number of schools and higher educational institutions grows here, and the number of students in schools and higher educational institutions continuously increases.

In the 1948/49 academic year, 33 million students were already studying in elementary and secondary general education schools, i.e., several times more than in 1914. In 1949 in the USSR, 450 thousand people graduated from higher educational institutions, technical schools, and other specialized secondary educational institutions, including correspondence courses. Newly admitted were 770 thousand people, of whom 320 thousand were in higher educational institutions.

How can such gigantic successes in carrying out the cultural revolution in the USSR in the shortest timeframe be explained? Why in bourgeois countries, say, in England, 56 years after the introduction of the law on universal compulsory primary education, is a huge number of children of working people deprived of this primary education?

The answer to these questions must be sought in the fundamentally different nature of the Soviet socialist social and state system, in contrast to any bourgeois social and state system.

"In the rise of the material condition and cultural development of the masses of the people," says Comrade Stalin, "the strength, power, and invincibility of our Soviet revolution

showed themselves. Revolutions in the past perished because, while giving the people freedom, they did not have the opportunity to give them at the same time a serious improvement in their material and cultural position. In this lay their main weakness. Our revolution differs from all other revolutions in that it gave the people not only freedom from tsarism, from capitalism, but also a radical improvement in their material and cultural position. In this lies its strength and invincibility"[67].

Comrade Stalin pays especially much attention to issues of the communist upbringing, education, and instruction of the growing generation, considering them as one of the most important state and political tasks, as one of the most important conditions for our successes in building communism.

Comrade Stalin in his speeches repeatedly emphasizes the thought that the young generation represents the future of our country, that it must be prepared for the victorious completion of the construction of communism.

Delivering a report on the results of the XIII Congress of the RKP(b) [Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)] in June 1924, Comrade Stalin said: "The significance of youth—I speak of worker-peasant youth—consists in the fact that it represents the most grateful soil for building the future, that it is and carries within itself the future of our country. If our work in the state apparatus, among peasants, among working women is of immense importance in the matter of overcoming old habits and traditions, in the matter of *re-educating* old generations of the working masses, then work among youth, which is more or less free from these traditions and these habits, acquires invaluable significance in the matter of *educating* new cadres of working people in the spirit of the dictatorship of the

[67] *History of the VKP(b). Short Course*, 1938, p. 326.

proletariat and socialism, for here the soil—this goes without saying—is exceptionally favorable"[68].

Further, Comrade Stalin emphasizes the immense importance in the matter of the communist upbringing of the young generation of the Leninist Young Communist League and the pioneer organization. He sets before the Komsomol the task of drawing its members into all fields of economic, cultural, and administrative work. This work must be organized in such a way as to prepare from the young generation fighters and builders, workers and leaders of our country.

The role and significance of educating the young generation in the communist spirit in the general plan for building a socialist society are evident, in particular, from the fact that the resolution "On Work Among Youth", adopted by the XIII Congress of the RKP(b), completely specifically poses the question of the victory of the socialist economy as depending in significant measure on whether "...the proletarian state succeeds in sufficiently expanding the circle of communist cadre personnel and ensuring in a progressively increasing measure the communist reshaping of growing generations. Therefore, the question of youth is of truly immense importance"[69].

In 1933, in a speech at the First Congress of Collective Farm Shock-Workers, Comrade Stalin again returns to the thought of the role of the young generation in building communism and of the duties of youth to learn Leninism.

---

[68] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 6, p. 252.

[69] *«VKP(b) in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences, and Plenums of the CC»*, part I. Partizdat, 1936, pp. 622–623.

"Youth," said Comrade Stalin, "is our future, our hope, comrades. Youth must replace us, old people. It must carry our banner to a victorious conclusion"[70].

In order for the young generation to be prepared for the construction of communism, so that it is capable of carrying the banner of communism to a victorious conclusion, so that it is a worthy replacement for the old guard of builders of communism—it must stubbornly and persistently learn Leninism, deeply and firmly master knowledge of the fundamentals of the sciences necessary for a modern educated person.

The main and primary task of the young generation is to learn, for without knowledge, without science, it is impossible to become a real communist, impossible to build a communist society. Comrade Stalin views the struggle of youth to master knowledge and science in close connection with the task of preparing new cadres of builders of communist society from the young generation.

The connection between the upbringing of the young generation and the task of preparing new cadres in accordance with the needs of socialist construction was emphasized with special force by Comrade Stalin in his speech at the VIII Congress of the VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Young Communist League] in 1928.

Characterizing the greatest tasks in the field of socialist reconstruction of industry and agriculture and the related task of preparing cadres for socialist construction, Comrade Stalin set before the youth the task: to master science, become Bolsheviks, specialists in one field of knowledge or another who know how to build and lead.

---

[70] J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 420.

"There are more than enough candidates to build and lead construction," said Comrade Stalin, "both in the field of agriculture and in the field of industry. But people who know how to build and lead—we have precious few...

In order to build, one must know, one must master science. And to know, one must learn. Learn stubbornly, patiently...

Before us stands a fortress. It is called science, with its numerous branches of knowledge. This fortress we must capture at all costs. This fortress must be taken by youth, if they want to be builders of a new life, if they want to become a real replacement for the old guard"[71].

For youth, mastering science and knowledge is the main task of their life, for without solving this task it is impossible to become active and initiative-taking builders of communism. The construction of a socialist society requires not cadres in general, not dilettantes, not know-it-alls, but Bolshevik-specialists in specific branches of industry, agriculture, trade, transport, etc.

"We need now," said Comrade Stalin, "whole groups, hundreds and thousands of new cadres from among Bolsheviks who can be masters of their trade in the most diverse branches of knowledge. Without this, there is no use talking about a fast pace of socialist construction in our country. Without this, there is no use talking about our being able to catch up with and surpass the advanced capitalist countries.

To master science, to forge new cadres of Bolshevik specialists in all branches of knowledge, to learn, learn, learn in the most stubborn manner—such is now the task.

---

[71] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 11, pp. 75–77.

A mass campaign of revolutionary youth for science—that is what we need now, comrades"[72].

Thus, the mastery of science and knowledge by the young generation is the central link in preparing new cadres of builders of communism from among the youth. That is why the struggle for a deep and firm assimilation by students of the fundamentals of the sciences is the central task of the Soviet socialist school.

The CC VKP(b), on the basis of the guiding instructions of Comrade Stalin, tirelessly rivets the attention of all educational workers in its decisions on the school and teacher precisely to this most important position of the Leninist-Stalinist teaching on the communist upbringing of the young generation.

Comrade Stalin teaches that the creation by the working class of its own industrial-technical intelligentsia is one of the indispensable conditions for successful socialist construction. In connection with this, Comrade Stalin pays special attention to the work of higher educational institutions and gives exhaustive instructions regarding those tasks that Soviet students are called upon to solve.

Higher and secondary vocational-technical educational institutions Comrade Stalin defines as schools for training command personnel for the economy and culture.

"Medics and economists, cooperators and pedagogues, miners and statisticians, technicians and chemists, agriculturalists and railway engineers, veterinarians and foresters, electricians and mechanics—these are all future commanders for building a new society, for building a socialist economy and socialist culture.

---

[72] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 11, p. 77.

One cannot build a new society without new command personnel, just as one cannot build a new army without new command personnel"[73].

Comrade Stalin sets before Soviet students as their most important task—the task of becoming conscious builders of a socialist economy and socialist culture.

However, knowledge of the command personnel alone is not enough to build a new socialist society. If command personnel do not enjoy the trust and support of the broad masses of working people, they will not be able to accomplish the tasks of socialist construction facing them.

In an address to the All-Union Conference of Proletarian Students in April 1925, Comrade Stalin not only defines the tasks facing students of Soviet higher educational institutions, but also reveals the main and essential quality of the Soviet intelligentsia that fundamentally distinguishes it from the intelligentsia of capitalist society.

"The new command personnel for building a new economy and a new culture is called new precisely because," says Comrade Stalin, "it must break with the old ways of commanding sharply and irrevocably. Not isolation from the masses, but the closest connection with them; not placing oneself above the masses, but going ahead of the masses, leading them behind oneself; not alienating oneself from the masses, but merging with them and winning their trust and support—such are the new ways of management for the new command personnel. Outside of these ways, no socialist construction is conceivable"[74].

---

[73] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 7, p. 86.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 87.

Thus, Comrade Stalin makes success in the activity of the Soviet intelligentsia directly dependent on the intelligentsia's connection with the broad masses of working people. He demands of Soviet students that they view themselves as an integral part of the working masses, so that they not only feel themselves to be public figures, but also conduct themselves as genuine public figures. Such is the second task that Comrade Stalin set before Soviet students.

The third important task consists in students understanding the necessity of mastering science and act truly mastered it, for without this it is impossible to lead socialist construction. The slogan "master science" acquires great significance also because students cannot stand aside from the main highway of the development of science.

"I think," says Comrade Stalin, "that our country, with its revolutionary skills and traditions, with its struggle against inertia and stagnation of thought, presents the most favorable environment for the flourishing of science... Our country has in this respect a great future as the citadel and breeding ground of sciences free from fetters"[75].

Following Stalin's instructions, the Bolshevik Party has achieved immense success in the field of cultural and scientific development in our country. Soviet science, inextricably linked with the creative, constructive activity of the entire people, has reached an unprecedented flourish. For the first time in history, all achievements of science and technology are placed at the service of the people and have become the property of the entire nation.

Carrying out Stalin's instructions, the Soviet people, under the leadership of the Party of Lenin–Stalin, created their own

[75] I. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 88.

numerous intelligentsia of a new type, which is an integral part of the Soviet people and deservedly enjoys their immense trust and support.

Comrade Stalin, developing the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the education of all-round developed builders and defenders of communism under new conditions—under the conditions of the direct construction of socialist society and the gradual transition from socialism to communism—raised this doctrine to a new, higher level and worked out concrete ways for its implementation.

In our country, under the leadership of the party and personally Comrade Stalin, the world-historic task of educating all-round developed, educated builders of communism—who are able to combine theory with practice, who have mastered technology, who know how to extract from technology everything it can give, who are not afraid of difficulties, and who are capable of overcoming any obstacles—is being successfully resolved.

The problem of educating all-round developed builders of communism is inextricably linked with the problem of liquidating the opposition between mental and physical labor.

Characterizing the Stakhanovite movement as a movement called upon to bring about a revolution in our industry—one that will go down in the history of socialist construction as one of its most glorious pages, and which prepares the conditions for the transition from socialism to communism—Comrade Stalin gives fundamental guiding directives and defines concrete ways to solve the problem of eliminating the opposition between mental and physical labor.

For the transition from socialism to communism, Marxism-Leninism requires the following conditions. First, such a high cultural and technical level of the working class as would undermine the foundations of the opposition between mental

and physical labor. Second, the productivity of labor must be raised to such a height as ensures the production of a full abundance of consumer goods.

Comrade Stalin, speaking about raising the cultural and technical level of the working class to the level of engineering and technical workers, points out that such a rise "...is fully feasible under the conditions of the Soviet system, where the productive forces of the country are freed from the chains of capitalism, where labor is freed from the yoke of exploitation, where the working class is in power, and where the young generation of the working class has every opportunity to secure a sufficient technical education"[76].

Guided by these directives of Comrade Stalin, the party and the Soviet state have carried out immense work to raise the cultural and technical level of the working class. In carrying out the historical task set by Comrade Stalin at the 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)—to make all workers and all peasants cultural and educated people—very serious successes have been achieved. In terms of the development of general and vocational education, the USSR stands in first place in the world. The general educational and general cultural training that young people receive in schools allows them to master new technology in production faster and more thoroughly and to improve their technical literacy without interruption from production and to raise their technical literacy without taking time off from production.

Of enormous importance for the further growth of the cultural and technical level of the working class is the system of state labor reserves created on the initiative of Comrade Stalin.

---

[76] I. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., pp. 495–496.

In FZO (Factory-Plant Training) schools, trade, and railway schools, more than 4 million young skilled workers have been trained since their founding. In addition, at every enterprise, any worker has full opportunity to improve their qualifications and replenish their technical knowledge without taking time off from production. Many factories and plants represent distinct educational combines. Here, workers at enterprises receive secondary and higher technical education without taking time off from production.

As a result of all these measures, in the last two years alone, the technical qualification of more than 10 million workers has been raised.

With each passing year, the number of workers—production innovators, and collective farmers—masters of high yields, receiving along with outstanding scientists the high title of Stalin Prize Laureates, is growing.

The paternal care of Comrade Stalin for the communist upbringing, education, and instruction of the younger generation is also manifested in the fact that, based on his guiding instructions, the party and government in their decisions on the school and teacher have given clear and exhaustive guidelines on the ways and means for a radical improvement in the quality of education and communist upbringing in the Soviet school. Guided by these historic decisions of the party and government, Soviet educators have achieved outstanding successes in the cause of communist upbringing of the younger generation and in preparing new cadres of builders of communism from among them.

At present, based on the decisions of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on ideological questions, the Soviet socialist school is fighting for a further increase in the quality of students' mastery of the fundamentals

of sciences, and for raising the scientific and ideologico-political level of all educational and upbringing work in the school.

The training of active and initiative-driven builders and defenders of communism is ensured, above all, by that the younger generation receives a proper education and masters science and knowledge. But education alone—teaches Comrade Stalin—is not enough to become a real communist.

"Were there really few educated people," says Comrade Stalin, "on the side of the old order in the 17th century in England, and at the end of the 18th century in France, and during the era of the October Revolution in Russia? The old order had on its side, in its service, many highly educated people who defended the old order and went against the new order. For education is a weapon, the effect of which depends on who holds it in their hands and who they want to strike with this weapon"[77].

Consequently, the success of the cause of educating the younger generation is decided, first and foremost, by the ideological direction of education, the ideological basis of education and instruction in school, and the ideologico-political preparation of teachers.

The party and government have always attached paramount importance to the ideological basis of the communist upbringing, education, and instruction of the younger generation. These questions acquire particularly vital importance during the period of completing the building of socialism and the gradual transition from socialism to communism, when overcoming the remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of people, the communist upbringing of

[77] I. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 10th ed., p. 610.

working people, and especially the younger generation, comes to the fore and acquires decisive importance.

Communist upbringing is the upbringing of the younger generation on the great ideas of Leninism, upbringing in the spirit of the party's policy—which is the vital foundation of the Soviet system—and upbringing in the spirit of life-giving Soviet patriotism and Soviet national pride.

Comrade Stalin defines Soviet patriotism as one of the driving forces of Soviet society. The labor of Soviet people in all sectors of socialist construction is inspired by a life-giving feeling of Soviet patriotism and Soviet national pride. Soviet patriotism serves as an inexhaustible source of creative initiative for the broad masses of working people in the struggle for the construction of communism.

"The strength of Soviet patriotism," says Comrade Stalin, "consists in the fact that it has as its basis not racial or nationalistic prejudices, but the deep devotion and loyalty of the people to their Soviet Motherland, and the fraternal community of the working people of all nations of our country. In Soviet patriotism, national traditions of peoples and common vital interests of all working people of the Soviet Union are harmoniously combined. Soviet patriotism does not divide, but on the contrary, welds all nations and nationalities of our country into a single fraternal family. In this, one must see the foundations of the indestructible and ever-strengthening friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union. At the same time, the peoples of the USSR respect the rights and independence of peoples of foreign countries and have always shown readiness to live in peace and friendship with neighboring states. In this, one must see the basis of the

growing and strengthening ties of our state with freedom-loving peoples"[78].

Such is the classic Stalinist definition of the essence of Soviet patriotism, in the spirit of which the party educates the entire Soviet people, and in the spirit of which our young growing generation is educated. Soviet patriotism is expressed, above all, in the creative, constructive labor of Soviet people. That is why, in instilling in students a life-giving feeling of Soviet patriotism, we must foster in them not an abstract, platonic love for the Motherland, but an active love, which is organically linked with the struggle for a free, strong, and independent socialist Motherland, for the construction of communism.

Patriotic upbringing in the Soviet socialist school should also be aimed at instilling in the younger generation—the future cadres of builders of communism—boundless devotion to the cause of the party of Lenin–Stalin, loyalty to the ideals of communism, and readiness to give all their strength and knowledge, received in school, to the further strengthening and development of the power of their beloved Motherland.

That is why the main patriotic duty of Soviet schoolchildren is to study excellently, to fight for a deep and solid mastery of the fundamentals of sciences, and to perform all their school duties honestly and conscientiously.

The more thoroughly the younger generation masters knowledge and science in school, the more actively and fruitfully it will be able to apply this knowledge in future practical work for the benefit of its great Motherland.

Thus, the Stalinist doctrine on communist upbringing requires from the Soviet school that it not only prepare educated people

---

[78] I. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, 5th ed., 1946, pp. 160–161.

from the younger generation, but also raise communists out of them, educating the young generation in the spirit of Soviet, communist ideology, and conducting a decisive struggle against the remnants of bourgeois ideology, which can penetrate and sometimes does penetrate in one form or another into the consciousness of youth.

In realizing a genuinely communist upbringing of the younger generation, a decisive role is played by the personality of the educator. Therefore, the problem of training highly qualified teachers for schools constitutes one of the constant concerns of the party and government.

In his historic report at the 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Comrade Stalin set the task to pay special attention to the organization of pedagogical and medical education. "I have in mind," said Comrade Stalin, "the impermissible phenomenon that pedagogical and medical 'faculties' are still neglected among us. This is a major defect bordering on a violation of state interests. This defect must definitely be put to an end. And the sooner this is done, the better"[79].

The role of the school and teachers in educating the younger generation is enormous. But no single school and teachers educate the young generation alone. An exceptionally important role in raising children belongs to the mother. That is why Comrade Stalin, noting as a gratifying fact and as a sign of the cultural growth in the countryside, says: "This circumstance, comrades, is of tremendous significance. It is of tremendous significance because women constitute half the population of our country; they constitute a vast army of labor,

[79] I. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 460.

and they are called upon to raise our children, our future generation, that is, our future"[80].

In training highly qualified teachers for schools who would be able to successfully cope with the honorable and responsible tasks of communist upbringing, education, and instruction of the younger generation, we are guided by the Stalinist doctrine on cadres.

One of the essential sections of this doctrine is the question of the dependence of success in work on the level of Marxist-Leninist consciousness of the worker.

"...The higher the political level," says Comrade Stalin, "and the Marxist-Leninist consciousness of workers in any branch of state and party work, the higher and more fruitful the work itself, and the more effective the results..."[81]

Such is the necessary, law-governed connection between success in work in all branches of diverse party, state, economic, cultural, and other activity, and the ideological preparation of cadres and their political seasoning. Such is the role of Marxist-Leninist theory in the further forward movement of socialist society toward communism.

In connection with this, Comrade Stalin raises the question of the necessity for deep study and mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory by specialists in any branch of science, and by representatives of any detachment of the Soviet intelligentsia.

"...There is one branch of science," teaches Comrade Stalin, "knowledge of which must be obligatory for Bolsheviks of all branches of science—it is the Marxist-Leninist science of society, of the laws of social development, of the laws of development of the proletarian revolution, of the laws of

---

[80] *Ibid.*

[81] I. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 598.

development of socialist construction, and of the victory of communism. For a person cannot be considered a real Leninist if they call themselves a Leninist but are enclosed in their specialization, enclosed, say, in mathematics, botany, or chemistry, and see nothing beyond their specialization"[82].

Of particularly crucial importance is the mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory for education workers, for they are on one of the most responsible sectors of the ideological front; the scientific-theoretical and ideologico-political level of all educational and upbringing work in school depends on the level of the teacher's Marxist-Leninist preparation.

The immense successes of the Soviet socialist school are inextricably linked with the name of Lenin and the name of Stalin. The Leninist-Stalinist doctrine on communist upbringing is the unshakable foundation of all our theoretical and practical activity in the upbringing, education, and instruction of the younger generation. Developed and enriched by the genius of Stalin, it arms education workers for the successful implementation of those new and responsible tasks facing the school and pedagogical science now, during the period of gradual transition from socialism to communism.

"*Soviet Pedagogics", 1949, No. 12.*

[82] *Ibid.*, pp. 598–599.

N. K. GONCHAROV

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences

MARXIST-LENINIST DOCTRINE ON MORALITY—THE BASIS OF COMMUNIST UPBRINGING IN SCHOOL

The Great October Socialist Revolution, in matters of upbringing and education, was a revolution asserting new, communist norms of human behavior.

The successful struggle for the construction of a socialist society in the USSR shows not only our economic successes, but also the exceptional growth of people's consciousness. The understanding by our Soviet people of the political tasks facing the country demonstrates the high moral qualities of the workers of socialist society, and finally shows the great work done by our school in the communist upbringing of the younger generation.

Both during the period of peaceful construction and during the war, the results of the titanic, organizational, and educational work of the Party and the Soviet state made themselves felt. These results were expressed in the selfless devotion of the Soviet people to the Motherland, in their readiness for any sacrifices for its freedom and prosperity, in their exceptional devotion and trust in the party of Bolsheviks and Comrade Stalin, and in the politico-moral unity of all peoples of our vast country.

The new stage of socialist construction sets higher tasks in the further moral growth and perfection of Soviet people. New tasks also confront our school. Of immense importance for improving the upbringing of communist morality are the decrees of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) on the

journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*, on the repertoire of drama theaters, on the feature film *A Great Life*, and others. These decrees make it possible to raise all our ideological work and bring it into line with the economic and political tasks facing the country.

The completion of building a socialist society and the gradual transition to communism set with all decisiveness the question of eradicating the remnants of capitalism in the minds of people and educating communist morality, for in a socialist society there still remain "birthmarks of the old society, from whose womb it emerged". The struggle for building a communist society and the education of communist morality are two sides of one and the same issue.

If lingering remnants of the past are still present in the behavior of our people, this only confirms that consciousness lags behind the new socialist conditions of life. The task of educational work consists precisely in raising the level of consciousness. Capitalist remnants in the minds of people are being eliminated more and more through the course of socialist construction and the policy of the party aimed at the further development of society and the strengthening of educational work among both the adult population and the younger generation.

A correct scientific explanation of the origin, essence, and significance of morality in society was given by the founders of scientific socialism. To solve this question, it was necessary to substantiate a dialectical-materialist understanding of history.

At the heart of the historical development of human society lies the development of the material conditions of societal life, the mode of procuring the means of life necessary for human existence, and the mode of producing material goods.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the material life of society—its being—is primary, while its spiritual life is secondary, derivative, a reflection of social being. In the process of production, social relations between people are formed. In a class society, people are divided into large social groups—classes. In social production, different classes develop their own ideas, views, and norms of behavior. Therefore, the founders of scientific socialism view morality as one of the forms of social consciousness.

Morality, being one of the forms of social ideology, cannot remain unchanged. It changes and develops along with the development of society and is conditioned by the development of society itself. From this point of view, morality does not have its own isolated history of development. Human society develops material production and thereby alters social intercourse. Morality changes as a result of changes in the conditions of material life. "Thus, morality, religion, metaphysics, and all other ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness no longer retain the appearance of independence. They have no history, no development; but men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter along with this their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking"[83].

Thus, the morality of bourgeois society, based on commodity production with a sharp division into classes, cannot fail to reflect the contradictions that exist in class society. In a class society, there is not and cannot be a universal human morality or moral norms of behavior common to all, no matter how bourgeois scholars try to prove otherwise.

The bourgeoisie hypocritically reproaches the working people with immorality, while trying to pass off its own bourgeois

[83] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. IV, p. 17.

morality as universal human morality. In reality, the bourgeoisie violates even its own moral norms at every step. The bourgeoisie bypasses any moral norms, but wants others to strictly observe them. "The dissolute bourgeois bypasses marriage and secretly commits adultery; the merchant bypasses the institution of property, depriving others of property through speculation, bankruptcy, etc.; the young bourgeois makes himself independent from his own family when he can do so; he practically abolishes the family for himself, but marriage, property, and the family remain theoretically inviolable because they form the practical foundations upon which the bourgeoisie has erected its dominance, because in their bourgeois form they are the conditions that make the bourgeois a bourgeois... This relation of the bourgeois to the conditions of his existence acquires one of its general forms in bourgeois morality"[84].

The working class does not hide the class essence of its morality, as it does not view its class existence as eternal. Fighting for political power, workers do not intend to preserve their class dominance forever. They need political power to reshape society on new principles and to eliminate classes altogether. Truly human morality will be possible only when there are not only no classes and class contradictions, but when their trace is erased in the practical life of people.

Asserting that there is no morality "in general," but rather the morality of a specific social formation and specific classes, Marx and Engels do not deny that in the contradictory moral concepts and norms of any society there is also something common. Bourgeois scholars always emphasize this common element in an attempt to prove the self-sufficiency and independence of morality from society and social relations.

---

[84] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. IV, p. 161.

The common element in morality is explained not by the fact that it is independent of society or has an immutable origin, but by the fact that morality has a certain common historical background. If private ownership of the means of production lies at the foundation of a society as a common and decisive basis, this inevitably affects moral concepts and views. One must not forget the simple truth for Marxists that the possessing classes are not only owners of material wealth, but that their concepts, including moral ones, are the dominant ones. One cannot imagine that the working masses are immune to bourgeois morality. The possessing classes have immense material and spiritual means to influence the exploited, oppressed classes.

For Marx and Engels, and subsequently for Lenin and Stalin, a correct scientific explanation of the origin and essence of morality and the exposure of bourgeois morality were not reduced to abstract academic disputes with opponents from the camp of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologists. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine on society and morality in particular shows the true paths of struggle for the restructuring of human society, and the struggle for communism as the most perfect form of human society. A correct understanding of the laws of social development makes it possible to clarify the role and significance of morality in human relations.

Communist morality is inextricably linked with the Marxist-Leninist scientific worldview. Therefore, the struggle for a new worldview is a struggle for a new morality.

Marxist-Leninist theory possesses immense transformative power. This was well understood and is understood by all overt and covert enemies of the working people. That is why Marxism was subjected and continues to be subjected to fierce attacks from various scientific lackeys of the bourgeoisie. The teaching of the classics of Marxism on morality was also

subjected to attacks. All sorts of opportunists and revisionists, under the guise of the "insufficiency" of Marxism's development, tried to supplement it with Kantianism, especially in the part concerning ethical doctrine.

The geniuses of humanity, Lenin and Stalin, not only consistently led the struggle for Marxism as a unified and complete doctrine, but also further developed this teaching. They also developed the Marxist doctrine on morality. These great thinkers, even before knowing each other personally, gave in their early works an exceptionally deep and clear interpretation of the problem of ideology as a form of social consciousness and morality as one of its forms, showing the significance of social ideas—including morality—in the life of human society. We refer to V. I. Lenin's work *"What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats"* and I. V. Stalin's work *"Anarchism or Socialism?"*.

The entire activity of V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin—these truly great people—shows how to live and fight for the people, serve the people, and see in the people the greatest transformative force for changing old social relations and old morality, and for creating a new society and a new morality.

The genius of Lenin and the genius of Stalin were also manifested in the fact that they showed the true paths for constructing a new society, and consequently, the paths of moral perfection of people in the process of a persistent struggle against everything that supports the old, obsolete elements in human society. This struggle cannot be fragmented or spontaneous, for fragmentation and spontaneity cannot lead to final victory. The struggle can be successful only if it is organized and purposeful. The teaching of Lenin–Stalin is the primary and decisive force directing this struggle. It proceeds from the objective laws of the development of human society and social relations, and is therefore all-powerful. The

Leninist-Stalinist doctrine on morality is a powerful factor in building a new communist society.

The Great October Socialist Revolution created the economic and political prerequisites for new, genuinely human relations. However, the creation of these new relations and the complete renewal of human society require a long and intense class struggle against all forces and traditions of the old society.

Manners and customs of people change more slowly than the material conditions of their lives, but changes in material conditions must precede changes in moral norms and concepts.

New socialist social relations provide the basis for resolving the question of the personal and the public. The personal and the public under class society were always antagonistic concepts. Those social classes and groups that spoke on behalf of society always covered up their selfish class interests with the name of the people. All talk by bourgeois ideologists about serving society and public duty remained empty words concealing the exploitative essence of the bourgeoisie. Moral sententiae about egoism and altruism could not resolve the question of the personal and the public. Ideologists of the petty bourgeoisie asserted that the liberation of the individual is the first condition for the liberation of the masses, forgetting that the individual by itself, apart from the masses, cannot change social relations.

Communists, leading the struggle against exploitation, set before themselves the greatest political tasks—the construction of a new society. Bound up with this are the noblest moral tasks—the all-round development of the individual and the manifestation of all their physical and spiritual capabilities. In a socialist society, every individual, working for society, works for themselves as well. The more the material foundations of this society develop, the more opportunities appear for

satisfying personal needs. That is why all petty-bourgeois daydreams about individual freedom divorced from the masses are harmful utopias that lead not to moral perfection, but to individualism, egoism, and licentiousness.

Comrade Stalin, in his work *"Anarchism or Socialism?"*, concisely and clearly expressed the Bolshevik views on the individual and the collective. He wrote: "The cornerstone of anarchism is the **individual**, whose liberation, according to its view, is the main condition for the liberation of the masses, the collective. According to anarchism, the liberation of the masses is impossible until the individual is liberated, which is why its slogan is: 'Everything for the individual'. The cornerstone of Marxism, however, is the mass, whose liberation, according to its view, is the main condition for the liberation of the individual. That is, according to Marxism, the liberation of the individual is impossible until the mass is liberated, which is why its slogan is: 'Everything for the mass'"[85].

The greatest historical service of the Bolshevik Party and its creators and leaders, Lenin and Stalin, consists in the fact that it liberated the "masses", awakened them to immense constructive activity, and provided the opportunity for national talents and abilities to flourish. The individual and the collective in Soviet society are not opposed to each other. The individual acts as part of the collective, displaying their individuality to the maximum extent.

We fight against individualism as a remnant of the past, but Soviet society has created the most favorable conditions for the multifaceted creative activity of any individual.

People in our country can display their abilities in any branch of the national economy, art, and science. What a vast number

---

[85] I. V. Stalin, *Anarchism or Socialism? Works*, Vol. I, 1946, p. 296.

of innovators we have among ordinary people both in industry and in agriculture! Many of them have received the highest evaluation for their activity—the title of Hero of Socialist Labor—and have become Stalin Prize laureates. Many remarkable organizers and leaders have grown among us. Their growth is explained primarily by the fact that they, as the best representatives of the people, are bound to the people and serve the people.

Intense creative labor and love for it are among the essential elements of communist morality. Labor gives a person the opportunity to prove themselves. People who know how to work well and fruitfully enjoy universal respect and recognition in our country. Working productively has become an unshakable principle of communist morality and a norm of behavior for the Soviet person.

As a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution, all life in our country changed, as did the morality and psyche of the people. As a result of the October Revolution, our country was freed not only from political and economic dependence on the bourgeois world, but the Bolshevik Party also fostered a sense of national dignity in Soviet people. This feeling is based on the superiority of our socialist system over the capitalist system, of our ideology over bourgeois ideology, of our communist morality over exploitative morality, and of our system of education and upbringing over the bourgeois system of education and upbringing. The people gained faith in their own strength and received every opportunity to exert these forces to work for the benefit of the Motherland. The good of the Motherland and its further prosperity are paramount for the Soviet person. The life-giving force of Soviet patriotism makes it possible to overcome immense difficulties and unite the peoples of our country. "The strength of Soviet patriotism," says Comrade Stalin, "consists in the fact that it has as its basis

not racial or nationalistic prejudices, but the deep devotion and loyalty of the people to their Soviet Motherland, and the fraternal community of working people of all nations of our country. In Soviet patriotism, national traditions of peoples and common vital interests of all working people of the Soviet Union are harmoniously combined"[86].

The Soviet people, having created a new society under the leadership of the Party of Lenin–Stalin, treat the progressive traditions of the past with deep respect. One can say more: it is only in our time, after the Great October Socialist Revolution, that the opportunity appeared to deeply respect and honor the advanced, progressive past in the life of our peoples. For in pre-revolutionary Russia, everything progressive was suppressed, the priority of many scientific discoveries was not recognized, and servility toward foreign countries was cultivated.

Do we not know that Ushinsky and his ideas received recognition only in our time, not to mention the pedagogical ideas of the revolutionary democrats?

At the same time, we must not forget that remnants of capitalism, manifested in servility toward bourgeois culture and the idealization of the past, are not yet fully eradicated, especially among a certain section of the intelligentsia. In this respect, workers on the pedagogical front are no exception.

A fierce struggle is underway between our advanced socialist ideology and reactionary bourgeois ideology, between our system of upbringing—communist upbringing—and the system of bourgeois upbringing.

---

[86] I. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, 5th ed., 1946, pp. 160–161.

Our Soviet life and socialist social relations, developing on the basis of the teaching of Lenin–Stalin, are a powerful source for Soviet pedagogical science and a powerful factor of upbringing. The Soviet socialist system has eliminated the exploitation of man by man, and banished from usage such humiliating feelings as racial hatred, prejudices about the mental inferiority of women, and the unequal position of women in society and the family.

The Soviet system educates people as noble patriots of their motherland, with a highly developed sense of national dignity.

The Soviet school, being an organic part of socialist society, instills in our younger generation all the positive qualities of Soviet people. Soviet pedagogical science, guided by the policy of our party and the Soviet state, is called upon to assist the school to the maximum in solving its noble task—the communist upbringing, education, and instruction of our children and youth. Soviet people have become different people, with a new, noble morality hitherto unseen in history—communist morality. "Where will you find such a people and such a country as ours? Where will you find such splendid qualities as those displayed by our Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War and which they display every day in labor, having transitioned to peaceful development and the restoration of the economy and culture! Every day elevates our people higher and higher. Today we are not who we were yesterday, and tomorrow we will not be who we were today. We are no longer the Russians we were before 1917, and our Rus' is no longer the same, and our character is different. We have changed and grown along with those greatest transformations that radically altered the face of our country" (Zhdanov).

The Soviet people, under the difficult conditions of the Great Patriotic War, endured severe trials and displayed the greatest moral fortitude and patriotism, both at the front and in the rear.

Remarkable victories in the struggle for building socialism and in the struggle against fascist hordes instill a sense of boundless love for the motherland and for the great Stalin, inspiring confidence in the further victorious movement toward communism.

The Great Patriotic War and the struggle for the restoration and development of the national economy demonstrate all the power, freshness, and moral fortitude of the peoples of the Soviet Union, their high adherence to ideology, and their unshakable confidence in victory.

The politico-moral unity of the Soviet people during the war manifested itself with special strength. The war tempered people even further; difficulties and their overcoming contributed to the forging of an iron will and mass heroism. "The unprecedented difficulties of the current war did not break, but rather forged even more the iron will and courageous spirit of the Soviet people. Our people have rightfully won the glory of a heroic people."[87]

In the struggle for the freedom and independence of our Motherland, in the struggle to liberate peoples from the yoke of fascism, and in the struggle for the final defeat of fascism, the moral factor played a huge role; it was not for nothing that Comrade Stalin, in his order of February 22, 1942, pointed to a number of factors that would decide the outcome of the successful struggle against fascism, and among these factors, he named the moral factor. Consequently, under our conditions, the moral factor acquires immense material force.

Indicative in this regard are the commitments undertaken by workers, collective farmers, and intelligentsia for the early fulfillment of the fourth Stalinist Five-Year Plan. The struggle

---

87 I. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, 1946, p. 159.

for high labor productivity and iron conscious discipline in factories, plants, and agriculture demonstrates the exceptional consciousness and high moral qualities of the vast majority of workers in socialist society. Soviet patriotism manifests itself in action. Effectiveness is a characteristic feature of Soviet patriotism. The actions and deeds of Soviet people show their moral fortitude, purposefulness, and devotion to the cause of communism.

Communist morality is, at the same time, the most humane morality, as it is directed toward the good and perfection of all the people. Humanism, as an essential component of communist morality, is defined by the entire Soviet system, by the entire system of socialist economy. With us, all material goods, all achievements of science and culture are placed at the service of the people. Relations between people are built on comradely support and mutual cooperation. The fullness of human life, awareness of the feeling of human dignity, respect for the human personality, and the unfolding of natural and spiritual abilities of people, regardless of gender, race, and nationality, have become possible only under the conditions of Soviet reality.

Once the greatest humanist writer, A. M. Gorky, wrote: "Simply 'a human being'—that is still too little. History requires that a new human being appear, free from racial, national, and class prejudices." Such a new human being appeared as a result of the victory of the new social system, and care for the individual is the most essential part of the activity of this society. Genuine, true humanism is possible only in our social system.

Bourgeois humanism, which arose in the 14th–15th centuries, was indisputably a progressive phenomenon. Early bourgeois humanists were the mouthpieces of the new social order replacing feudalism. But gradually bourgeois humanism

transformed into a reactionary ideology calling for non-resistance to violence, thereby justifying the oppression of man by man. The more organized the working class becomes, the more reactionary bourgeois humanism becomes. Bourgeois ideology moves from early humanist tendencies to a misanthropic ideology, and in its vile nakedness finds its culmination in fascism. Fascism denies all morality, preaches misanthropy, and not only denies it, but in fact has already brought torrents of grief, misfortune, humiliation, and ruin to humanity. The Soviet people are proud to have accomplished the most humane deed by defeating the military fascist machine and giving suffering peoples the opportunity to breathe freely from the yoke of fascism.

Socialist humanism is an effective humanism; it is aimed at combating everything that prevents the creation of genuinely human relations, and it is aimed at developing the best qualities of the human being—the true creator of history.

Service to the people and understanding the interests of the people is also one of the characteristic features of the Soviet system of upbringing. The school itself at all levels is, for us, genuinely of the people, the most democratic; it is part of our life, the most important organic part of the socialist system.

The school cannot and must not stand aside from the tasks and policy of the Soviet state, from policies aimed at further strengthening and flourishing our Motherland. The role of the school is especially increasing at the present time, when a gradual transition from socialism to communism is being carried out in our Soviet country. Under these conditions, high education, communist consciousness, and firm conviction are required from the builders of the new society. The school must develop these qualities in the younger generation first and foremost. Of special importance is educating youth in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and high communist consciousness.

All our Soviet reality, the remarkable traditions of past struggles against oppression, violence, invaders, and interveners, the advanced democratic traditions of science, literature, and art, and especially the creative and inspiring role of the Soviet state, the Communist Party, the selfless service to the people by the figures and leaders of the country, and the images of Lenin and Stalin—all these are a bright and inexhaustible source of educating Soviet patriotism. However, it should not be forgotten that educational work in school, including the education of Soviet patriotism, is not a spontaneous process. Only planned and targeted activities of the entire teaching staff, thoughtful influence on the mind, feelings, will, and character of the rising generation make it possible to develop patriotism and protect students from the corrupting influence of foreign ideology, servility, and groveling before foreign things. There is not a single subject taught in school that does not offer an opportunity to carry out patriotic education. Well-organized educational work in school inevitably presupposes the closest connection between school and life. How close and understandable surrounding nature becomes to a child when they do not merely observe it, but know and understand it! How dear the native collective farm becomes, in the prosperity of which there is a feasible share of the school's participation. That is why the combination of studying basic sciences with feasible social work by students both in and out of school is exceptionally important in terms of education and upbringing. Students' love for the Motherland must manifest itself in thoughts, feelings, and practical deeds.

It is completely clear that communist education can be successfully carried out only when the teacher themselves is not only convinced of the justice of our great cause, but also when they lead students from ignorance to knowledge, from elementary feelings and ideas about the Motherland to an understanding of the great role of our country, which was the

first to step onto the path of transforming human society. The high principles and convictions of the teacher make educational work highly principled and effective.

Questions of communist youth education have always been at the center of attention of our party. V. I. Lenin pointed to the necessity of fostering a worldview in youth that would stand opposed to bureaucratic science and official philosophy. After the Great October Socialist Revolution, the youth faced the task of building a new socialist society. To build under difficult and complex conditions. Construction required vast knowledge, much drive, selflessness, and confidence. Enemies of the people tried to distract the youth from fundamental and urgent tasks by preaching vulgarity, lack of principles, and retreat into small daily squabbles. Youth, guided by the party, correctly assessed these false friends.

Educating youth in the spirit of Bolshevik principles, vigor, self-confidence, and faith in the immense creativity of the popular masses is a major historical merit of the Communist Party. "And what would have happened if we had educated youth in the spirit of despondency and disbelief in our cause? What would have happened is that we would not have won the Great Patriotic War. It was precisely because the Soviet state and our party, with the help of Soviet literature, educated our youth in the spirit of vigor and self-confidence that we overcame the greatest difficulties in building socialism and achieved victory over the Germans and the Japanese."[88]

All the best qualities of Soviet youth have been nurtured by the Bolshevik Party, Lenin, and Stalin. Throughout its history, the Communist Party has shown care for youth and their

---

[88] A. A. Zhdanov, *On the Journals "Zvezda" and "Leningrad"*, Gospolitizdat, 1946, p. 17.

ideological upbringing, setting an example of selfless service to the people.

The war extraordinarily raised the authority of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and increased interest in all aspects of its life and activity, including the education of youth and the work of schools. At the same time, reactionaries from all countries are conducting a furious slanderous campaign against us, against our ideology, morality, and system of youth education, hiding behind loud phrases about "democracy in education." All this is done with a specific goal—to discredit our system of communist education.

Alongside this, various "new" pedagogical theories are emerging that aim to instill bourgeois morality in the working people. These "theories" preach class harmony and the apolitical nature of education. They talk about changing the content of education and strengthening reaction in educational work. This reaction manifests itself in extracurricular work, in organizing children's and youth organizations (the Scout movement). All this is often masked under purely cultural activities that seemingly have no relation to general bourgeois politics. V. I. Lenin pointed out that "the terms 'apolitical nature' or 'non-political nature' of education are nothing but the hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie, nothing but deception of the masses..."[89]

Fear of an uncertain future and a zoological hatred of the Soviet system and communist educational model force bourgeois educators to pay special attention to the school, where the fig leaf of apoliticalness is often cast aside. Take, for example, the famous pragmatist philosopher and educator John Dewey, who claims: "A sense of unresolved social problems hangs over us. These are problems of crime, law, capital, labor,

[89] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXV, p. 449.

unemployment, security, family life, war and peace, and international relations. All these questions are posed on a scale never before seen in world history" (*Some Features of Contemporary Education*).

Acknowledging the complexity of the current situation, Dewey sees the way out in a radical change of the educational system. An educational system must be created that enables the preparation of future citizens to understand the contemporary tasks of civilization; if this is not done, civilization will perish.

Public education must be given a single guiding goal. What that goal is, we shall see below. "Public education currently lacks a single guiding goal. It grows randomly, pushed here and there by various demands, rather than systematically following a broad and inspiring social idea. It grows through minor additions and mechanical layering, rather than through a vital inner strength... The demand for broad and fundamental changes in the public education system is not merely a prediction that this will happen—it is a warning. If the educational system fails to prepare future citizens to solve the massive problems of modernity, our civilization will perish. But the school cannot do this until it undergoes deep changes itself." On the eve of the war, Dewey's book *Education Today* was published. In this book, Dewey included several old works and a few new articles.

In these articles, special attention is paid to the problem of education. Issues of moral education are, of course, not bypassed. Dewey asserts that morality depends on facts arising from active connections of some human beings with others, as a consequence of their mutually influencing activities in the realm of desire, belief, judgment, satisfaction, and dissatisfaction. As a result of "mutually influencing activities," the concept of what is "good" and what is "bad" arises.

For proper moral education, it is necessary to organize appropriate mutual influence between the environment and teacher on one side, and the child on the other. The child must not be shown the negative aspects of reality, as this might lead them to form an incorrect view of reality. Education should reduce to a process of adapting to social conditions, where social conditions lead to certain ethical outcomes. Education must respond to the "spirit, temperament, dominant customs, and conditions uniting the people of a given country, insofar as they are united in the labor unity of life." Dewey attempts to present matters as if American millionaires and American workers are united in a common labor unity of life, and therefore have the same interests, the same tasks, and consequently the exact same morality. Their position in society is different, but they are united by one common idea—the national interest. The idea of cooperation between workers and the bourgeoisie permeates Dewey's entire pedagogical concept. Properly structured education, he claims, is the main method of progress and civilization. Education is not merely preparation for life, but life itself. A child enters life through labor, primarily through domestic labor. Education should boil down to the gradual complication of labor activities. The school "must demonstrate these types of activity to the child and reproduce them in a way that allows the child to gradually understand their significance and play an independent role in relation to them... This is the only way to ensure continuity in child growth, the only way to create a background of past experience for new concepts."

Based on his general premises, Dewey determines methods of educational work and derives them from the nature of the child itself. He explicitly states: "The question of methods ultimately boils down to the order of development of the child's powers and interests." Still, the child's learning happens through labor.

We have paused on Dewey's pedagogical views because he is the primary representative of reactionary pragmatic American pedagogy. His influence is significant not only in America, but also in other capitalist countries.

Our task is to expose and criticize bourgeois theories of education, regardless of what loud phrases about democracy they hide behind.

The struggle is between our ideology and bourgeois ideology, between our communist educational system and the bourgeois system of education. The bourgeoisie sneaks its ideology in by every means possible and presents it as the most democratic, nationwide, and even universal human ideology.

Can we say that individual people in our country cannot be subject to the influence of bourgeois ideology? Of course not. We would be naive people if we did not see certain dark sides of our reality. We remember well Comrade Stalin's statement that people's consciousness usually lags behind economic conditions of life. Until we overcome this lagging, individual people may appear among us who will not only be subject to the influence of bourgeois ideology, but will even act as mouthpieces for these influences.

An apolitical attitude in education under our conditions means secretly introducing foreign political influences. We cannot tolerate an apolitical stance in conducting educational work. Any distance from politics in matters of education inevitably leads to positions alien to the Soviet state and the Soviet people.

An apolitical approach in our educational work manifests in some teachers believing their job is merely to teach and impart knowledge to students, while upbringing should be handled by homeroom teachers, Pioneer, and Komsomol organizations. To reason this way is essentially to preach an apolitical stance and

instill a lack of principles. Everyone knows well that educational work is carried out primarily in the learning process itself. One of the most important principles of our Soviet didactics is the principle of *educative teaching*. A proper approach to teaching makes it possible to shape students' views on natural and social phenomena, i.e., to foster in them elements of a dialectical-materialist worldview.

The principle of educative teaching can be successfully implemented provided that students receive thorough and deep knowledge. The question of the quality of students' knowledge becomes particularly important because through knowledge, and with the help of knowledge, the school resolves the diverse and complex tasks of communist education. In a school where teaching is well-established, where solid and thorough knowledge is provided, as a rule, educational work is also well-established. Such a school sees high discipline and high student engagement. Without equipping students with the fundamentals of sciences, it is impossible to foster in them a passionate love for the socialist Motherland, a sense of Soviet national pride, high principles, and dedication. Comrade Molotov's direction that only that upbringing can be called communist which raises our mobilization readiness and all our capacities for selfless struggle and new battles for the victory of communism obliges the school to organize communist education so that it is effective and purposeful.

Speaking of the educative character of teaching, it is necessary to warn against a superficial, vulgar approach to this vital issue.

We consider highly principled teaching and upbringing to be those where material is presented deeply and thoroughly, where students understand specific regularities of studied phenomena and facts, where correct conclusions and generalizations are drawn, and where our socialist society is understood as the result of the natural historical development

of humanity. The entire learning process is aimed at preparing students as future builders of communist society. However, cases are not uncommon of completely unnecessary analogies drawn between the distant historical past and modern times, where the past is either idealized or, on the contrary, viewed as a continuous dark spot and a series of mistakes. The power of the Marxist-Leninist approach to facts and phenomena lies precisely in enabling a correct assessment of the past, an understanding of the present, and foresight into the future.

Our Soviet reality and socialist social relations serve as a powerful source of education; a teacher would be poor if they ignored the conditions of the new life and failed to demonstrate their features and all advantages over the capitalist world.

Our Soviet environment fosters people with different qualities than a capitalist environment—qualities worthy of human calling and purpose. This reality of ours must be shown to students; they must learn to love it, study it, perfect it, and improve it.

We have created a society with genuinely human relations. In this society, a huge role is assigned to the school. The school carries out the communist education of the rising generation and passes down to it the best qualities of Soviet people, raising ardent patriots.

"Sovetskaya Pedagogika", 1947, No. 12.

N. I. BOLDYREV

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences

M. I. KALININ ON COMMUNIST EDUCATION

An outstanding figure of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state, Mikhail Ivanovich Kalinin, paid great attention to issues of communist education for rising generations. His articles and speeches on upbringing, education, and instruction of children and youth are unquestionably a most valuable contribution to our Soviet pedagogical science.

It would be wrong to interpret these statements as a special system of education distinct from our Soviet system. M. I. Kalinin did not invent a new system; he merely developed and specified our system of communist education, the main tenets of which were formulated by the founders of Marxism-Leninism.

Therefore, a deep study and creative application in practical work of M. I. Kalinin's statements on communist education is a most important and urgent matter. In these statements, pedagogical scientists and teachers will find guiding instructions so necessary in such a complex and multifaceted task as educating the new human being—an active and conscious builder of communist society.

In this article, we do not touch upon Mikhail Ivanovich's statements on the cultural revolution, training of personnel, or the elimination of illiteracy among the adult population. All these questions require special study and can serve as the subject of separate articles.

In the present article, we shall consider only M. I. Kalinin's statements on the essence of communist education, its goals

and tasks, methods of implementation, and the role of the school and teacher in educating the rising generation.

In his statements on communist education, M. I. Kalinin always relied on Marxist-Leninist theory and the aggregated experience of Soviet schools, Komsomol, and Pioneer organizations, while also drawing on the most progressive ideas of leading Russian educators of the past. He turned particularly often to the pedagogical heritage of the great Russian educator K. D. Ushinsky. All this significantly increases the theoretical and practical value of M. I. Kalinin's advice and instructions on educating children and youth.

M. I. Kalinin can rightfully be called one of the greatest educators of the working masses. He knew how to present the deepest and most complex issues in language accessible to the people. His wise advice and guidance helped and continue to help shape the character and consciousness of millions of young citizens in our country of socialism. His passionate and truthful words about communist education have always found a warm response among pedagogical scientists, teachers in public schools, party and Komsomol workers, parents, and everyone who holds dear the cause of educating and instructing the younger generation.

****

M. I. Kalinin, in a series of his speeches, profoundly revealed the **essence of communist education** and showed its fundamental difference from bourgeois education.

In his report *"On Communist Education,"* delivered on October 2, 1940, at a meeting of party activists in Moscow, he stated that education is often confused with instruction. Pointing out the incorrectness of such confusion and emphasizing that education is a broader concept than instruction and has its own specific features, M. I. Kalinin gave the following definition of

this vital pedagogical concept: *"...Education is a definite, purposeful, and systematic impact on the psychology of the educated person in order to instill in them qualities desired by the educator"* (italics ours.—*N. B.*).

This definition in broad terms reveals the essence of any organized educational process carried out under the direction of a teacher or educator. The purposeful and systematic nature of the educator's impact on the pupil is unquestionably the main feature of any organized education. Therefore it is no coincidence that M. I. Kalinin emphasized precisely these aspects of educational impact on students. The indication that impact on pupils is carried out to instill qualities desired by the educator was also not made by chance. In this part of M. I. Kalinin's formulation defining education, the leading role of the educator and teacher in the process of educational impact on pupils is highlighted. Mikhail Ivanovich pointed out this aspect of education repeatedly in his other speeches as well.

Thus, in the definition of education given by M. I. Kalinin, despite its brevity, the main and most essential features of education are revealed: namely, the *purposefulness* and *systematic nature* of educational impact on the pupil's psyche, and the leading role of the educator in this process.

M. I. Kalinin did not limit himself to the general formulation defining education given above. He also revealed the essence of educational impact on pupils, stating that into the concept of education we put *"...instilling a specific worldview, morality, and rules of human community living; developing specific character traits, will, habits, and tastes; developing specific physical traits, etc."* Here, the main direction and content of educational impact are shown. Here we find the answer to the question: What does it mean to educate? M. I. Kalinin returned to this question repeatedly.

In a speech at an evening dedicated to honoring award-winning rural school teachers on July 8, 1939, he said: "What does it mean to educate? It means influencing the psychological and moral profile of the student, influencing them in a specific direction throughout their ten years of study—that is, molding them into a human being. To educate means to conduct oneself with students in such a way that, when resolving the countless inevitable misunderstandings and conflicts in school life, they develop the conviction that the teacher acted correctly. And this leaves a deep mark on the child's soul. If a teacher gives a biased grade to a weak student, I am certain this biased grade will not pass without leaving a mark on the pupils' psyche. The point is that a teacher finds themselves, as it were, in their own kind of hall of mirrors; hundreds of sharp, impressionable young eyes look at them, remarkably skilled at noticing both positive and negative sides of the teacher. *Educating students is primarily about the teacher's behavior in class, the teacher's attitude toward the students* (italics ours.—*N. B.*).

This response by M. I. Kalinin to the question "What does it mean to educate?" also emphasizes the leading, decisive role of the teacher in educating the rising generation.

In defining the essence of education, M. I. Kalinin proceeded from the fact that a person usually yields to impact and influence. A bad influence on pupils, he said, leads to negative consequences, developing and solidifying bad qualities in children and youth. A good influence and humane impact on pupils, on the other hand, fosters the development and consolidation of positive qualities and noble human traits.

In his speeches, M. I. Kalinin demanded the implementation of communist education for children and youth in our schools. "We also want," he said at that same evening on July 8, 1939, "our people to receive a Soviet, communist education. We want our school to provide a communist education."

By communist education of the rising generation, he understood educating our children and youth in the communist spirit, shaping their communist consciousness, and instilling in them the norms and rules of communist behavior.

Characterizing the fundamental, principled difference between communist education and bourgeois education, Mikhail Ivanovich said: "In bourgeois society, education is thoroughly imbued with hypocrisy and the selfish interests of the ruling classes; it carries a deeply contradictory character reflecting the antagonism of capitalist society.

The ideal of capitalists is to see workers and peasants as their submissive servants, quietly bearing the burden of exploitation.

A working person in bourgeois society, from birth to death, is under the constant influence of thoughts, feelings, and habits advantageous to the ruling class. This is carried out through countless channels, sometimes taking barely tangible forms. The Church, school, art, the press, cinema, theater, various organizations — all of this serves as a tool for instilling the bourgeois worldview, morality, habits, etc., into the consciousness of the masses.

"Under our conditions, it (*education.—N. B.*) must be subordinated to the tasks facing the party and the Soviet state. The primary and main task of communist education is to provide maximum assistance in our class struggle"[90].

This is how M. I. Kalinin characterized the features and main direction of education in bourgeois and socialist societies. He emphasized that education, as a crucial function of social life, cannot be non-class-based. In a class society, it has always

[90] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education*. Selected articles and speeches. 2nd ed., "Molodaya Gvardiya", 1946, pp. 70–72.

been carried out in the interests of the ruling classes and had a distinctly expressed class character.

***

The numerous statements of M. I. Kalinin on the **goals and tasks of communist education** are of particularly great value to Soviet pedagogical science.

In a number of his speeches, M. I. Kalinin showed that the goal of the communist education of the rising generation is the preparation of comprehensively developed builders of a new society, educating our children and youth in the spirit of communist morality. Defining the tasks of Soviet schools, Komsomol, and Pioneer organizations, he always emphasized that the main task of our time is the education of a new person, a citizen of socialist society.

"A new person of socialist society is being created among us," he said on December 28, 1938, at a conference of exemplary teachers from urban and rural schools. *"The very best human qualities must be instilled in this new person."*

What qualities, then, should this new person — a citizen of socialist society — possess? What traits, first and foremost, should the Soviet school cultivate and reinforce in them?

Answering these questions, M. I. Kalinin pointed to the following qualities: *"This is, first of all, love—love for one's people, love for the working masses... Secondly, honesty. Thirdly, courage. Fourthly, comradely solidarity. Fifthly, one must love labor. One must not only love labor, but also treat it honestly, while firmly remembering that if a person lives and eats without working, it means they are consuming someone else's labor."*[91]

---

[91] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education. Selected Articles and Speeches*, 2nd ed., "Molodaya gvardiya," 1946, pp. 39–40.

M. I. Kalinin did not limit himself to the list of qualities mentioned above. He provided a deep substantiation for them and pointed out the need to foster and consolidate a number of other valuable qualities in children and youth—ideological commitment, discipline, organization, high consciousness, and cultural refinement.

M. I. Kalinin paid particularly close attention to educating our youth in Bolshevik ideological commitment. In his speeches, he taught youth to live a broad, meaningful life, living for the interests of the Motherland and the interests of their people. "If you live by such interests," he said, addressing students in the Leninsky District of Moscow, "if all your thoughts are directed toward exalting your people even further, raising the economic and military might of your Motherland even higher, if you give all your strength to the struggle for the complete victory of communism, and if this great idea dominates your consciousness, then I have no doubt that you will truly live a great life." These words, spoken by an ardent Soviet patriot, wise and intimate friend, and advisor to Soviet youth, should be received as a legacy for the rising generation. Following this legacy, our youth must seek the meaning of their life not in a narrow world of personal interests, but in the struggle for lofty ideals, in the struggle to liberate humanity from oppression and exploitation, and in building a new, communist society.

M. I. Kalinin pointed out that in our country, there are rich opportunities for an ideological life, for a life that is purposeful and filled with social interests. Soviet youth have the opportunity to receive a broad and multifaceted general education. In Pioneer and Komsomol organizations, they develop politically, engage in socially useful labor, and actively participate in public life. All this unquestionably contributes to the successful resolution of tasks in the ideologico-political education of Soviet children and youth.

The foundation of Bolshevik ideological commitment and communist consciousness among our youth, M. I. Kalinin taught, must be a communist worldview. Therefore, he attached great importance to developing a proper communist worldview in the rising generation.

"A communist worldview is the exact same thing for fighters of the proletarian revolution as, say, a huge telescope is for an astronomer, or a microscope for a laboratory researcher," he said in a speech at a meeting of Komsomol activists in Dnipropetrovsk in May 1934.

Speaking to senior students of the Bauman district of Moscow on April 7, 1940, Mikhail Ivanovich set a serious task before the youth—to outline their path in life, develop their character and convictions, and form a firm worldview.

He warned against a reckless approach by youth toward deciding their life's path and spoke out against easy "self-determination." To determine oneself seriously, he said, means to outline one's life path, develop one's character and convictions, and find one's calling.

M. I. Kalinin reminded youth of the life path of Comrade Stalin, who became a Marxist in his early youth. "Already at fifteen years old he became a Marxist, and at seventeen he was expelled from the seminary for holding definite political convictions entirely directed against tsarist autocracy and against capitalism."[92]

M. I. Kalinin found particularly warm and heartfelt words when he spoke or wrote about Comrade Stalin, about the happiness of living and working under his leadership.

---

[92] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education. Selected Articles and Speeches*, 2nd ed., "Molodaya gvardiya," 1946, p. 59.

"Comrade Stalin," he pointed out, "has always led and leads those who are not afraid of the storm, who hold firmly to the wheel, boldly cut through the waves, and confidently advance toward communism. And that is why everything active, advanced, young, and eager for the struggle for communism strives toward him."[93]

M. I. Kalinin considered the life of I. V. Stalin, our great leader, an example of a principled and purposeful life. He called upon Soviet youth to learn to live and work like Comrade Stalin.

M. I. Kalinin taught how to raise our youth to be convinced communists. He proceeded from the idea that a true communist is the ideal human being, as the highest human qualities are concentrated in them—love for the Motherland, devotion to one's people, and high ideological principles. "In a true communist," said M. I. Kalinin, "personal experiences usually hold a subordinate character. Public interests and the interests of one's people are always paramount."

M. I. Kalinin viewed developing the political consciousness of our youth as a vital task for schools, Komsomol, and Pioneer organizations. "With us, people's political consciousness plays a very large role," he said, "and we strive to ensure that every person among us is politically conscious."

Mikhail Ivanovich recommended starting the development of political consciousness in our children and youth as early as possible. In one of his last speeches on July 11, 1945, during the presentation of USSR orders to the newspapers *Komsomolskaya Pravda* and *Pionerskaya Pravda*, he indicated that the work of these newspapers should primarily be aimed at developing political consciousness in the younger generation.

---

[93] M. I. Kalinin, *On the Sixtieth Anniversary of Comrade Stalin's Birth*, Gospolitizdat, 1939, p. 68.

He demanded that Soviet people *"...from the first steps of life, already in adolescence, unobtrusively become accustomed to reading newspapers and engaging in public life, so that their consciousness grows smoothly rather than in spurts as was previously the case, when a person up to age 40 could be unconscious and then at 40, under the influence of party workers or by chance, suddenly see the light; rather, our Pioneers' consciousness should grow gradually and steadily..."*[94]

Only on the basis of developing political consciousness in our youth can they be educated in the communist spirit and instilled with communist principles.

In a speech at an evening honoring award-winning rural school teachers on July 8, 1939, M. I. Kalinin explained in detail what communist principles are. He said:

"Communist principles, taken simply, are the principles of a highly educated, honest, and advanced person; they are love for the socialist Motherland, friendship, comradeship, humaneness, honesty, love for socialist labor, and a whole range of other high qualities understandable to everyone. Educating and nurturing these traits, these high qualities, is the most important component of communist education." In these words, the fundamental tasks of educating the rising generation in communism are essentially formulated.

We also find valuable instructions on the main tasks of communist education in Mikhail Ivanovich's report *"On Communist Education,"* delivered at a meeting of party activists in Moscow on October 2, 1940. True, this report deals with educating the adult population. However, many provisions formulated in that report indisputably apply directly to school

---

[94] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education. Selected Articles and Speeches*, 2nd ed., "Molodaya gvardiya," 1946, p. 251.

education as well. In this report, M. I. Kalinin vividly and convincingly substantiated such vital tasks of communist education as fostering a new, socialist attitude toward labor and public property among Soviet people, developing and solidifying Soviet patriotism, and instilling collectivism and high culture. All these tasks must unquestionably be resolved primarily in our schools, in Pioneer and Komsomol organizations, through the process of communist education of the rising generation.

***

In his articles and speeches on educational issues, M. I. Kalinin did not limit himself to defining the goals and tasks of communist education. He also deeply revealed its **content**. In Mikhail Ivanovich's numerous statements, it is vividly demonstrated that only socialist society creates favorable conditions for the comprehensive development of the individual, for providing mental and polytechnic education, as well as moral, physical, and aesthetic education for children and youth.

He paid particularly great attention to the *moral education* of the younger generation as a crucial component of communist education. His statements on moral education will undoubtedly help workers on the pedagogical front approach the resolution of educating our children and youth in the spirit of communist morality more correctly.

In M. I. Kalinin's works, the essence of morality is revealed first and foremost, and its origins are shown. Great attention is paid to the origins and development of Soviet communist morality.

In the article *"On the Moral Profile of Our People,"* which first appeared in print in January 1945, M. I. Kalinin vividly and convincingly showed that morality has existed since the

inception of human society and is ultimately determined by its economic development. Demonstrating how morality took shape in specific norms of human behavior at various stages of human societal development, he deeply and thoroughly uncovered the roots of communist morality. With exceptional persuasiveness, Mikhail Ivanovich proved that the foundation of our Soviet morality is, above all, the socialist economy of the Soviet state and the guiding activity of the Communist Party and Soviet state aimed at steadily improving the material well-being of the people and raising their political consciousness.

Even under the harsh conditions of tsarist autocracy, the Russian people produced outstanding figures from their midst who, in contrast to the egoistic, narrowly class-bound morality of the bourgeois-landowner classes, proclaimed the foundations of a new revolutionary morality—hatred for exploiters, love for the Motherland, and devotion to their people. M. I. Kalinin noted the first sprouts of revolutionary morality as far back as the works of Radishchev and Lomonosov. "The strongest impetus to the development and deepening of revolutionary morality, which embraced broader masses of society at that time," he pointed out, "was given by Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, and Nekrasov." Their works made people think about life and about what useful things could be done for society. Their personal lives, dedicated to the development of democracy in Russia, were surrounded by an aura of high morality.

With the growth of the working class in Russia, favorable conditions were created for the spread of the new communist morality. A huge role in this was played by the Bolshevik Party. "An amazingly ennobling element was brought into the working-class environment by the propaganda of our party," M. I. Kalinin wrote in the aforementioned article.

"...Propagandists and organizers welded the working environment into a compact, organized force; they instilled a revolutionary proletarian morality that penetrated the working masses far deeper than it appeared from the outside. Revolutionary morality embraced not only the sphere of social relations, but also the everyday life of the working class."

As a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the new, revolutionary morality in our country was raised to a higher level. In M. I. Kalinin's words, it became the highest morality in human society.

The radical breakdown of old social relations in our country led to a change in the moral profile of Soviet people. The elimination of exploiting classes and the eradication of exploitation of man by man contributed to making the moral principles and ethical norms of our people's behavior the most advanced and progressive. The Soviet socialist system served as the basis for developing a new communist morality.

In the article *"On the Moral Profile of Our People"* and in a number of his other articles and speeches, M. I. Kalinin showed what elements constitute communist morality. He named moral qualities such as high ideological commitment and communist consciousness, love for the Motherland and hatred for the enemies of our people, socialist humanism, love for labor, care for socialist property, and a sense of collectivism, friendship and comradeship, truthfulness and honesty, activity, organization, and many others. All these qualities taken together characterize the advanced Soviet person—the carrier of the new communist morality.

The implementation of communist morality occurs primarily through two meeting pathways. On one hand, qualities of communist morality are instilled through moral education carried out in preschool institutions, schools, Pioneer, and

Komsomol organizations, and through agitation and propaganda work conducted by the Bolshevik Party and Soviet state. On the other hand, the Soviet system and Soviet reality themselves contribute to developing and consolidating communist morality in Soviet people. In one of his speeches, M. I. Kalinin said: "It is much easier to educate people where life itself assists in that education."[95] Soviet youth find themselves in exceptionally favorable conditions, and therefore the foundations of a new communist morality are laid in them from an early age.

M. I. Kalinin paid particularly close attention to educating Soviet people, and above all Soviet youth, in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and Soviet national pride. Whatever topic he wrote or spoke on, the idea of fostering and strengthening Soviet patriotism remained unalterably at the center of his attention. He always emphasized with special force that love for the Motherland inspired Soviet people to unprecedented military and labor heroic deeds. This invincible and all-conquering love, nurtured in our people by the party of Lenin and Stalin, the Komsomol, the school, and our entire Soviet reality, was one of the main sources of victory for the Soviet Union in a war unprecedented in its scale. The noble sense of Soviet patriotism inspires Soviet people to quickly heal the severe wounds of war, rebuild, and further develop our national economy.

M. I. Kalinin always emphasized the effective, active nature of Soviet patriotism. As early as 1940, in his report *"On Communist Education,"* he stated: "...We must educate all working people of the USSR in the spirit of ardent patriotism, in the spirit of boundless love for their country. I am talking not about abstract or platonic love, but about active, passionate,

---

[95] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education. Selected Articles and Speeches*, 2nd ed., "Molodaya gvardiya," 1946, p. 211.

irrepressible love—a love that knows no mercy toward enemies and will stop at no sacrifice for the sake of the Motherland."[96] If a person is a true patriot, Mikhail Ivanovich said, they cannot remain outside work or outside struggle. They cannot remain a mere spectator of unfolding events; they are obligated to constantly participate in work, struggle, and public life.

M. I. Kalinin recommended starting the education of our children and youth in Soviet patriotism through an in-depth study of their Motherland, acquainting Soviet schoolchildren with the heroic past and wonderful present of our country. At the same time, he pointed to the necessity of involving Soviet schoolchildren and Pioneers in active public work, blending theoretical study with practical activity.

In his speeches on communist education, M. I. Kalinin also paid great attention to the *mental education* of the rising generation. He proceeded from Lenin's directive that "one can become a communist only when one enriches one's memory with a knowledge of all the riches that humanity has produced."[97]

Back in 1926, in a speech at the graduation of students from the Y. M. Sverdlov Communist University, Mikhail Ivanovich talked about how our life and work become more complex with every passing year, requiring increasingly qualified personnel in our country. Therefore, in our day, "...it is extremely difficult to approach social phenomena with a primitive mindset." Socialist construction needs highly educated people who possess the heights of modern science.

Our youth, M. I. Kalinin emphasized, must "master the entire heritage of human culture, master all the heights of science and

---

[96] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education*, 2nd ed., "Molodaya gvardiya," 1946, p. 85.

[97] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 3rd ed., Vol. XXX, p. 407.

technology, rise to the top of knowledge, and become the most educated people in the world."

Raising the general culture of our youth through the Soviet general education school, M. I. Kalinin taught, would contribute to growth in labor productivity in both city and countryside.

In one of his last articles, *"On the Collective Farm System and Collective Farm Women,"* M. I. Kalinin wrote: "The day is not far off when not only in cities, but also in villages, all youth will have completed secondary education. Will this hinder agriculture, will it hinder people's capacity for labor, will ten-year school graduates want to work on collective farms? No, it will not hinder them. But it is not enough to simply say 'no.' The fact that in the future flax will be processed by people who have finished ten-year school, and plowing will be done by people with secondary education—this in itself predetermines that these tasks themselves must be, so to speak, cultivated."[98]

Mikhail Ivanovich assigned the decisive role in equipping our youth with systematized knowledge to the general education school. In his speeches, he constantly demanded that youth study seriously and deeply. People with shallow, superficial knowledge cannot play a significant role in the life of Soviet society, he said. A solid foundation of general education must be laid in primary and secondary school.

In a letter addressed to Pioneers of the Ural village of Ust-Tui, M. I. Kalinin wrote: "The struggle for knowledge and science is the duty and primary obligation of every Komsomol member and Pioneer of the Soviet Union. Socialism is a society of

---

[98] M. I. Kalinin, *On the Collective Farm System and Collective Farm Women*, Gospolitizdat, 1947, pp. 14–15. ² Quoted from the journal *"Vozhatyy"*, 1946, No. 8–9, p. 2.

science and culture. And to be a worthy member of socialist society, one must study much and well, and know a great deal."

Mikhail Ivanovich expressed this thought well in his greeting to the Leningrad Pioneer newspaper *Leninskie Iskry*. He wrote: "To study well and excellently - that is the main patriotic task for Soviet kids. That is precisely where communism begins for you."[99]

Only our Soviet school can raise a harmoniously developed individual and prepare active, conscious builders of communist society. Our school crafts the people of the future, a worthy replacement for the older generation, M. I. Kalinin said. Only school can provide systematized knowledge and accustom students to planned work. Anyone who wants to become a skilled worker must go through Soviet school, master the heritage of human culture, acquire deep knowledge, skills, and habits, and develop communist views and convictions. From school, our youth enter life, and their future and the future of our Motherland largely depend on how they studied and were raised in school.

With special force, M. I. Kalinin emphasized the accessibility of Soviet schools for children and youth. "Our school," he wrote in his article on the twentieth anniversary of the Komsomol, "does not frighten a child, and an eight-year-old Octobrist enters school with self-dignity, like a master stepping into their domain. The unbroken link between primary school and secondary school, and between secondary school and higher education, facilitates the transition to higher education for youth thirsty for learning."[100]

While emphasizing the decisive role of the school in teaching and educating the rising generation, M. I. Kalinin

---

[99] Quoted from the journal *"Nachalnaya Shkola"*, 1946, No. 10–11, p. 5.

[100] M. I. Kalinin, *On Youth*, "Molodaya gvardiya," 1940, p. 278.

simultaneously attached great importance to *self-education*. He demanded that youth constantly work to expand their knowledge. No matter how many tasks our youth have, Mikhail Ivanovich said, these should not hinder study. On the contrary, these tasks should prompt and drive them to learn. In a speech at a meeting of Dnipropetrovsk Komsomol activists, M. I. Kalinin said: "Komsomol members, especially activists, sometimes complain that they have no time to read and engage in self-study. I am a busy person too, yet I set aside time daily for reading.

Daily I read through at least eighty pages not of paperwork, but of Marxist books, and besides that I read new fiction works."[101] Valuable thoughts on the merits and shortcomings of self-education were expressed by Mikhail Ivanovich in his article *"The Path to Self-Education for the Worker and Peasant,"* published back in 1924 in the journal *Help for Self-Education*.

In revealing the content of communist education, M. I. Kalinin paid special attention to *physical education* of the rising generation. He demanded improved physical training for schoolchildren and mass development of physical culture and sports. He viewed physical education as a crucial tool for the comprehensive development of the individual. "We want," Mikhail Ivanovich said, "to comprehensively develop a person so they can run, swim, and walk quickly and gracefully, with all organs functioning properly—in a word, so they are a normal, healthy person ready for labor and defense, with mental qualities developing properly alongside physical ones."[102]

---

[101] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education*, 2nd ed., "Molodaya gvardiya," 1946, p. 21.

[102] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

Thus M. I. Kalinin defined the main tasks of physical education.

It is known that physical culture and sports discipline people, strengthen health, and stimulate self-reliance and initiative; they help foster strong, agile, brave youth who look forward with confidence. Physical endurance acquires particularly great value during times of severe trials, in war years. In his speeches during the Great Patriotic War, Mikhail Ivanovich repeatedly emphasized this thought and demanded widespread promotion of physical culture and sports among youth.

M. I. Kalinin also devoted much attention to *labor education*. He framed the task of labor education for children and youth particularly sharply during the Great Patriotic War. In a talk with state labor reserve workers on October 23, 1942, he said: "Now the educational system must be different from what it was, say, three years ago. Previously, we educated, if one may put it this way, intellectuals rather than people of physical labor.

I personally consider such education wrong, since in our state, the main mass of the population engages in physical labor. And we face the question: How can we make our young person agile in physical labor while simultaneously being intellectually developed? Instilling respect for labor in general, and physical labor in particular, is, in M. I. Kalinin's view, one of the most important tasks of communist education."

M. I. Kalinin also attached great importance to *artistic* or *aesthetic education* of the rising generation. In his speeches, he recommended that youth read more fiction literature. Speaking on organizing leisure time for trade school students, he pointed to the need to provide students with musical instruments, host evening parties, and organize dances in schools. Dances, he said, "...teach people fluidity of movement. A person who

knows how to dance will enter a room properly and turn gracefully."

****

In M. I. Kalinin's articles and speeches on communist education, great attention is paid to **methods of educational impact**—or in other words, methods of communist education.

In his report *"On Communist Education,"* Mikhail Ivanovich stated that our communist education fundamentally differs from bourgeois education not only in its goals and tasks, but also in its methods. This difference lies primarily in the fact that education in our country is inextricably linked with developing pupils' political consciousness and raising the general cultural and intellectual level of the masses. It is permeated with ideas of socialist humanism, where high standards for pupils are combined with respect for their personality. Communist education in our country is based on unity of interests between the individual and society (which is possible only in our country), unity of worldview and behavior, and unity of word and deed among Soviet people. Such are the main features of communist education that determined the radical difference in educational methods applied in Soviet schools.

It is known that communist education is realized through impact not only on pupils' minds, but also on their feelings, will, actions, and behavior. Therefore, it requires applying a variety of methods, paths, and means of educational impact.

Pedagogical mastery in experienced teachers and educators is expressed mainly in the skillful selection and application of various educational methods. In educational work, far more than in instruction, routine is inadmissible, as is applying the exact same methods and techniques without considering the individual characteristics of pupils.

In educational work, M. I. Kalinin said, *"...one cannot rely entirely on fixed organizational forms or invent new forms for every occasion, thinking education will then proceed on its own. One cannot solve all educational problems with a single ready-made form, even a good one."*[103] Therefore, Mikhail Ivanovich decisively opposed routine in education. He recommended studying, generalizing, and applying positive experiences from educational work. However, this experience should not be transferred without considering situational specifics or pupils' characteristics. "Of course, one must use the experience of others," M. I. Kalinin said, "but one cannot transplant ready-made experience without accounting for situational specifics, people, and tasks. Any experience must be hard-won, won in battle, so that it becomes part of one's flesh and blood."[2] Educational work demands a creative approach from the teacher and educator; it does not tolerate routine or rigid formulas.

Effective application of varied methods in communist education is unthinkable without studying the characteristics of pupils. In his speeches, M. I. Kalinin demanded that educators know their pupils' traits and psychology well. At the same time, he pointed out a number of general traits characteristic of youth.

As far back as 1926, in a speech at the 7th Congress of the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League (VLKSM), Mikhail Ivanovich stated that youth is characterized by exceptional receptivity, and that the feature of this age "...lies in a huge inner drive toward ideal experiences." In that same speech, Mikhail Ivanovich emphasized that our youth "en masse are unusually sincere and direct." He called upon educators to cherish these youthful qualities and develop them.

---

[103] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education. Selected Articles and Speeches*, 2nd ed., "Molodaya gvardiya," 1946, p. 208. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 211.

Mikhail Ivanovich recommended using methods such as persuasion, habituation, practice, encouragement, and punishment in communist education. He attached great importance to students' socially useful labor. He also recommended raising youth on examples drawn from our Motherland's heroic past and the contemporary life and struggles of the Soviet people. Skillful application of these educational impact methods must undoubtedly ensure the successful resolution of tasks in educating the younger generation in communism.

***

M. I. Kalinin assigned the leading and decisive role in the communist education of the rising generation to the **teacher**. He pointed out repeatedly that shaping the qualities in children and youth necessary for future builders of communism depends primarily on the teacher.

Teachers, M. I. Kalinin said, perform honorable and responsible functions. "The state and people entrust children to teachers—that is, people at an age when it is easiest to influence them; they entrust them with raising, developing, and shaping the younger generation, i.e., their hope and future. This is an immense trust that places great responsibility on teachers."[104]

In his speeches to teachers, M. I. Kalinin paid special attention to requirements for the Soviet teacher as an educator of the younger generation.

As far back as 1919, in a speech at the 1st Teachers' Congress in Morshansk, Tambov Governorate, he stated that as our country advanced toward communism, the role of the teaching

[104] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education. Selected Articles and Speeches*, 2nd ed., "Molodaya gvardiya," 1946, p. 50.

profession would increase, and requirements for teachers would rise accordingly.

In his report at the 7th Congress of Educational Workers in March 1929, he similarly pointed out that the Soviet teacher "...must possess immense moral weight and moral significance in the giant collective being built."[105]

A teacher's influence on students, M. I. Kalinin argued, is based not only on knowledge, but also on moral authority. Therefore, Mikhail Ivanovich paid special attention to raising the teacher's authority and moral profile. In a speech at a conference of exemplary teachers on December 28, 1938, he said that "...a teacher's worldview, behavior, life, and approach to every phenomenon influence all students in one way or another... One can boldly say that if a teacher possesses high authority, traces of that teacher's influence remain in some people for their entire lives. That is why it is important for a teacher to monitor themselves, feeling that their behavior and actions are under the strongest scrutiny—a scrutiny faced by no other person in the world. Dozens of children's eyes look at them, and nothing is more attentive, sharper, or more receptive to various nuances of human mental life than a child's eye."

In the article *"Teachers and the War,"* published in the newspaper *Komsomolskaya Pravda* on July 14, 1943, M. I. Kalinin also pointed to the immense value of a teacher's authority and personal example. Citing statements by N. A. Dobrolyubov on teacher authority, he emphasized with particular force that a teacher must represent a supreme model of human perfection to students and enjoy unquestioned authority among them.

---

[105] M. I. Kalinin, *On Youth*, 2nd ed., "Molodaya gvardiya," 1940, p. 96.

What, then, are the prerequisites for gaining authority as a teacher? What requirements must a teacher meet to honorably fulfill the tasks entrusted to them?

M. I. Kalinin, first and foremost, required teachers to possess high ideological commitment and Bolshevik party loyalty (*partiinost'*). He always called on teachers to study Marxist-Leninist theory deeply—not in a superficial, schoolboy manner, but based on combining theoretical knowledge with practical activity. "Marxist-Leninist theory is not a creed, not a collection of dogmas, but a guide to action...," he said. "We study Marxism-Leninism as a method, as an instrument with the help of which we correctly determine our political, social, and personal behavior. We believe this to be man's most powerful weapon in his practical life."[106]

A Soviet teacher must strive not for a superficial study of Marxism, but for the implementation of communist principles in practice, in the process of educational work. A deep mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory and its skillful application will undoubtedly help teachers raise the ideological and theoretical level of their teaching and ensure Bolshevik party commitment in educational work. It has long been known that the quality of educational work and its ideological level depend primarily on the level of the teacher's political consciousness, on their ideological grounding, and on their understanding of the policy of the Soviet state and their duty to the people. Therefore, ideological stamina, political maturity, and communist consciousness, according to M. I. Kalinin, must become integral qualities of Soviet teachers.

M. I. Kalinin demanded from teachers a deep knowledge of their subject, love for their subject, and love for pedagogical

---

[106] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education. Selected Articles and Speeches*. 2nd ed., "Molodaya Gvardiya", 1946, pp. 32–33.

activity. "In order to be able to consciously exert a certain influence," he said, "a teacher must himself be a very cultured and... highly educated person."[107] However, it is not enough for a teacher to know their subject; they must know how to present it to students with maximum educational effect.

Consequently, a deep knowledge of such pedagogical sciences such as psychology, pedagogy, and methods of teaching their subject is required of the teacher.

Speaking of the moral character of the Soviet teacher, M. I. Kalinin attached great importance to such qualities as honesty and incorruptibility of character.

Addressing order-bearing teachers of rural schools, he said: "...Teachers must be people who, on the one hand, are highly educated, and on the other hand, crystal-honest. For honesty—I would say, incorruptibility of character, in the highest sense of the word—not only impresses children, it infects them, it leaves a deep imprint on their entire subsequent life."[108] A teacher must borrow their very best traits and qualities from their people, from its leading representatives. "...If a Soviet teacher wants to be a genuine, leading teacher today and tomorrow, he must always walk with the most advanced part of the people."[109]

In this connection, M. I. Kalinin repeatedly pointed out the great importance of teachers' daily participation in public life. Every teacher must learn to approach people closely, to understand reality, to learn to navigate the local situation well, and to influence it through the school, through the students. The Soviet teacher, said Mikhail Ivanovich, must bring his

---

[107] *Ibid.*, pp. 49–50.

[108] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education. Selected Articles and Speeches*. 2nd ed., "Molodaya Gvardiya", 1946, p. 50.

[109] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

knowledge to the popular masses, daily participate in public life, and thereby help the Bolshevik Party in the communist education of our people. A teacher serves his people not only by teaching and educating children, the future builders of communism, but also by conducting broad socio-political and cultural-mass work among the adult population. A teacher can do particularly much in the field of culture, in introducing our socialist culture to the masses. In the struggle for culture, noted M. I. Kalinin, one can easily slip into philistinism (*obyshatelshchina*). To prevent this from happening, a teacher must constantly see the divide between philistinism and genuine culture.

Mikhail Ivanovich recommended constantly linking the struggle for culture with socialist construction.

"Cultural achievements," he said, "must be viewed not as an end in themselves, but as a means, as a new step for our country's advancement along the path to communism."

To raise the culture of teachers, he recommended turning to the history of culture, to all cultural heritage of humanity, pointing out to teachers the necessity of knowing fiction literature. Being the richest panorama of various types of people placed in diverse situations, fiction literature, M. I. Kalinin said, "...enriches a person most of all, gives the opportunity... to grow as a person, to understand people better."[110] Knowledge of fiction, according to M. I. Kalinin, is a professional obligation of a teacher.

Mikhail Ivanovich attached particularly great importance to Russian classical literature. In a speech to art workers in 1939, he said: "Russian fiction literature has done much for the development of universal human thought and occupies an

---

[110] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education. Selected Articles and Speeches*. 2nd ed., "Molodaya Gvardiya", 1946, p. 47.

honorable place in it. Pushkin, Tolstoy, Gorky—these are immense world artists, and at the same time, they are truly Russian writers who reflected their era and the traits of the Russian people."

M. I. Kalinin demanded that teachers tirelessly work on themselves, expand their knowledge, and perfect their pedagogical mastery. He particularly often pointed out the need to master the art of educational work. In order for a Soviet teacher to honorably fulfill the honorable tasks entrusted to him by the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet State, he must not only teach children well and give them knowledge, but also educate them. He must be a master of educational work.

M. I. Kalinin himself was a remarkable master of educational work. His speeches on issues of communist education testify to a deep understanding of pedagogical work. His talks with senior students of the Bauman and Leninsky districts of our capital, his speeches before students of trade, railway, and factory training schools (*FZO*) will long remain bright, unsurpassed models of pedagogical conversation. In them, the clarity of thought, power of conviction, sincerity, directness, and pedagogical tact inherent to Mikhail Ivanovich manifested with exceptional force.

***

Speaking of communist education, M. I. Kalinin never limited it to the framework of the school. In his report "On Communist Education," he said that alongside school education, "...there is also the school of life, in which an interrupted process of mass education takes place, where the educator is life itself, the state, the party, and those being educated are millions of adult people with varied life experience and political experience."[111] Not

[111] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education. Selected Articles and Speeches*. 2nd ed., "Molodaya Gvardiya", 1946, p. 70.

only adults, but also growing generations go through this "school of life." They are subjected to educational influence not only from the school and teachers, but are also brought up in the family, in pioneer and Komsomol organizations, and in out-of-school institutions. Therefore, along with school education, M. I. Kalinin attached great importance to the education of the younger generation in the family, where our children undergo their first school of morality and acquire initial habits of behavior. Parents, as is known, exert a serious influence on the formation of character and worldview of their children. The educational role of the family is particularly great in our country, where relations between children and parents have radically changed. "In the capitalist world," M. I. Kalinin wrote in the article "The Glorious Path of the Komsomol," "these relations are callous, selfish, crude, and cruel, whereas here they have been humanized in the best sense of the word."[112] In our country, the school and the family face common tasks: to raise a generation capable of conclusively establishing communism.

M. I. Kalinin assigned a major role in the matter of communist education to Pioneer and Komsomol organizations. In these organizations, our children, adolescents and youth join public life, are educated in an ideological-political sense, and acquire habits and skills of communist behavior.

Mikhail Ivanovich devoted a particularly large number of vivid statements to clarifying the educational role of the Komsomol.

In a speech at a conference of secretaries of Komsomol organizations of collective farms in the Moscow region on July 12, 1945, he said that "...the Komsomol shapes a person. The Komsomol, if one may put it this way, lays the foundation for a person's activity for his whole life."

---

[112] M. I. Kalinin, *On Youth*. 2nd ed., "Molodaya Gvardiya", 1940, p. 278.

Komsomol organizations are the closest assistants of teachers in carrying out educational work in school. They strive to maintain order and discipline among students, educate them politically, and organize the leisure time of studying youth outside school hours.

In a series of his speeches, M. I. Kalinin showed that all educational work in our country, including work on the communist education of youth, is directed by our Bolshevik Party. The Party of Bolsheviks—through the school, through pioneer and Komsomol organizations, through out-of-school educational institutions—instills high moral qualities in our youth, educates them in the spirit of friendship among peoples, love for their motherland, and devotion to the cause of communism.

***

This article by no means exhausts all the richness of M. I. Kalinin's wonderful ideas and profound thoughts on communist education. Many statements by M. I. Kalinin require special study and coverage in dedicated articles. One must hope that such articles will appear in our pedagogical press in the near future. Interest in the pedagogical heritage left by the prominent figure of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet State, M. I. Kalinin, is constantly growing. This is explained primarily by the fact that issues of communist education are currently coming to the forefront.

M. I. Kalinin never considered issues of communist education in isolation from the pressing tasks of socialist construction. He was an enemy of an abstract approach to issues of education. Speaking of the need to cultivate high moral qualities inherent to the new person in our children and youth, he proceeded above all from the tasks and needs of building a new communist society. This circumstance significantly raises the

theoretical and practical value of M. I. Kalinin's statements on communist education and heightens their relevance.

In our days, when issues of the ideological-political education of the younger generation acquire exceptional sharpness, one should turn again and again to the pedagogical heritage of M. I. Kalinin.

One must deeply study his advice and instructions on communist education and translate them into life. Illuminated by the light of Marxist-Leninist theory and rich with the vastest life experience, M. I. Kalinin's articles and speeches on communist education will help raise our youth to be cheerful and joy-filled, devoted to the socialist Homeland, believing in the victory of our cause, and capable of overcoming any difficulties.

"Sovetskaya Pedagogika", 1947, No. 11.

Prof. N. A. KONSTANTINOV

Full Member of the APN RSFSR

N. K. KRUPSKAYA ON EDUCATION AND INSTRUCTION

An outstanding Soviet figure, friend of the great Lenin—Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya—dedicated a significant part of her life to developing key issues in pedagogy. Her interest in the teaching profession arose back in early childhood.

At age 11, during the summer, she lived in Pskov Governorate. There, little Nadya met an attractive young 18-year-old girl. This was a rural teacher, Alexandra Timofeevna Yavorskaya, or "Timofeika," as Nadya, who quickly became friends with her, called her. "Timofeika" introduced Nadya to the village school where she worked. At that time, the senior section of 5 students ("Ilyusha, Senya, Mitya, Vasya, and Pavel") was studying at the school and due to take exams soon. Nadya began stopping by the school frequently, solving arithmetic problems with the children and reading aloud together. This captivated her immensely.

One day, the teacher Yavorskaya and four older children, taking Nadya along, traveled to the neighboring estate of the wealthy landowner Nazimova. There, the children had to take an exam in the presence of a local priest and an inspector of public primary schools. The exam went quite smoothly, but little Nadya was perhaps more anxious than the examinees and "Timofeika" herself.

The young teacher made an exceptionally strong impression on the little girl. She realized that Alexandra Timofeevna was a friend of the peasants, a friend of the people, and that this teacher brought light and knowledge to the people. Alexandra

Timofeevna[113], for her part, strove to develop the girl and show her the harsh peasant life without embellishment.

"Yes, of course, I thought," wrote Nadezhda Konstantinovna, "'Timofeika' is right when she says landowners aren't needed. I had heard the same thing even earlier from my father."[114]

Later, in winter, sitting in class, Nadya dreamed of walking the thorny path of "Timofeika," drew little houses with a sign saying "School," and thought about the time when she would work as a rural schoolteacher.

"Since then," wrote Nadezhda Konstantinovna, "I have retained an interest in the rural school and rural teaching for my whole life."[115]

The enhancement and reinforcement of the young girl Nadya's interest in the teaching profession were further aided by outstanding educators at the Obolenskaya Gymnasium, where she studied. Such teachers as arithmetic teacher Litvinova, algebra teacher Bilibin—"in love with his subject"—the brilliant geography teacher A. O. Pulikovsky (author of several good textbooks), and literature teacher Smirnov who captivated the gymnasium girls, not only fostered increased interest in studies among students, but also instilled a love for the pedagogical profession. Particularly great in this regard was the role of Alexander Yakovlevich Gerd, director of the gymnasium, a revolutionarily inclined teacher of natural science and a Darwinist.

One student (Trachevskaya) recounted Gerd's lessons: "The class, staring intent upon Alexander Yakovlevich, listening to his clear, always illustrative teaching, and hardly looking into

---

[113] Later A. T. Yavorskaya was arrested and placed in solitary confinement in Pskov Prison. Nadezhda Konstantinovna never met her again.

[114] N. K. Krupskaya, *My Life*, p. 14.

[115] *Ibid.*, p. 16

the book, answered lessons excellently—lessons that sank deeply and forever into the minds and hearts of the students..." From these examples of pedagogical mastery and enthusiasm, Nadya learned; she involuntarily caught this noble pedagogical passion.

No less a role was played by the fact that Nadya knew about the unity of views between Gerd and her father on socio-political issues. In Gerd himself, little Nadya saw a teacher serving the people. With Gerd's knowledge and likely even on his initiative, senior students discussed methodological and pedagogical issues linked to public life. Thus, when geometry teacher Velichko conducted lessons unsuccessfully, the students arranged a special discussion on methods of teaching mathematics, comparing Litvinova's method with Velichko's method. The students repeatedly discussed school rules and made concrete decisions.

From age 14, as a gymnasium student, Nadya began giving private lessons as a tutor in wealthy families, revealing an extraordinary pedagogical talent.

"My lessons in arithmetic and algebra went very successfully," Nadezhda Konstantinovna noted later.[116]

Granted, the students' parents looked down on the tutor, often treated her with contempt, and interfered in lessons. But despite this unpleasant experience, an ardent desire to be a teacher never left Nadezhda Konstantinovna, and upon graduating from the gymnasium, she was convinced that pedagogical work was her calling and that through this work she would be useful to the people.

---

[116] N. K. Krupskaya, *The Main Thing in Teaching Mathematics*, journal "Shkola vzroslykh" [Adult School], 1937, No. 7.

Having graduated from the gymnasium with distinction, Nadezhda Konstantinovna could not find a position as a teacher anywhere, so she first had to enter as a tutor at a gymnasium boarding house, where there were twenty students of various classes.

In addition, she began teaching at a vocational school where girls were taught sewing.

In 1889, in search of "truth," Nadezhda Konstantinovna entered the mathematics department of the Bestuzhev Higher Women's Courses. But she did not find answers there to the questions that troubled her. As before, Nadezhda Konstantinovna anxiously asked herself: "Where is the way out? Can studying mathematics really help the people?"

Then, in one of the student circles, Nadezhda Konstantinovna obtained revolutionary literature that finally answered the question that tormented her so much. There, for the first time, she heard the word "International" and the names of great men —Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. There she began working seriously on the brilliant works of Marx and Engels.

Nadezhda Konstantinovna realized that she could not simultaneously study at the courses, earn a living, and study Marxism. She dropped her studies at the courses, rented a log cabin (*izba*) with her mother (by the summer of 1890), and began working on the text of *Capital*. "The first two chapters were very difficult," she recalled, "but starting from the third chapter, things went smoothly. It was as if I was drinking living water. Not in a tapestry of solitary efforts, not in Tolstoyan self-improvement must one seek the way out. The mighty workers' movement—that is the way out. Dusk falls, I sit with the book on the steps of the porch, reading: 'The knell

of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.' My heart beats so hard it can be heard."[117]

Nadezhda Konstantinovna understood that "...the revolutionary movement can change the life of the working class, and to be useful and needed—one must give all one's strength to the working-class cause."[118]

Rereading *Capital* and studying *Anti-Dühring*, Nadezhda Konstantinovna found the answer to yet another question that troubled her—"what should youth be taught in schools?"[119]

Proceeding from a Marxist worldview, N. K. Krupskaya sought to connect as closely as possible with working circles, "to join the labor movement as soon as possible."

From the autumn of 1891, she became a teacher at an evening-Sunday school on the Shlisselburg tract, where she conducted active political and pedagogical work right up to her arrest in 1896. In this school, Nadezhda Konstantinovna established a live connection with workers; there she received her first revolutionary tempering, and there she accumulated her first, highly significant pedagogical experience.

Classes at the school, which gave so much to both teachers and students, captivated Nadezhda Konstantinovna. "I was in love with the school," she wrote in her memoirs, "and you could have withheld bread from me, so long as I could talk about the school, about the students, about Semyannikov, Thornton, Maxwell, and other factories of the Nevsky tract."[120]

---

[117] Coll. *Education of Youth in the Leninist Spirit*. Moscow, 1925, p. 41.

[118] From a speech by N. K. Krupskaya at the provincial conference of agitators of the VKP(b) and cultural departments of trade unions of Bryansk Governorate. October 1927.

[119] N. K. Krupskaya, *The Main Thing in Teaching Mathematics*, journal "Shkola vzroslykh", 1937, No. 7.

[120] N. K. Krupskaya, *My Life*, p. 30.

As is known, N. K. Krupskaya soon met V. I. Lenin in Petersburg. Many of Nadezhda Konstantinovna's students joined Vladimir Ilyich's circle; a number of them wrote their names into the history of the Russian revolutionary movement (for example, Babushkin).

After the arrest and exile of V. I. Lenin, and following her own arrest, Nadezhda Konstantinovna struggled to secure permission to serve her exile in the village of Shushenskoye, where Vladimir Ilyich had already been exiled.

"Since then," wrote Nadezhda Konstantinovna in her autobiography, "my life followed his life; I helped him in his work, however and with whatever I could."

During her exile years, N. K. Krupskaya was Lenin's closest assistant in his daily work. "On the whole, exile passed fairly well," recalled Nadezhda Konstantinovna. "Those were years of serious study."[121]

And there, under exile conditions, pedagogical questions interested her; there in 1899 she wrote her first book: *The Working Woman* (printed in 1901 at the "Iskra" printing house). In this book, Nadezhda Konstantinovna with exceptional vividness exposed the appalling living conditions of working women in Russia; in Chapter III of her work, titled "Woman and Education," she showed that under capitalist conditions, a woman cannot provide children with the necessary upbringing.

Describing the plight of a peasant mother, N. K. Krupskaya pointed out the causes that lead to half of all children in villages dying before age five: "and as for those peasant children who survived, it was difficult to get into school, and

[121] N. K. Krupskaya, *Memoirs of Lenin*. Moscow, 1932, p. 33.

those who did managed only to learn somewhat to read, write, and count."

"Our schools in Russia are very bad, teachers are forbidden from teaching children anything except basic literacy. It is profitable for the government to keep the people in ignorance, and therefore schools are not allowed to tell children or let them read books about how other peoples won their freedom, what laws and order they have; they forbid explaining why some peoples have one system and others have a different one, why some people are poor and others wealthy. In a word," wrote Nadezhda Konstantinovna, "they forbid speaking the truth, and teachers must only teach children to revere God and the Tsar."[122]

Further, N. K. Krupskaya pointed out that things were no better with child upbringing for a woman working in cottage industry. In the family of such a worker, as a result of a hopeless financial situation, children themselves begin working at age 6 –8, and "there can be no talk of any school." Roughly the same was the situation of a woman factory worker. When a mother leaves for the factory, some elderly neighbor woman watches the children while they are small, and older children grow up almost on the street. Although there are schools in cities and suburban areas, they are extremely overcrowded, and by no means all children get in; by age twelve, many of them go to work at factories themselves. A working woman's entire family life takes shape such that her children grow up halfway as strangers to the mother.

Bitter was the life of a female domestic servant. She was not supposed to start a family. If a servant had a child, she was forced against her will to send it away to be raised, and then most of her earnings went toward maintaining the child.

---

[122] N. K. Krupskaya, *Woman and Education*.

"Thus, we see," writes Nadezhda Konstantinovna, "that in the majority of cases, a working woman is placed in total impossibility to raise her children sensibly."[123]

And Nadezhda Konstantinovna shows that the only possible way out can be found only in a socialist society.

Maternal feelings compel a working woman to desire public education for children, the victory of the working-class cause, and a socialist system.

Only in a socialist society can public education be broadly established; from kindergarten, children will transition to school. But the school there will become completely different than in capitalist society. "The school in a socialist society, of course, will not resemble today's school," wrote N. K. Krupskaya in conclusion. "In the future school, students will acquire far more knowledge. They will at the same time be accustomed to productive labor, and most importantly, the school will not only teach—it will develop their spiritual and physical strength, and will raise them into useful, energetic citizens."[124]

Thus, for the first time in print, Nadezhda Konstantinovna spoke on a sharp political-pedagogical problem: she gave a sharply critical assessment of contemporary education in bourgeois society, indicated the path of struggle for a better future, and clarified what school would be like in a socialist society.

Devoting herself in subsequent years to Party work, N. K. Krupskaya at the same time worked on solving pedagogical problems, thoroughly studied extensive foreign and Russian

---

123 N. K. Krupskaya, *Woman and Education*.

124 *Ibid.*

pedagogical literature, visited schools, and received broad information regarding the state of public education in Russia.

The guiding light illuminating all these sources for Nadezhda Konstantinovna was the works of Marx and Engels and her daily conversations with Vladimir Ilyich.

Publishing on pedagogical issues prior to the October Revolution, Nadezhda Konstantinovna always set a two-fold goal: first, to show the true face of pre-revolutionary Russian schools and their class, exploitative nature; second, to outline ways for developing the new school, the school of a new society—that school which will be built after the victory of the proletarian revolution.

In her work "Should Boys Be Taught 'Women's Work'?"[125], Nadezhda Konstantinovna demonstrated with full clarity the role and significance of manual labor training for both boys and girls as a means of fighting for equal rights between men and women.

"All this talk about a woman being destined by nature itself for managing a household is the same kind of nonsense as the speeches once delivered by slaveholders claiming that slaves were 'destined by nature itself' to be slaves," Nadezhda Konstantinovna passionately stated.

The free school will fight all these prejudices that "spoil people's lives."

"Both boys and girls must equally learn to do everything necessary around the house and not consider doing this work as something beneath them."

---

[125] See journal *Svobodnoe vospitanie* [Free Education], 1909–1910, No. 10, pp. 55–56.

This, of course, is a "trifle," noted Nadezhda Konstantinovna. It would be ridiculous to expect grand consequences from teaching boys "women's work," but this is one of those details that create the general spirit of a school and to which attention should be paid.

The atmosphere in the vast majority of Tsarist Russian schools during the years of reaction was depressing. A segment of youth saw no future. The barbaric regime established by Kasso in educational institutions suppressed unstable young people. Cases of suicide among studying youth grew more frequent. And Nadezhda Konstantinovna raised her voice. In her work "Suicides Among Students and the Free Labor School," Nadezhda Konstantinovna contrasted the state drill-school with the free labor school of the future society.

The school in Tsarist Russia was completely cut off from life. Students had nothing good to remember it by: "Take our gymnasium students," wrote Nadezhda Konstantinovna, "how few school memories they have! The best years of life pass for them like some murky dream, and afterward there is nothing to remember them by."[126]

The heavy moral state of children was exacerbated by the inhumane "class regime."

Subjecting the entire life of pre-revolutionary schools to devastating criticism, N. K. Krupskaya pointed out that this school "aggravates the painful mental state of the child" and leads children to suicides, which had become widespread among students.

N. K. Krupskaya pointed to three viewpoints that existed on this sad phenomenon in contemporary Russian society. The first was the viewpoint of "the man in a case"—bureaucrats

---

[126] *Ibid.*

who believed that the sole cause of this "disastrous phenomenon" lay in loose behavior supposedly reigning among students, and therefore the way out, according to these persons, lay in increased supervision, compulsory church attendance by children, etc. The second viewpoint was the opinion of many parents and "generally well-meaning people" who spoke only of the need for a humane approach to youth, gentleness, abolition of exams, etc. The third viewpoint comprised thoughts expressed by a few: that the contemporary school was completely unfit; these people saw a way out in creating a new school built on pedagogical principles completely different from those accepted in bourgeois society. This "school of the future" ought to thoroughly develop a sense of solidarity in children; it ought to prepare conscious citizens, fighters, and people useful to society. In this school, children will prepare for working life. Labor itself can serve as a powerful lever for the development of the growing generation.

When organizing children's labor, wrote Nadezhda Konstantinovna, "...one must keep its educational purpose in mind, and therefore observe the following conditions: 1) this labor must interest the child, as only in that case will it be free; 2) it must be an application of knowledge and skills acquired by the child and be not only physical, but also mental—it should not be solely the work of a carpenter or shoemaker, but also of an educator, lecturer, etc., of course within the measure of their strength and knowledge; 3) the child must in each individual case see and understand the result of their labor—it must be clear to them that they turned out to be useful in such-and-such a way; 4) children's labor should be applied not only within school walls, but also outside them, as this provides an opportunity to engage on a practical level in comprehensive communication with people, observe life, learn to live, and feel like a useful member of society from early childhood."

"A student should not be isolated from society; he must encounter people everywhere, learn to live and work among people, and for the good of people, for the good of the nation."[127]

Nadezhda Konstantinovna even back then, during the years of reaction, called on educators to fight so that the ideas of a new, genuinely democratic school would not remain the property of a narrow circle of teachers, but of the entire progressive part of society.

She categorically objected to the opinion of certain educators who claimed that the propositions she advanced were utopian; foreseeing the coming social revolution, N. K. Krupskaya wrote: "The time will come when it will be possible to create the kind of school the younger generation needs. And one will need to know how to create it; for this, experience is needed, and thought must work in this direction in advance, so that it is clear how to get down to business."[128]

As is known, in those same years, Russian pedagogical thought across various movements fiercely debated the question of separate vs. co-education of children in school. The Ministry of Public Education rejected co-education as an "unsuitable" system. On the whole, this was not so much a pedagogical issue as a political-pedagogical problem that, with proper direction, helped correctly solve the task of equating men and women in rights.

In bourgeois pedagogical literature, there existed a viewpoint that reduced the educational significance of school on this issue to zero, thereby "recognizing the helplessness of school before life"; proponents of these positions refused to fight for co-education.

---

[127] See journal *Svobodnoe vospitanie*, 1910–1911, No. 10.

[128] *Ibid.*

Nadezhda Konstantinovna correctly and vividly illuminated this entire important question in her article "Co-education."[129]

"It would be ridiculous," wrote Nadezhda Konstantinovna, "to think that co-education can instantly and radically alter relations between men and women. These relations are determined by a long historical past, determined by the economic position of women and by the role of the class to which a particular man or woman belongs. The family and surrounding environment influence the child, instilling corresponding views and habits.

One should not exaggerate the educational role of the school. The role of the teacher and school consists in fighting, persistently if needed, against those views and habits with which the child came to school."

Nadezhda Konstantinovna also emphasized that under the conditions of pre-revolutionary Russia, co-education was not only difficult, but generally almost impossible. Implementing it required a decisive change in public life.

She believed that at a certain historical stage, the school would play its political-pedagogical role in resolving the issue of equal rights for men and women, and in overcoming incorrect concepts in people's consciousness. But this would happen in a "renewed school, a school where close relations prevail between teachers and students, where a thirst for knowledge reigns along with a desire to learn to work and live for the benefit of people."

In these same years, Nadezhda Konstantinovna came out with all decisiveness and passion against an article by the French bourgeois educator Cugney, who with exceptional audacity and nerve slandered Leo Tolstoy as a pedagogue. "His (Tolstoy's)

---

[129] Journal *Russkaya shkola* [Russian School], 1911, Issue VII.

immense merit," she wrote, "lies in the fact that he raised every seemingly purely pedagogical question (on curriculum, reading, punishments, etc.) sharply, in all its breadth, not outside of time and space, but in close connection with surrounding reality." Tolstoy posed particular questions not as a narrow specialist, but as a "citizen of his native land," excruciatingly searched for an answer, and forced the reader to search too. Tolstoy's merits as an educator were immense, Nadezhda Konstantinovna emphasized: "His influence undoubtedly left its indelible mark on Russian pedagogical thought."

Nadezhda Konstantinovna noted that a reactionary was criticizing Tolstoy. Tellingly, the article came from a representative of a bourgeois reformed school, she explained. Further, N. K. Krupskaya gave a party assessment of the entire movement of so-called "new schools." "Here people often idealize bourgeois 'new schools,' paying attention to outward appearance and ignoring the democratic-alien spirit saturated through and through with philistinism that reigns in many of these schools," she wrote. "Classes take place in the garden, singing and drawing are wonderfully set up, manual labor is introduced, room is given for children's self-activity, and the attitude toward children is educational, and so forth. But children in such a school are taught deference to existing authority, chauvinism, and the idea that religion is good for ignorant people and that there is no salvation without it. It would be a big mistake to ignore this spirit of many 'new schools'."[130]

***

Lenin foresaw the onset of revolution in Russia. "One had to prepare for the moment," wrote N. K. Krupskaya, "when power

[130] Journal *Svobodnoe vospitanie*, 1911–1912, No. 12, pp. 91–96.

would pass into the hands of the working class; one had to prepare the front of enlightenment. This work became urgent; when war broke out, one had to get down to work closely."[131]

Rereading and reviewing the works of major educators of the past, books by contemporary bourgeois educators, repeatedly studying the great heritage of Marx and Engels, listening to Lenin's daily instructions, summing up her personal experience and observations of Swiss schools, Nadezhda Konstantinovna decided to write a synthesizing work that would show the development of democratic pedagogical ideas and reveal the exploitative nature of the contemporary bourgeois school.

This book was published in 1917 under the title *Public Education and Democracy* (written in 1915).

The high appraisal of this work given by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin is well known.

The role and significance of *Public Education and Democracy*, which illuminated issues of public education from Marxist positions, are undoubtedly great.[132] It brought forward the issue of polytechnic education and showed "...how the content of this idea changed depending on general economic conditions and on which social class tried to put the labor school into practice."

In conclusion of her study, N. K. Krupskaya stated: "So long as the organization of schooling remains in the hands of the bourgeoisie, the labor school will be a tool directed against the interests of the working class; only the working class can make the labor school a tool for transforming contemporary society."[133]

---

131 N. K. Krupskaya, *Public Education and Democracy*. Moscow, 1930, p. 12.

132 See our article in the journal *Sovetskaya Pedagogika*, 1946, No. 3.

133 N. K. Krupskaya, *Public Education and Democracy*. Moscow, 1930.

All these and several other works by N. K. Krupskaya written before Great October had enormous significance for developing the foundations of a new pedagogy. They awakened pedagogical thought, called for solving the most acute pedagogical problems, and indicated the correct Bolshevik path for their solution.

***

The role of Nadezhda Konstantinovna in building the Soviet school can hardly be overstated. From the first days of Great October, she actively participated in the daily construction of the socialist school. Literally, there was not a single problem in the field of enlightenment about which she did not write or speak. Deep knowledge of the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, an excellent acquaintance with the works of classical educators, and accumulated personal pedagogical experience enabled her to solve the most difficult problems correctly.

Characterizing one of the main questions of Soviet pedagogy—the goals of school—Nadezhda Konstantinovna wrote: "Both the bourgeoisie and the working class set definite goals for the school, but the bourgeoisie views the school as a means of class domination, whereas the proletariat views it as a means to raise a generation capable of putting an end to class domination. The goals of the bourgeois state lead to suppressing the personality of the vast majority of children and darkening their consciousness; these goals run counter to the interests of the young generation. The goals set for the school by the working class lead to the flourishing of every child's personality, expanding their horizons, deepening their consciousness, and enriching their experiences these goals align with the interests of the younger generation. Therein lies

the difference between the goals of the bourgeoisie and the goals of the proletariat."[134]

In her works, Nadezhda Konstantinovna put forward and resolved with full force the central pedagogical problem of ideological-political, Bolshevik education of Soviet school pupils, closely linking its resolution with Soviet children mastering the foundations of science.

For us, for the Soviet school and pedagogy, the guiding principle is instilling in Soviet children a communist worldview, Bolshevik purposefulness, and high-will qualities.

"Look at what the party now demands from every one of its members," wrote Nadezhda Konstantinovna. "It demands great willpower and tolerates no laxity. A Party member must know how to subordinate his will to the interests of the whole not in words, but in deed. This is not always so simple and easy as it might seem at first glance. For this, one must possess high consciousness and a firm will, and this conscious will must be developed."

"In order to correctly approach the question of what communist education should be," said Nadezhda Konstantinovna, "one must first of all realize what kind of person a communist should be, what he must know, what he should strive for, and how he should act."[135]

Thus, paramount importance must be placed on instilling in our children a communist worldview, ardent love for the homeland, and the ability to fight for this worldview, for their beloved homeland, and for its great leaders.

---

[134] N. K. Krupskaya, *On the Paths to the New School*, 1923, No. 2–3.

[135] *Speeches at the Plenum of the Central House of Children's Communist Education*, December 11, 1932.

"We are obliged to educate students so that they learn to understand what is happening around them, understand the mechanics of the existing system, study the laws of development of human society, comprehend interconnections, and, most importantly, understand where social development is heading."[136]

However, this alone is not enough; "one must know how to build a new life; one must not only know, but know how to do it."

The teaching of every subject and the entire style of school work must be subordinated to these basic tasks.

Nadezhda Konstantinovna pointed out that all school activities must always be saturated with the spirit of Marxism: "One must give a Marxist understanding of the environment without saying any extra words; one must create a curriculum in which the word Marxism might not even be used, but which in essence would show the connection of phenomena in their true light." At the same time, Nadezhda Konstantinovna particularly insisted against vulgarization and simplification when conveying the basic tenets of Marxism to children. "Of course, this is a somewhat grandiose phrase—Marxist worldview," she wrote. "Sometimes such big words are repeated by children. Recently a girl came to me, barely taller than the table, and to the question of what they do on weekdays—not on holidays, but on weekdays in the children's home—she answered me very gravely: 'we study Leninism.' If children start talking about worldview like that, it will be harmful and unnatural, because they do not yet have a clear idea of what a worldview is."[137]

---

[136] Journal *Yuny Kommunist* [Young Communist], 1922, No. 8–9.

[137] From a speech at the II All-Russian Congress of Pioneer Workers.

Children should be taught using concrete material. An experienced educator, said Nadezhda Konstantinovna, taking into account the age of children, can give everything essential for forming a communist worldview in them without any vulgarization. From an early age, an educator must paint images of humanity's greatest people—Lenin and Stalin—for children and show their remarkable deeds. A teacher should reveal in their narrative about these geniuses the ideal personality of a fighter, revolutionary, patriot, thinker, scientist, human being, and leader of all progressive humanity—that unsurpassed ideal toward which children should then strive all their lives. Unfortunately, not all our teachers know how to present the brilliant images of these great people before children in concrete, grand, and vivid material.

Thus, deep study of the life and work of Lenin and Stalin is an obligatory, integral part of forming a communist worldview in children.

We are educating youth who must not only envision the foundations of a communist worldview; these foundations must serve as a guide to action for our students, be translated into life, and determine their actions and behavior.

The school, pioneer organization, and Komsomol must know how to establish collective work among studying youth, as the role of the collective and its educational significance are exceptionally great.

Here mistakes are possible, along with a misunderstanding of what collective work actually is, for "working collectively does not simply mean working together, in the same room, on the exact same task. That is the simplest form of cooperation. Collective work is defined as work that has a common goal...

This constant awareness of oneself as part of a whole has immense educational, disciplining significance."[138]

Individual traits of a collective member will by no means be erased; on the contrary, they will bloom in full color in the interests of the entire collective. One must help the child, Nadezhda Konstantinovna pointed out, "...to realize their thoughts and feelings—to think clearer and feel deeper; one must help the child make this self-knowledge a means of knowing others, a means of closer bonding with the collective, a means of growing together with others through the collective toward a perfected, new, full life of deep and meaningful experiences."[139]

Often a teacher does not know how to approach a class, or whom to rely on in order to forge a collective out of scattered individuals. This happens because in pedagogical practice we frequently counterpose the collective to the individual study of a child, to an individual approach to a child or adolescent. This is a mistaken position. A teacher often lectures the class about the collective and the necessity of collective work, but does not know those "units" of which their collective is composed. They all look "alike" to him. "To organize a collective," advised Nadezhda Konstantinovna, "one must know what each child can do. Who among them is stronger. One knows how to tell a story well, another can draw, etc. And one must teach them to distribute work among themselves so that a truly collective effort results work results. Working collectively by no means means working identically."

Every student, as a member of a collective, should be proud of his collective; every Pioneer should be proud of his Pioneer organization. He must guard the honor of his collective. In this

---

138 Journal *Na putyakh k novoy shkole*, 1923, No. 1.

139 *Artistic Education in School*, 1925.

regard, symbolism carries great educational value. "We are very often inclined to treat all outward things with contempt," Nadezhda Konstantinovna wrote back in 1932, "as well as all kinds of badges. But a badge given as a symbol of belonging to a Soviet organization 'strengthens the bond between the organization and its members, heightens a member's responsibility for their actions,'[140] and places the member under public scrutiny of the collective."

A good teacher will know how to rely on the collective's public opinion and correctly evaluate every action of a student. But does this mean a teacher can submit every violation of discipline to discussion by the class or school collective? This is not only impossible, but unwise and harmful. One must realistically evaluate the situation in the classroom and school. One cannot always approach things from a position of "persuasion" and abstract-theoretical reasoning. When necessary, punishments should be applied.

Remarkable were N. K. Krupskaya's speeches on teaching individual subjects. Nadezhda Konstantinovna put forward with full force the task of interrelating individual subjects of instruction. She emphasized the political significance of skillfully teaching such subjects as the Russian language, history, literature, and geography.

"Literature," she wrote, "is a powerful means of influencing the younger generation. It can help them understand life, people, what they live by, what they breathe; it can teach them to understand people and what troubles them. Literature can teach how to approach people, how to influence them. Literature affects morality, human behavior, and one's worldview. Fiction

[140] Quoted from coll. *Education of Youth in the Leninist Spirit*, Leningrad, 1925, pp. 62–63.

literature has a very strong effect on adolescents and youth—at that age when a person's character is being formed."[141]

As is known, Nadezhda Konstantinovna was one of the organizers of the Pioneer movement in the USSR. Children's "it would be a mistake to think that the school can teach productive labor; it teaches only that labor which helps to study real labor in school (pasting, carpentry, modeling, drawing, elementary sewing, etc.). Only life will teach real labor,"[142] wrote Nadezhda Konstantinovna in 1919.

Developing the issue of labor training in schools and children's homes, Nadezhda Konstantinovna prepared a program in 1920 for teaching sewing to girls in children's homes. Thus, for example, in the first half-year, in her opinion, the student should fluently master the needle, sewing machine, edging, basting buttonholes, seams, sewing on buttons, snap fasteners, and hooks. In addition, children must be able to calculate what work can be performed in what amount of time, know the basic types, prices, and properties of fabrics and trimmings. In the second half-year, students should learn to cut fabric according to patterns, overlay and measure it out, and prepare a child's dress of an ordinary style from simple fabric according to a template. Girls must be able to calculate the cost of the dress, the time required for its manufacture, select colors, and suitable materials. The third and fourth half-years were to instill in students the skill of making dresses according to specific designs.

As we can see, Nadezhda Konstantinovna places great importance on labor skills. She writes: "We must give children labor knowledge and skills. Parents want this, workers want this, peasants want this. The children themselves want this...

---

[141] *Na putyakh k novoy shkole*, 1932, No. 1, pp. 62–65.

[142] N. K. Krupskaya, *Collected Works*, Vol. III, p. 82.

The Young Pioneers want this." Labor, as Nadezhda Konstantinovna emphasizes, must in no way hinder school studies or the mastery of knowledge, but rather complement them. For the school must arm children with knowledge. "The era we are living through is an era of high development in technology and science. The growing generation must master knowledge — without this, it is impossible to become the master of life."[143]

Thus, our school must prepare a broadly educated person, "must carry out the upbringing of a collectivist, combined with the upbringing of a comprehensively developed, disciplined person, capable "of feeling deeply, thinking clearly, and acting in an organized manner."[144]

Such a person must be nimble, brave, physically hardened, and know not only what we must fight for, but also be able to fight for our great Motherland and its leaders. In a series of her articles, Nadezhda Konstantinovna develops an entire system of measures for the physical preparation of youth. Back in 1918 (in an article in the supplement to *"Izvestiya VTsIK"* No. 3), Nadezhda Konstantinovna, in connection with a decree of the Central Executive Committee (TsIK), emphasized that the main task of the military-physical education of youth rests upon the People's Commissariat for Education. Therefore, it is obliged "to see to it that the school fosters neatness and accuracy in the execution of every piece of work, that the school develops initiative, provides labor skills, and instills the ability to quickly adapt to new conditions."

"In the soldiers of the new order, it is necessary to cultivate selfless devotion to their socialist fatherland, to world

---

143 Journal *"Narodny Uchitel"* ("National Teacher"), 1931, No. 9, pp. 28–29.

144 Journal *"Na Putyakh k Novoy Shkole"* ("On the Paths to the New School"), 1927, No. 10.

socialism, and to cultivate a readiness to defend it to the last drop of blood. And the school must prepare convinced socialists who are endlessly devoted to the cause."

But we must not forget that upbringing in the Soviet school cannot be realized in isolation from the family. Nadezhda Konstantinovna attached enormous importance to family upbringing and the link between the family and the school.

Speaking against the underestimation of the role of the mother as an educator in the Soviet state—an underestimation permitted by some Komsomol members—Nadezhda Konstantinovna wrote: "Maternal instinct gives a woman much joy. There is nothing bad in this instinct. We consider the maternal instinct to be a great driving force, but on the other hand, of course, we will not limit a woman solely to the upbringing of children. We will not tear her away from broad social life. Here, for March 8, in the newspaper *'Za Industrializatsiyu'* ('For Industrialization'), a remarkable quotation from Stalin was cited. He spoke about how it is not all the same to us how a mother will raise her child."[145] Nadezhda Konstantinovna demands that Soviet women learn to raise children in "our spirit."

Nadezhda Konstantinovna advocated for the broad participation of women in the country's public life. This participation in no way distracts a woman in a socialist society from the duties of a mother; on the contrary, it is precisely the activist mother who "can give children a true 'our', Soviet upbringing."

The mother, in the words of Nadezhda Konstantinovna, is a "natural educator." Her influence on children, especially on young ones, is immense: it leaves an imprint on the person's

---

145 *"Komsomolskaya Pravda"*, July 5, 1935.

entire character and all their subsequent development. The school is obligated to help parents (and mothers first and foremost) properly direct the upbringing of children, because "one can raise a daughter into a slave, or one can raise her into a petty-bourgeois individualist who is uninterested in the rapidly moving life around her, standing aside from this life and merely endlessly digging into her own experiences; or one can raise a girl into a collectivist, an active builder of socialism, a person who draws joy in harmonious labor and in the struggle for great goals—a true communist."[146]

Complex issues of family pedagogy can only be resolved through close contact between parents and the school.

At home, just as at school, a love for daily routine work should be developed, and "lordly" habits must be eradicated in every possible way. "Now, under socialism," wrote N. K. Krupskaya, "all conditions and prerequisites have been created so that all remnants of the old, of which much still remains in people's consciousness and daily lives, can be eradicated completely."[147]

Only by walking hand in hand can the school and the family overcome the difficulties encountered in the practical upbringing of the growing generation.

"Our preschool institutions and our Soviet school must serve as a model for how to raise new people out of children—builders of socialism. The combination of public education provided in our preschool institutions and schools with family upbringing, where mothers' hearts beat fervently for the cause of socialism, creates a remarkable generation of people."[148]

---

146 Journal *"Yunyy Kommunist"* ("Young Communist"), 1935, No. 8.

147 *"Rabochaya Moskva"*, February 27, 1939.

148 Journal *"Yunyy Kommunist"*, 1935, No. 8.

It is impossible not to note that Nadezhda Konstantinovna was one of the first Soviet educators to unravel the reactionary essence of German pedagogy. As early as her classical 1915 work *Public Education and Democracy*, Nadezhda Konstantinovna established that the well-known educator Kerschensteiner, who was considered "progressive," "inspires no fears in the government of Bavaria; he is far from any democratism. He bows down before the bourgeois state, guards its interests above all else, and aligns his pedagogical activity with it."

In another article from 1917 ("The Road of Talent"), she emphasized that in modern Germany, "the Kerschensteiners, Foersters, and Natorps take possession of the child's soul and firmly lay within it a reverence for the existing German state." "This school," Nadezhda Konstantinovna wrote further, "is the foundation for the propaganda of extreme chauvinism and misanthropy. All creative work of children is directed into a military channel."

Further, in her short work *War and the German Public School*, Nadezhda Konstantinovna, contrasting the goals of progressive bourgeois pedagogy of the past century with the goals of "state" pedagogy in imperialist Germany, points out that the "public" school in Germany is diametrically opposed to the best ideas of the past; its goals are different—"the raising of a mindless soldier. The student is merely a means to achieve these goals; for the sake of these goals, certain views are cultivated in him. The teacher is a means for carrying out these goals." Nadezhda Konstantinovna wrote this long before the takeover of power by fascism, but she gave an accurate prediction of the further development of reaction in the field of pedagogy in Germany: an even greater disregard for the rights of the child and human rights, and an even greater transformation of the school into a tool of rampant reaction.

The Soviet teacher is a Soviet patriot; his duty is to educate future citizens of our great Motherland, fighters for the cause of Lenin–Stalin. The role of the teacher is immense, the profession of a teacher is not only honorable, but it is one of the most exciting professions. After all, our teacher is a teacher in the world's first country of socialism.

"We might not know what someone's name is—who is Petrenko, who is Vladimir—but we feel that among the teaching staff we have a harmonious, ideologically united collective that, rolling up its sleeves, works to make our entire way of life even more cultured."[149]

"The duty of our teaching staff is to raise our children into true Leninists, true Stalinists. For the name of Lenin and the name of Stalin are our banner," Nadezhda Konstantinovna emphasized with all her strength. "When we speak of Lenin, of Stalin, we think of socialism, of those immense achievements that we have, and we think of the victory of communism. We need to grow children into true Leninists and Stalinists, so that following the example of teachers, looking at adult Stakhanovite front-runners, looking at their mothers who are public activists, they truly grow up as new people. To know how to raise children into such new people, all of you must work on yourselves even more, truly learn Marxism–Leninism, and raise the banner of Marx–Engels–Lenin–Stalin ever higher."[150]

"Sovetskaya Pedagogika", 1947, No. 11.

---

149 *"Rabochaya Moskva"*, February 28, 1939, No. 48.

150 Ibid.

A. S. MAKARENKO — AN INNOVATIVE EDUCATOR[151]

On April 1, 1939, the outstanding Soviet innovative educator Anton Semyonovich Makarenko ended his life's journey.

Throughout his life, he dedicated his entire remarkable talent to the development of the theory and practice of communist education for the growing generations. He boldly broke outdated views and traditions in pedagogy and persistently developed new methods, techniques, and organizational forms of communist education.

From his works emanates cheerfulness and confidence in the righteousness of our cause, revolutionary optimism, and intolerance toward everything foreign and hostile to the Soviet order. A. S. Makarenko did not tolerate routine, inertia, dogma, or formulaic approaches in educational work. The characterization given by Comrade Stalin to those innovators in science who possess "...courage and determination to break old traditions, norms, and guidelines when they become outdated, when they become an obstacle to moving forward..." applies to him in full measure.[152]

A. S. Makarenko considered himself a Stakhanovite in the field of education. Beginning his series of lectures for employees of the People's Commissariat for Education of the RSFSR in January 1938, he said: "...We live in an era when practical workers make remarkable corrections to the propositions of science. These workers in our country, in the Soviet Union, are

---

[151] Leading article published on the 10th anniversary of the death of A. S. Makarenko.

[152] J. V. Stalin, *Speech at a Kremlin Reception for Higher Education Workers*, May 17, 1938.

called Stakhanovites."[153] Further, he pointed out that the conclusions drawn from his practical experience allowed him to make certain corrections to the theory and practice of educational work.

The pedagogical works of A. S. Makarenko, which summarize his rich experience, undoubtedly play a huge role in the development of Soviet pedagogy. They exert a great influence on the creation of a new pedagogy in the countries of people's democracy.

A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical mastery received high praise from M. Gorky. In his letter addressed to Anton Semyonovich, he wrote: "...Your strikingly successful pedagogical experiment has global significance..."

A. S. Makarenko was a revolutionary educator. He posed and solved every issue of communist education in a new way—in the spirit of the policies of the Party and the Soviet government.

In one of his last speeches, just a few days before his death, Anton Semyonovich said: "Our cause, the cause of communist education, is a new cause on a global scale. If we take fields such as technology, literature, and others, you always receive something from past generations. But in the area of communist education, matters are more complex, because twenty years ago these two words were hardly combined: communist education."[154]

Being an innovative educator, Anton Semyonovich was able to clearly and precisely formulate the fundamentally new elements that distinguish Soviet pedagogy and the Soviet educational system from bourgeois pedagogical theories and

---

153 A. S. Makarenko, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, Uchpedgiz, 1946, p. 67.

154 A. S. Makarenko, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, Uchpedgiz, 1946, pp. 174–175.

the bourgeois system of education. He was among the first to embark on the path of a decisive break with the formalism and metaphysics of bourgeois pedagogy. He resolutely fought for a genuinely progressive Soviet pedagogical science.

In his numerous works and practical activity, A. S. Makarenko developed a new system of education that reflected the needs of building a socialist society.

All his theoretical works and speeches on issues of pedagogy are imbued with the idea of the necessity of raising a new person—an active and conscious builder of communist society.

"...We cannot talk only about the professional training of the new generation," wrote A. S. Makarenko in his article *The Goal of Education*. "We must also think about cultivating the kind of behavior, character traits, and personal qualities that are necessary for the Soviet state during the dictatorship of the working class and at the moment of establishing a classless society."

Anton Semyonovich was deeply convinced that the qualities of a Soviet person are fundamentally different from the qualities of a person in a bourgeois society. Therefore, our education must also be fundamentally different from bourgeois education. He wrote: "We must graduate energetic and ideologically grounded members of a socialist society from our schools—people capable without hesitation, always, and at every moment of their lives, of finding the right criterion for personal action, while simultaneously being able to demand proper behavior from others. Our pupil, whoever he may be, can never act in life merely as the bearer of some personal perfection, merely as a good or honest person.

He must always act “first and foremost as a member of his collective, as a member of society, responsible for the actions not only of himself, but also of his comrades."[155]

A. S. Makarenko persistently sought new paths and means to achieve the goals and tasks of communist education formulated by the classics of Marxism–Leninism. He understood very well that a new person cannot be educated using old techniques and methods. It was necessary to develop and substantiate a new methodology of educational work—a methodology of communist education.

"...The new person must be made in a new way," he wrote in *Poem of Education* (*Road to Life*).[156] This idea runs like a red thread through all the speeches of this remarkable innovative educator.

The pedagogical system of A. S. Makarenko could only emerge and find practical application under the conditions of our Soviet order. The creative period of his life and work, as is well known, coincided with the struggle of the Soviet people for the victory and consolidation of the socialist order in our country. Thanks to this, A. S. Makarenko had unlimited opportunities to develop a new, original pedagogical system.

The methodological basis of this system is dialectical materialism, skillfully applied by A. S. Makarenko when solving the most important issues of communist education. Creatively developing the problems of education, Anton Semyonovich relied on the teachings of the founders of Marxism–Leninism regarding communist education.

In the article *Problems of Education in the Soviet School*, Anton Semyonovich wrote: "...The general pedagogical ideas

---

[155] A. S. Makarenko, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, Uchpedgiz, 1946, p. 30.

[156] A. S. Makarenko, *Poem of Education* (*Road to Life*), Goslitizdat, 1948, p. 8.

of Marxism–Leninism, and the statements of Lenin and Stalin, provide a completely clear orientation in the field of education and open up vast room for pedagogical creativity."

Being an outstanding innovative educator and revolutionary, A. S. Makarenko brilliantly realized the tasks of communist education in practice and formulated a number of fundamental principles that enriched Soviet pedagogical science.

The pedagogical practice and pedagogical statements of A. S. Makarenko are imbued with socialist humanism and deep optimism, with faith in man, his strength, and his capabilities. The works of M. Gorky had a great influence on him in this regard. Gorky taught A. S. Makarenko to value and warmly love human beings, to be an optimist regarding humanity, and to see inner beauty in a person.

Touching upon the foundations of his pedagogical system, A. S. Makarenko wrote: "...The decisive factor is Gorky's optimism... The good in a person must always be projected, and the educator is obligated to do this. He is obligated to approach a person with an optimistic hypothesis, even at some risk of being mistaken. And one must learn this ability to project the best, strongest, and most interesting qualities in a person from Gorky. It is especially important that with Gorky, this skill is realized in a way that is far from simple. Gorky knows how to see positive forces in a person, but he never fawns over them, never lowers his demands on a person, and will never stop short of the harshest condemnation. Such an attitude toward a person is a Marxist attitude."[157]

A. S. Makarenko loved children very much, but this was a rational, demanding love, foreign to petty-bourgeois sentimentality.

---

[157] A. S. Makarenko, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, Uchpedgiz, 1946, p. 61.

At a meeting of teachers in Leningrad on October 16, 1938, he said: "My main principle has always been: as many demands on a person as possible, but at the same time as much respect for them as possible. In our dialectic, these are actually one and the same thing: when we demand a lot from a person, that demand itself contains our respect; precisely because we demand, precisely because the demand is fulfilled, we respect the person."[158] This combination of high expectations and respect represents one of the core principles of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical system.

Another major principle of his pedagogical system, closely linked to the principle of socialist humanism and optimism, is the "system of perspective lines."

"A person cannot live in the world if he has nothing joyful ahead of him," wrote Anton Semyonovich in *Poem of Education* (*Road to Life*). "...the true stimulus of human life is tomorrow's joy. To raise a person means to cultivate in him perspective paths along which his tomorrow's joy is arranged. One could write an entire methodology on this important work. It consists of organizing new perspectives, utilizing those that already exist, and gradually introducing more valuable ones."[159]

Thus, the main principles of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical system should be considered: socialist humanism, closely linked pedagogical optimism, the combination of high expectations of a person with respect for them, and the "system of perspective lines." These principles are based on the Leninist–Stalinist teaching about the new person, and on the relationship between the individual and society in a socialist state. They reflect the progressive nature of the Soviet

---

[158] Ibid., pp. 160–161.

[159] A. S. Makarenko, *Poem of Education* (*Road to Life*), 5th ed., 1940, pp. 448–449.

educational system that has taken shape in the country of victorious socialism.

Let us consider some of the problems of communist education to the development of which Anton Semyonovich made a major contribution.

***

Proceeding from the Marxist–Leninist teaching that a person cannot be considered outside of society and social relations, Anton Semyonovich raised the question of the children's collective in all its breadth as a vital factor in education. He believed that "in the Soviet Union, there can be no individual outside the collective, and therefore there can be no isolated personal fate, personal path, or happiness set in opposition to the fate and happiness of the collective."[160]

By a collective, A. S. Makarenko understood "...a social living organism, which is an organism precisely because it has organs, that there are powers, responsibilities, interrelations of parts, and interdependence."[161] Being an enemy of dogma and formulaic approaches in the organization of a children's collective, he thoroughly worked out such questions as: basic requirements for a collective, the organization of a collective, and leadership of a collective.

In A. S. Makarenko's lecture *Pedagogy of Individual Action*, many valuable instructions are given regarding the implementation of an individual approach to pupils, the necessity of taking into account the personal characteristics and character of each pupil, and combining collective education with individual influence on pupils.

---

[160] A. S. Makarenko, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, Uchpedgiz, 1946, p. 28.

[161] A. S. Makarenko, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, Uchpedgiz, 1946, p. 162.

Anton Semyonovich devoted particularly significant attention to cultivating in children and adolescents within a collective such vital qualities as organization, discipline, and initiative.

A. S. Makarenko introduced much that was new and original to the understanding of the problem of "discipline." He asserted that discipline is not so much a method of proper education as it is the result of it. "Proper discipline," he stated in his lecture on discipline, "is that good outcome toward which an educator must strive with all his strength and through all the means available at his disposal."[162]

In contrast to the limited, essentially Herbartian understanding of discipline merely as a tool for obedience and maintaining order, A. S. Makarenko pointed to the necessity of cultivating a "discipline of struggle and overcoming." In his view, discipline consists not only in maintaining order, punctuality, obedience, and adhering to established rules, but also in persistent, tenacious struggle to overcome difficulties standing in the way of achieving set goals. A. S. Makarenko pointed out that in the Soviet state, obedience alone is insufficient. A Soviet person must possess initiative and creative will. Therefore, the cultivation of discipline in A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical system is closely linked to the tasks of building strong will, courage, and a firm character in the rising generation.

A. S. Makarenko was the first in the history of pedagogy to practically realize the combination of academic instruction with social-productive labor in high-tech industrial manufacturing.

Labor education is a crucial feature of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical system. "Proper Soviet education cannot be imagined as non-labor education... Our state is a state of

---

[162] Ibid., p. 254.

workers; our Constitution states: 'He who does not work, shall not eat'. Therefore, in educational work as well, labor must be one of the most fundamental elements."[163]

Anton Semyonovich viewed labor education as a vital condition for moral upbringing. In the lecture *Upbringing in Labor*, he said: "Only participation in collective labor allows a person to develop a correct, moral attitude toward other people —a kin-like love and friendship toward every working person, alongside indignation and condemnation toward the slacker, toward the person who evades labor."[164]

A. S. Makarenko also pointed out that labor education develops a person physically and spiritually, strengthening their confidence in their physical and moral capabilities.

A. S. Makarenko laid the foundations of Soviet family pedagogy for the first time and showed that in the family, children undergo an elementary school of morality—that the formation of their mental abilities, character, and primary personality traits as future Soviet citizens begins in the family. Therefore, in his pedagogical system, he devoted a large place to the questions of raising children in the family. In 1937, the first volume of his work *A Book for Parents* was published, drawing numerous responses from teachers and parents. Until the last day of his life, Anton Semyonovich worked persistently on the second volume of *A Book for Parents*, devoted to the moral and political education of children in the family. In addition, he intended to write two more volumes of *A Book for Parents*; he planned to dedicate the third volume to issues of labor education and career choice, and the fourth volume to the problem of raising a happy person. Unfortunately, his premature death prevented him from realizing these plans.

---

[163] A. S. Makarenko, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, Uchpedgiz, 1946, pp. 270–271.
[164] Ibid., p. 272.

After the publication of *A Book for Parents*, a review titled "Harmful Advice for Parents" was published in the pages of the journal *"Sovetskaya Pedagogika"*.[165] In this review, an attempt was made to "smash" *A Book for Parents* and discredit its author. A. S. Makarenko was accused of pedagogical nihilism, of detaching family upbringing from school upbringing, and of other deadly sins. Meanwhile, in *A Book for Parents*, and especially in *Lectures on Child Upbringing* broadcast on the radio, A. S. Makarenko formulated a number of valuable, practice-tested pedagogical tips on raising children in the family.

A. S. Makarenko paid great attention to the role of the educator. In his articles and lectures, he often spoke of the demands placed on a teacher as an educator of the rising generation.

Anton Semyonovich pointed out that a teacher and educator must possess high culture and versatile knowledge, and be a model of the new person—a citizen of socialist society. Necessary qualities of an educator, in A. S. Makarenko's opinion, should include: cheerfulness, vigor, energy, persistence, love for and high expectations of children, pedagogical tact, and high pedagogical mastery.

A. S. Makarenko attached great importance to pedagogical theory. He maintained that educational work, "if not armed with a clear, broad, detailed, known goal, will be the work of apolitical upbringing..."[166] The goal and methodology of educational work, Anton Semyonovich stated, "...cannot be derived from sciences such as psychology and biology."[167] Only

---

165 *"Sovetskaya Pedagogika"*, 1938, No. 3, pp. 124–128.

166 A. S. Makarenko, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, Uchpedgiz, 1946, p. 71.

167 Ibid., p. 70.

by relying on the data of pedagogical science can one ensure the proper, goal-oriented education of the rising generation.

The advanced, revolutionary pedagogical theory of A. S. Makarenko was created in a sharp struggle against anti-Marxist –Leninist, petty-bourgeois, and bourgeois theories. This struggle of the remarkable innovative educator against outdated and hostile theories was at times portrayed by some as a fight against pedagogical science itself.

Meanwhile, it was precisely in this struggle that the principle of Party spirit in pedagogical science and hostility toward opposing theories found its most vivid expression.

Anton Semyonovich waged a decisive fight against the petty-bourgeois "theory of free education." He repeatedly spoke out against the pseudoscience of pedology at a time when none of the scientific workers in pedagogy yet dared to criticize and expose the pedologists who had caused immense harm to our school.

In connection with his critique of pseudoscientific pedological theories, A. S. Makarenko decisively exposed so-called "experimental pedagogy," revealing its extreme individualism and biologism. In his article *The Goal of Education*, he wrote: "The infection began even before the revolution in the nests of experimental pedagogy, which was characterized by a rupture between the study of the child and his upbringing. Bourgeois pedagogy of the early 20th century, torn apart by numerous schools and innovators, endless swings from extreme individualism to shapeless and uncreative biologism, could seem like a revolutionary science because it stood under the banner of fighting against official school drill and hypocrisy. But even then, a keen ear had good reasons to meet this 'science' with great suspicion—a science deprived above all of a true scientific basis. Even then, one could see in it very

questionable tendencies toward biological excursions, which in essence represented an overt attempt to revise the Marxist concept of man.

The biological tendencies of experimental pedagogy, and later of pedology, repel every Marxist teacher."[168]

A. S. Makarenko, through his pedagogical experience and the remarkable results of his educational work, refuted pedagogical fabrications about "difficult children." Thousands of his pupils among former "delinquents" grew into full-fledged, active citizens and true patriots of their Motherland.

A. S. Makarenko sharply opposed attempts to ground pedagogy using reflexology. In his article *Teachers Shrug Their Shoulders*, he was rightly indignant that some pseudo-theoreticians wanted to support "all human upbringing with reflexology and calculated to produce a new person exclusively based on the study of conditioned reflexes."[169]

In the statements of A. S. Makarenko, we also find sharp criticism of bourgeois pedagogical theories that derive pedagogical "laws" in a purely speculative manner. Among such theories, he included primarily the reactionary theories of Herbart.

A. S. Makarenko passionately and fervently fought against apolitical attitudes in the theory and practice of educational work. He demanded that every issue of pedagogical theory be resolved as a political issue. He constantly emphasized that our upbringing is fundamentally different from the upbringing carried out in bourgeois society. For example, speaking of the tasks of raising our children and youth in the spirit of communist morality, he specifically emphasized that "...every

---

168 A. S. Makarenko, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, Uchpedgiz, 1946, pp. 23–24.

169 A. S. Makarenko, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, Uchpedgiz, 1946, p. 32.

moral quality in our society acquires a different content than in the bourgeoisie. And it is these special qualities of a moral personality that we must cultivate."[170]

This directive of A. S. Makarenko takes on especially great importance in our days, when the new, advanced, and progressive elements in Soviet pedagogy—elements that fundamentally set it apart from the pedagogical systems of the past and contemporary bourgeois systems—are becoming ever clearer.

The pedagogical heritage of A. S. Makarenko, unfortunately, is still insufficiently studied and developed. His immense contribution to pedagogical science has not yet been properly appreciated. It is high time to put an end to the underestimation of the pedagogical heritage of this remarkable innovative educator. We must more boldly push his advanced pedagogical ideas into our school practice.

****

A. S. Makarenko was not only a pedagogical theorist, but also a remarkable practical educator. His pedagogical views are a deep theoretical generalization of his lengthy pedagogical practice, which yielded remarkable results.

A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical experience and pedagogical statements are dear and valuable to us because they provide answers to the most burning and relevant questions of educational work.

A. S. Makarenko is dear and valuable as an innovative educator who paved new paths and substantiated new methods of educational influence on the rising generations. His articles, speeches, and presentations on communist education are distinguished by high ideogeneity and Bolshevik Party spirit.

---

[170] Ibid., p. 181.

Now, during the period of completing the construction of socialism and the gradual transition to communism, when the tasks of the communist education of Soviet people are brought to the forefront, studying the pedagogical heritage of A. S. Makarenko and introducing his advanced ideas into the practice of educational work acquires especially great importance.

Not only individual educators, but broad masses of the Soviet teaching community should turn to the remarkable works of A. S. Makarenko. These works should be studied with an eye toward solving practical tasks to improve the quality of the communist education of the growing personality of the Soviet person.

There is no doubt that deep study and creative utilization of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage will contribute to the further rise and development of Soviet pedagogy. The pedagogical experience of A. S. Makarenko, theoretically illuminated in his works, should help Soviet teachers raise our children and youth into active and conscious builders of communism.

"Sovetskaya Pedagogika", 1949, No. 3.

A. G. TER-GEVONDYAN

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences

THE IDEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL FOUNDATION OF A. S. MAKARENKO'S PEDAGOGICAL VIEWS

Recently, among the archival materials of A. S. Makarenko, his excerpts from the works of V. I. Lenin were discovered. Reading them, one is convinced firsthand that the life-giving source of the depth of his pedagogical views and convictions of Anton Semenovich is Marxist-Leninist teaching.

The notes made by A. S. Makarenko from Lenin's works are not limited merely to direct statements by V. I. Lenin on education, but encompass a broad range of social issues. Against this background, the problems of communist education —which found bright reflection in A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical system—stand out clearly.

The reader mentally visualizes through these notes the creative path along which the development of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical ideas progressed. In some instances, individual passages from his works are recalled in which the excerpts of Lenin's propositions he made are directly reflected.

A. S. Makarenko's educational system is strong in its ideological commitment. It reflects the harmonious doctrine of Lenin and Stalin on the laws of societal development and political struggle. It is inextricably linked with the practice of building communism in our country. It exudes a spirit of cheerfulness and revolutionary innovation.

****

It is well known that A. S. Makarenko expressed in the best possible way within his pedagogical system two traits inherent to Soviet pedagogy: socialist humanism and revolutionary optimism.

In doing so, he was guided by the correct thought that the higher the demands we place on a person, the more beautiful they will become in a moral sense.

In A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical experience, the main method of implementing exactingness in upbringing was Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism of the actions and behavior of pupils from the standpoint of the collective's interests. In this regard, his novella *Flags on the Towers* deserves special attention, in which general meetings of the communards—imbued with a spirit of an irreconcilable attitude toward negative phenomena in the life of the collective—are described in detail.

One of the colonists, for example, speaks at a general meeting regarding non-compliance with an order of the head of the colony:

— "Right now, at the general meeting, Filka is behaving atrociously. Yes, atrociously, there's no need to look at me. The main thing is—he lies, you see, he lies to the general meeting: he has lived in the colony for five years, and yet here he 'didn't understand the order'."

It is also interesting to recall a wonderful tradition that developed in the F. E. Dzerzhinsky Commune in connection with admitting a newcomer into a brigade. Upon the newcomer's first appearance, the brigade leader was obliged to tell him, in the presence of the entire brigade, about each member of his small collective. These brief, comrade-to-comrade characterizations represent a critical evaluation of the

individual in light of the collective's shared moral requirements.

Here are the words with which Brigade Leader Nesterenko accompanies the first introduction of Igor Chernyavin to Misha Gontar:

— “This is Misha Gontar, a repair locksmith, a good locksmith, only he doesn’t want to study at school. He reached the fifth grade, and now he’s imagined that he’s already a scholar. He went foolish, so we have to force him by strength. He’s a good comrade, I’ll say it straight, if only everyone were such comrades, but he’s just a slob—there’s no saving him. You won’t learn anything good from him on that front. But as a locksmith he’s good, and as a comrade too. He’s kind and loves to work; only small details remain for him to become a true person. He wants to become a driver, and every driver must be an educated person.”

Highly valuing the method of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism, A. S. Makarenko persistently cultivated in the communards the ability to "tell one's comrade unpleasant things and not take offense if unpleasant things are told to you". Bold, comradeship-driven exposures and self-critical admissions of one’s own shortcomings contributed to the moral and political cohesion of the children's collective and to the upbringing of morally steadfast people.

Upbringing based on mutual comradeship criticism is a very instructive experience for those who helplessly throw up their hands when facing a sense of false comradeship among children who do not wish to "give away" one another. Such phenomena testify to the absence of an organized children's collective—specifically, to a teacher’s inability to create a businesslike atmosphere for criticism through constant communication with the children and exchange of opinions

with them regarding various events occurring in the life of the collective.

The Communist Party calls on us to "nurture a new generation that is cheerful, believing in its cause, unafraid of obstacles, and ready to overcome any obstacles". A. S. Makarenko understood this task perfectly. His pedagogical teaching is imbued with the spirit of confidence in the final victory of the great cause of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, and in the victory of communism worldwide.

The mood with which life in the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzhinsky Commune was filled was called *major* by A. S. Makarenko. This is an uplifted spirit among Soviet children, which was expressed in everything, even in their posture and stride. In the energetic step of children and in their slightly raised heads, A. S. Makarenko saw a manifestation of the civic pride of a Soviet person.

In the as-yet-unpublished novella *FD-1*, Anton Semenovich wrote: “We worked a lot, studied, polished the facets of our collective, and rejoiced. The communards looked with an equally bright gaze at the sun and at the factory chimneys, because these were immutable elements of living life. The world in their vision was ideally harmonious; it consisted of the sky, the sun, factories, the working class, the Komsomol, and other good, valuable things”.

True pedagogical dialectic, according to A. S. Makarenko, consists in the fact that “a children’s collective must necessarily grow and enrich itself, must see a better tomorrow ahead and strive toward it in a joyful collective effort, in a persistent, cheerful dream”. In revolutionary optimism, he saw the main difference between our pedagogy and reactionary bourgeois pedagogy, which is steeped in a spirit of pessimism and gloom.

A. S. Makarenko laid these thoughts at the foundation of his "theory of tomorrow's joy," which holds great philosophical, political, and pedagogical significance.

The **philosophical significance** of this theory lies in the fact that it expresses the dialectic of the educational process.

The **political significance** consists in the fact that it reflects the victorious movement of our country toward communism.

In **pedagogical terms**, the "theory of tomorrow's joy" means the upbringing of Soviet patriotism, a creative attitude of children toward real life, and its active transformation.

In the "theory of tomorrow's joy," A. S. Makarenko talentedly expressed the interconnection among philosophy, politics, and pedagogy.

Revolutionary vigor never left A. S. Makarenko, even in the difficult moments of his work.

A. S. Makarenko listened attentively to the pulse of the children's collective, deeply grieved signs of slowing down or stopping its growth, and quickly set life in motion by renewing and expanding prospective paths. In *A Pedagogical Poem*, he wrote: "One must not accustom a collective to experience an unclear tension of action, an experience of social helplessness". These remarkable words breathe Stalinist optimism, with a completely unshakable faith in the triumph of the ideas of a socialist collective.

Casting aside any thought of the possibility of a collective feeling its weakness, A. S. Makarenko achieved a high degree of purposeful willpower in his pupils.

Internally composed and disciplined, they courageously endured failures, and their cheerfulness was an expression of a well-educated will.

The principles of socialist humanism and revolutionary optimism in A. S. Makarenko's educational practice express the idea of an unbroken connection between pedagogy and the policy of the Soviet state and the Communist Party.

A. S. Makarenko considered politics to be the indestructible foundation of pedagogy. He wrote on this matter: "The problems of Soviet school upbringing cannot be derived from positions outside Soviet social life and Soviet political history"[171]. In this matter, he made no concessions to either psychology or biology. On the contrary, he believed that "...no pedagogical means can be derived syllogistically from the positions of whatever science"[172], and that "such a conclusion, at best, will be an apolitical conclusion, and very often a politically harmful one"[173].

To designate the unbroken connection between pedagogy and politics, A. S. Makarenko widely uses in his writings the term "pedagogical logic," understanding by it a way of thinking that correctly reflects in pedagogy the principles and traditions of our society. In a letter to one of the staff members of the F. E. Dzerzhinsky Commune, A. S. Makarenko wrote: "What is pedagogical theory? It is the formulation of aspirations, tensions, principles, and views that exist in society in the sphere of requirements for personality".

The tasks of pedagogy and the content of communist education are determined by the policy of the Communist Party and Soviet power. But, on the other hand, as is demonstrated with great depth in A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical system, pedagogy in turn becomes a powerful factor in building communism.

---

171 A. S. Makarenko, *Pedagogical Works*, 1948, p. 36.

172 *Ibid.*

173 *Ibid.*

In the novella *FD-1*, Anton Semenovich notes: "The March of the year 1930! That was a happy, carefree time for the communards. That was the year when we, on some microscopic sector of the common Soviet front, were doing our own small work and were happy".

A. S. Makarenko felt this politically important thought with particular sharpness when the A. M. Gorky Colony marched on a field trip through the village of Podvorki to the Kuryazh Monastery to merge with another colony. Met with hostile looks from the population of Podvorki, which consisted of religious cult figures and monastery servants, Anton Semenovich understood the full significance of this march. He wrote on this account in *A Pedagogical Poem*: "Right here, on the streets of Podvorki, I suddenly clearly understood the great historical significance of our march, although it expressed only one of the molecular phenomena of our era. My concept of the Gorky Colony was suddenly freed from objective forms and pedagogical coloring. All that remained were pure people, people of a new experience and a new human standing on the plains of the Earth. And I suddenly realized that our colony was performing now, albeit a small, but sharply political, truly socialist task".

Throughout his entire work, A. S. Makarenko was guided by the principle of *partiinost'* (party spirit/loyalty) in pedagogy. He waged an uncompromising struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois pedagogical theories hostile to Marxism that were being uncritically transferred into Soviet pedagogy.

This struggle proceeded in three directions: 1) against the anarcho-individualistic theory of free upbringing; 2) against the fatalism preached by pedology; 3) against the philistine romanticization of child homelessness.

Proponents of the theory of free upbringing asserted that upbringing is a process of unfolding a child's spiritual powers inherently placed in them by nature. The role of an educator in free upbringing is merely to clear the path for a self-developing child. In doing so, pedagogical guidance over the child's development is completely excluded. A. S. Makarenko exposed the petty-bourgeois essence of the theory of free upbringing and proved the incompatibility of its main premises with the principle of Bolshevik exactingness in upbringing.

No less severe blows did he deliver to the pseudoscience of pedology. After the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) [VKP(b)], in its well-known decree of July 4, 1936, exposed the reactionary nature of pedology and its main law—the law of the fatalistic conditioning of children's destinies by biological and social factors, the influence of heredity, and some unalterable environment—A. S. Makarenko's critical speeches took on a sharply pronounced political character. He wrote: "...Pedology was built on upbringing in the absence of political goals. But in reality, it was a policy hostile to us"[174].

Finally, A. S. Makarenko debunked the philistine theory of an allegedly permanently existing "homeless society" consisting of thieves and drunkards, who were supposedly characterized by a special, street-level ideology of anarchists and destroyers.

The ideological opponents of A. S. Makarenko attempted to accuse him of deviating from Marxism. They pointed out, for example, Anton Semenovich's adherence to the organic theory of society. To "prove" this premise, they referred to the fact that in A. S. Makarenko's works, the collective is depicted as an organism that defends itself, assimilates, and acts with the help of organs, etc.

---

[174] A. S. Makarenko, *Pedagogical Works*, 1948, pp. 211–212.

But to any impartial person it is clear that these are merely artistic images with which Anton Semenovich operated, without attributing to them the significance of scientific concepts. In reality, A. S. Makarenko waged a most uncompromising struggle against biologism in pedagogy. Let us quote from his numerous statements on this matter at least the following passage from *Experience of a Methodology for the Work of a Children's Labor Colony*: "What is a collective? There were attempts to consider a collective as 'a group of interacting individuals, jointly reacting to various stimuli'. Interaction and joint reaction—this is something not even human, not social, which reeks of biology from ten versts away"[175].

A. S. Makarenko considered one of the most important sources for the theoretical enrichment of pedagogy to be the so-called "induction of complete experience". He wrote on this matter: "Only complete experience, verified both in its very course and in its results, only the comparison of complete complexes of experience, can provide us with data for choice and decision"[176].

Being an opponent of all-out inductivism, the flaw of which was noted as far back as Engels in *Dialectics of Nature*, A. S. Makarenko wrote: "In defending the rights of complete experience, we do not spend a single minute defending the exclusive rights of induction"[177]. The most crucial aspect in organizing experience he considered to be its class content, i.e., that which "...comes not from pedagogy, but from politics, and which must be organically linked with pedagogy"[178].

---

[175] A. S. Makarenko, *Pedagogical Works*, 1948, pp. 92 and 94.
[176] *Ibid.*, p. 102.
[177] *Ibid.*, p. 103.
[178] *Ibid.*, p. 102.

Pedagogical logic must proceed from the regularities of the development of Soviet society—such is the ideological and political content of the issue under consideration.

From the perspective of pedagogical logic, A. S. Makarenko's attitude toward questions of the psychology of upbringing also becomes clear.

First of all, it should be noted that Anton Semenovich was an enemy of so-called psychological prerequisites that impose shackles on the development of pedagogy. He believed that upbringing cannot be built upon a preconceived psychological idea. However, every pedagogical phenomenon has a specific psychological content, the uncovering of which provides essential assistance in educational work.

A. S. Makarenko did not deny the importance of psychology, but he believed that "...knowledge of psychology, knowledge of the child's soul, knowledge of each individual person will only help us apply our method most conveniently in one case, and somewhat differently in another"[179].

The problem of the communist personality is a central problem in the pedagogical heritage of A. S. Makarenko. Naturally, his psychological interests lay primarily in this area.

Proceeding from the tasks of communist upbringing of children, A. S. Makarenko enriched the doctrine of the psychological properties of personality with new ideological content. In his works, one can find a multitude of bold and creative formulations on these issues, which should become the subject of close attention for our psychologists. Here, for example, is what Anton Semenovich writes about need: "Need for us is a twin sister to duty, obligation, and ability; it is a manifestation of the interests not of a consumer of public

[179] A. S. Makarenko, *Pedagogical Works*, 1948, p. 211.

goods, but of a worker of socialist society, a creator of these goods"[180].

By aligning needs with human abilities, with the sense of duty and obligation of a Soviet citizen, A. S. Makarenko boldly stepped beyond the bounds of the formal classification scheme of personality's psychological properties, as he had in mind the real tasks of educating communist morality.

The pedagogical characteristics of various age groups provided in the works of A. S. Makarenko present exceptional interest from the perspective of psychological content. In all these characteristics, the leading idea is invariably the idea of the communist orientation of personality. Here is a small fragment of a group characterization of boys, uniting all their individual diversity with a common goal in life: "Some dark-complexioned, some rosy-cheeked, some handsome, some not very handsome, some openly trustful, some trustful with irony, some cheerful, some funny-serious, some simply frowning, some frowning through force, but all equally happy, proud of their brigade and their brigade leader, content that they live in the Soviet world with honor and know how to stand up for this honor"[181].

The main pedagogical task that A. S. Makarenko set for himself was the upbringing of well-rounded, politically conscious members of socialist society. An educational system based on combining schooling with productive labor contributed to the resolution of this paramount task. In 1932, Makarenko wrote: "The F. E. Dzerzhinsky Commune knows no gulf between mental and physical labor"[182].

---

180 A. S. Makarenko, *A Book for Parents*, 1937, p. 31.

181 A. S. Makarenko, *Flags on the Towers*, 1939, pp. 130–131.

182 A. S. Makarenko, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, 1946, p. 34.

Comrade Stalin teaches us that only "...a cultural and technical rise of the working class can undermine the foundations of the opposition between mental and physical labor, that only it can ensure that high productivity of labor and that abundance of consumer goods which are necessary in order to begin the transition from socialism to communism"[183].

The F. E. Dzerzhinsky Commune was precisely the kind of educational institution in which the task of training cadres for socialist industry—of a high cultural and technical level, true "commanders of machine tools"—was carried out.

The experience of combining education with productive labor, which took place under conditions of A. S. Makarenko's struggle against false pedagogical theories regarding the priority of production over school and against harmful economic orientations that aimed for enterprise profitability, led him to the deep conviction of the need to subordinate children's productive labor to the educational tasks of the school.

In connection with this, it is necessary to note A. S. Makarenko's sharply negative attitude toward enthusiasm for foreign pedagogical novelties—the complex and project methods, which reduced the role of theory and scientific education in the system of communist upbringing.

A. S. Makarenko did not want to simplify the task of the general education school by "complexifying" teaching with vocational training, as he understood perfectly well that only in the process of systematic mastery of the fundamentals of science are the general scientific principles of modern industrial production revealed, and that high intellectual culture achieved which is necessary for a conscious worker of socialist

[183] J. V. Stalin, *Speech at the First All-Union Conference of Stakhanovites*, 1935, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 496.

industry. School and production, in Anton Semenovich's words, must represent a "polytechnically harmonious unity". Therefore, he merely supplemented the tasks of the general education school with the teaching of specialized disciplines aimed at improving the vocational training of the communards.

Deeply conscious of the educational policy of the Soviet state and the Communist Party, A. S. Makarenko wrote: "*Education in our country is part of its life; it has ceased to be the erudition of a consumer of life and has become a weapon of the creator of life*"[184].

Even during the formation period of his pedagogical system, Anton Semenovich noted the role played by the school in educating children in communist consciousness. In *A Pedagogical Poem*, the following is written about this: "Our school studies gave a great deal to the colonists and greatly deepened their political education. The colonists already proudly recognized themselves as proletarians and perfectly understood the difference between their position and the position of rural youth"[185].

Among the many thoughts expressed by A. S. Makarenko in connection with the resolutions of the 18th Congress of the VKP(b), his words about the school attract attention due to their depth and expressiveness: "The school must fight for communism with the same will, with the same courage, with the same intensity as our entire society"[186].

Clear political tasks were put forward by A. S. Makarenko before his pupils in the area of productive labor. It is sufficient to point out, for example, that during the design of a factory in the commune—equipped according to the latest word in

---

184 A. S. Makarenko, *Pedagogical Works*, 1948, p. 264.

185 A. S. Makarenko, *A Pedagogical Poem*, 1947, p. 210.

186 A. S. Makarenko, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, 1946, p. 44.

technology—among other pedagogical requirements, it was specified that the item produced must be in short supply for the Soviet market and free us in some way from foreign dependency. Therefore, the subsequent development of manufacturing electric drills of the American pattern and manufacturing 35mm film cameras of the German "Leica" type took place in an atmosphere of exceptional patriotic enthusiasm and political consciousness among the communards. It is interesting to note that as a result of the production activity of the pupils, led by the Komsomol organization, the production of more advanced, non-sparking electric drills was mastered in the F. E. Dzerzhinsky Commune.

In a 1935 memorandum to the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR, A. S. Makarenko pointed out the contradiction that existed in the pedagogical practice of children's colonies between the content of political-educational work and the nature of children's productive labor. He wrote that we tell our pupils about industrialization, about Dneprostroy, about automobile plants, and give them newspapers in which they read about technology, rationalization, and construction sites, but at the same time we force them to "twist pitch-thread".

The necessity of organizing a technically advanced production system was justified by A. S. Makarenko also by the fact that this production was meant to serve as a means of connecting the collective of colonists with Soviet life.

One of the remarkable results achieved by A. S. Makarenko in the process of productive labor of adolescents and youth should be considered the upbringing of communist morality based on the proper organization of production behavior and the instilling of production culture habits. With admiration, A. S. Makarenko spoke of this side of the educational process in his lecture "On Communist Education and Behavior": "How can

there be any talk of damaging a machine tool! A speck on a machine tool, uncleaned shavings shouldn't exist. And I saw that the problem of a speck on a machine tool is a moral question, it is ethics. The ethics of a new person, still young, who hasn't taken this ethics from our society, this new human soul, which sees in a machine tool, in work, a kind of banner for behavior"[187].

A distinctive trait of the communards was their sufficient independence in production, which came as a result of raising their overall production-technical culture and uniting the collective on the basis of fulfilling economic and political tasks. This was felt especially vividly in the mechanical shop, about which A. S. Makarenko wrote the following lines in *The March of the Year 1930*: "Nowhere are gathered so many real communards who have gone through our entire school—vigorous, cheerful, hardworking, and successful—as in the bench-fitting mechanical shop. The overwhelming majority here are Komsomol members. Here at every machine tool lives young, self-assured working thought. In everything, at every step, in every cubic centimeter of air, one feels here that a strong, unshakably self-confident collective of boys has stood at the head of the shop—without any resolutions, without protocols, and almost without speeches, solely thanks to their consciousness and cohesion"[188].

With particular force, the ideological and political single-mindedness of A. S. Makarenko manifested itself in matters of educating communist morality. Anton Semenovich devoted his entire pedagogical activity to raising ardent patriots of the socialist Motherland, and following the instructions of the 18th Congress of the VKP(b) regarding the decisive significance of

---

[187] A. S. Makarenko, *Pedagogical Works*, 1948, p. 66.

[188] "A Writer's Word," 1939, p. 212.

communist education for the successful completion of building socialism and the gradual transition from socialism to communism, he deepened even further into the theoretical elaboration of questions regarding the upbringing of communist morality.

Combining within himself the talent of an educator and a writer, Anton Semenovich wrote to the 18th Congress of the VKP(b) in a collection of statements by Soviet writers: "In the theses of Comrade Molotov's report, our serious attention is drawn to the difficulties facing our tasks. And, perhaps, the main difficulty is located in that sector which is, to a certain extent, entrusted to our writing detachment—in the matter of communist education of the working people, in the matter of combating the vestiges of capitalism."

"It is precisely in this sector that grandiose work lies ahead for 'engineers of human souls'... Those souls that must grow, bloom, act, and conquer, which above all are obligated to be not only beautiful creative souls, but also souls of beautiful, happy people—these will be the souls of the new humanity, the humanity of communism"[189].

Following the teachings of the founders of Marxism-Leninism regarding the class nature of ideology, A. S. Makarenko subjected bourgeois morality to merciless criticism, pointing out its idealistic and religious-mystical basis. A characteristic feature of religious morality, serving as an ideological weapon of the bourgeoisie, is, on the one hand, its refinement, and on the other hand, its cynicism. "Such a moral system was necessary so that class oppression, widespread and uninhibited exploitation, could exist with a 'clear conscience' and with the greatest success".

---

[189] A. S. Makarenko, *Pedagogical Works*, 1948, p. 57.

But the main thing consists in the fact that bourgeois morality of gain and acquisitiveness, preaching individualism and egoism, continues to live in the consciousness of people as a vestige of capitalism, governing their actions. "Much has been done," said A. S. Makarenko, "to destroy these vestiges, but a great deal of work still lies ahead for their final overcoming. It is necessary to develop a harmonious and practically realizable system of communist morality, guided by the teaching of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Certain moral concepts must be excluded from our usage (for example, all-forgiveness), others must be revised (for example, jealousy), and a third group must be introduced into the system of communist morality (for example, punctuality). ...Ideological integrity and purity of communist ethics will facilitate and accelerate our victory over the vestiges of capitalism"[190].

A. S. Makarenko always examined questions of moral and political education in an unbroken connection. Therefore, it is more accurate to speak of moral-political education in Makarenko's system, which he carried out, above all, in conditions of collective labor life.

Anton Semenovich believed that a "children's collective is a phenomenon of Soviet reality, that to a children's collective as a cell of socialist society, all the features of any other collective are inherent. Therefore, the first sign of organization in a children's collective should be considered its moral-political unity, constituting the indestructible power of the entire Soviet people."

Considering discipline in Soviet society as a moral and political phenomenon, A. S. Makarenko noted the necessity of raising in children not only a discipline of obedience, but also a discipline of overcoming. This idea of Anton Semenovich

---

[190] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

responds directly to the tasks of raising conscious and active builders of communism.

In precisely the same way, A. S. Makarenko pointed out the special nature of punishment in the Soviet system of upbringing. Every punishment must express the demand of the collective toward an individual who has violated common interests. Concrete forms of its application include public reprimand, removal from the collective, a labor detail to make up for the infringed interests of the collective, deprivation of the right to participate in common joy, etc. Even the anger of a teacher, protesting on behalf of the collective against disorder, can serve as a punishment. Punishment works only where a collective exists. Therefore, the primary task of an educator consists in properly organizing the children's collective so that every pupil values their position in the collective and reckons with public opinion.

Thus, punishment in the practice of A. S. Makarenko's work met one of the main requirements of communist morality—subordinating personal interests to public ones, the ability to see one's personal good in the common good.

The logic of punishment in the Soviet system of education, developed by A. S. Makarenko on the basis of the principle of Bolshevik exactingness, stands in sharp contrast to the logic of punishment in pre-revolutionary and modern bourgeois schools, which is based on the idea of vengeance and expiation of sin through suffering.

Let us focus on one more issue covered by A. S. Makarenko with great ideological and political depth—the issue of family upbringing.

Anton Semenovich believed that the Soviet family represents a collective. This is the main feature of the Soviet family, free from the corrupting influence of private property on intra-

family relations. Spouses are united by genuine human love, a community of civic interests, and care for the communist upbringing of children.

However, as A. S. Makarenko points out in *A Book for Parents*, in some cases a "physical collapse" or "chemical decomposition" of the family can occur.

"Physical collapse" is possible in cases where the family is small, if it consists of three members. To preserve the family collective, it is necessary for the family to be large. A. S. Makarenko provides well-founded arguments in favor of upbringing in a large family. His pedagogical ideas coincide fully with the policy of the Soviet state, which legislatively encourages mothers of large families.

"Chemical decomposition" occurs in divorces. Children become victims of the parents' personal relationships. After a divorce, their upbringing takes place in an extremely complex setting. Lacking the ability to delve into the relations of their parents, children maneuver between father and mother as best they can. A splitting of the child's soul occurs. A. S. Makarenko calls upon parents to overcome the causes of divorce and preserve the family for the sake of the children's future.

All this testifies once again to the fact that A. S. Makarenko knew how to combine the tasks of pedagogy with the tasks of policy very subtly.

Without claiming an exhaustive coverage of the presented topic, we wish merely to note that no matter what part of A. S. Makarenko's educational system we take, we invariably find in it a deep ideological and political foundation.

A. M. Gorky, upon becoming acquainted with A. S. Makarenko, remarked that in appearance he resembled a

military officer and a rural teacher from among the "ideological ones"[191].

The deep ideality of A. S. Makarenko attracts the attention of our foreign friends. From the countries of the new democracy, we receive a large number of letters with queries about the life, pedagogical, and literary activity of A. S. Makarenko.

The fascist barbarians burned with fear and hatred, during the occupation of Riga, the works of A. S. Makarenko that breathe communist truth.

Soviet educators and progressive teachers across the entire world will learn from the bright example of A. S. Makarenko's life and pedagogical activity how to serve the cause of the communist education of the growing generation.

"Soviet Pedagogy", 1949, No. 3.

[191] Journal *Our Achievements*, 1929, No. 2.

CONTENT, ORGANIZATION, AND METHODS OF EDUCATIONAL WORK IN THE SOVIET SCHOOL

Prof. V. S. SHEVKIN

ON COMMUNIST MORALITY AND EDUCATION

Our Soviet society, led by the Bolshevik Party, successfully carrying out the plan of the post-war Stalinist five-year plan, is taking new steps forward along the path of gradual transition from socialism to communism.

The decisive condition for the further strengthening and development of the socialist social order is the upbringing of all Soviet people in the spirit of communist consciousness, elevating the level of their ideological armament.

Communist education of the growing generation holds exceptionally important significance for our socialist society. *The upbringing of the young generation of Soviet people in the spirit of communist morality, well-rounded, highly principled, vigorous, believing in their cause, capable of overcoming difficulties, is one of the necessary conditions for the further growth of the strength and might of our socialist Motherland*.

Successful theoretical development and practical resolution of issues regarding upbringing in the young generation of communist morality are possible only on the basis of mastering Marxism-Leninism, the teaching of Lenin and Stalin on the laws of socialist construction, and the laws of building a communist society.

Marx and Engels were the first to give a scientific explanation of the phenomena of human moral life. In creating a proletarian worldview—fundamentally new compared to previous teachings—they showed that the moral prescriptions followed by people stem from the practical conditions of societal life and are determined, in the final analysis, by the properties of the economic social order. Morality, like law, science, politics,

etc., constitutes one of the forms of social consciousness that undergoes changes alongside the development of society. There are no moral principles that would have force under any historical conditions. Rejecting the eternal and immutable character of moral principles, Marx and Engels established that under the conditions of each socio-economic formation, specific moral requirements inherently arise and exist out of necessity, regulating human behavior in society. In societies built upon an antagonistic mode of production, morality inevitably assumes a class character. A revolutionary role in historical movement is played by that system of morality which expresses the interests of progressive forces in society. And, conversely, a morality expressing the interests of reactionary forces holds back social development.

Marx and Engels showed that the bourgeois morality dominant in capitalist society arose on the soil of capitalist production relations and serves the interests of the bourgeois class. Bourgeois ideologists, in order to strengthen the class dominance of the bourgeoisie, created the illusion of the eternity of bourgeois morality.

The founders of Marxism showed that in capitalist society, alongside bourgeois morality, there arises and develops the morality of the working class, which corresponds to its special living conditions of existence and its historical role. Proletarian morality is formed in the process of the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and serves the cause of this struggle.

Being the most advanced type of morality in a class society, proletarian morality expresses the aspirations of all progressive humanity. However, under capitalism, the morality of the working class cannot acquire universal significance for all

people, because directed against its spread are not only all the means of ideological influence on the part of the ruling classes, but also bourgeois state power.

Therefore, the main condition for the development of proletarian morality is the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. *"Revolution is necessary not only because the ruling class cannot be overthrown in any other way, but also because…"*

overthrowing class can only in a revolution cleanse itself of all the filth of the old society and become capable of creating a new society" (Marx and Engels).

The works of V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, in which Marxist theory received its further development, are at the same time the richest treasure trove of ideas on questions of morality and the moral upbringing of youth in Soviet society.

In the book *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*, V. I. Lenin, subjecting Narodnik ideology as a whole to devastating criticism, exposes the reactionary essence of the Narodniks' views in the field of ethics.

A prominent representative of Narodnikism, Mikhailovsky, who attempted to criticize Marxist theory from the standpoint of subjective sociology, placed the recognition of free will at the center of his unscientific reasoning. According to his reactionary views, individual actions are not conditioned by any causes, but are the result of impulses of free will. Mikhailovsky tried to portray the matter as if Marxist theory—which explains the phenomena of social life through objective laws and recognizes historical necessity—denies the importance of ideals, individual activity, and morality. He elaborated in every way an invented conflict between

determinism and morality, between historical necessity and the importance of the individual.

V. I. Lenin, devastatingly refuting Mikhailovsky's assertions, shows that the reactionateness of subjective sociology lies in the fact that it takes as the basis of historical events only the ideational motives of individual activity, and therefore reduces the whole history of humanity to a sum of accidents. In reality, history represents a lawful, necessary process that does not depend on individual arbitrariness. Exposing Mikhailovsky's idealism, V. I. Lenin concludes: “The idea of determinism, which postulates that human actions are necessary and rejects the absurd fable about free will, in no way destroys either human reason, human conscience, or the appraisal of human actions. Quite the contrary, only the deterministic view permits a strict and correct appraisal instead of attributing anything one pleases to free will. Similarly, the idea of historical necessity does not in the least undermine the role of the individual in history: all history is made up precisely of the actions of individuals, who are undoubtedly active figures. The real question that arises in assessing the social activity of an individual consists in: under what conditions is the success of this activity guaranteed? what guarantees that this activity will not remain an isolated act, drowning in a sea of opposite acts?”[192]

Analyzing this question, V. I. Lenin convincingly shows that the freedom of human activity means nothing other than the ability to manage one's behavior based on knowledge of the laws of development of the objective world. And the truer these convictions and views reflect reality, the freer human activity itself becomes.

---

[192] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th ed., Vol. I, p. 142.

Confusing the deterministic view of the will with fatalism, Mikhailovsky attributed the latter to Marxism. In reality, however, as Lenin proves, Marxism discards both the idealistic recognition of the absolute freedom of human will and the assertion of the fatal conditioning of human actions. Exposing the groundlessness of Mikhailovsky's indeterminist point of view, Lenin at the same time emphasizes that "determinism not only does not assume fatalism, but on the contrary, provides precisely the basis for reasonable action"[193]. Under both indeterminism and fatalism, the lawfulness of human actions is excluded.

The moral assessment of human behavior in society arises not because the will is free, as Mikhailovsky tried to portray, but because it is necessary as a means of regulating relationships between people and their behavior. It is not the individual's will that determines moral actions, but the practical conditions of life, reflected in moral norms, that induce people to act in a certain direction.

V. I. Lenin, using concrete examples of the development of capitalism in Russia, shows how a change in economic relations inevitably entails a change in people's moral convictions and in the assessment of human actions.

Exposing the petty-bourgeois essence of Narodnikism and its critique of capitalism, V. I. Lenin consistently carries out the Marxist view that morality is a historical phenomenon and that the replacement of one socio-economic formation by another also causes a change in morality. At the same time, under the conditions of a class society, the moral assessment of human actions acquires a class character. Every class, depending on its conditions of life, develops its own system of morality.

---

193 *Ibid.*, p. 400.

The ideational defeat of Narodnikism contributed to the development of Marxism in Russia.

The highest moral duty of the advanced people of Russia at that time was the class struggle on the side of the proletariat against tsarist autocracy and the bourgeoisie. "...Reality," wrote Lenin, "demands struggle, demands that everyone who does not wish to be an involuntary or voluntary henchman of the bourgeoisie should stand on the side of the proletariat"[194].

In the light of this idea, one must consider V. I. Lenin's remark on the question of the relationship of Marxism to ethics. He wrote: "...in theoretical terms, he (Marxism.—*V. Sh.*) subordinates the 'ethical point of view' to the 'principle of causality'; in practical terms, he reduces it to class struggle"[195]. V. I. Lenin points out here that human feelings, views, and volitional movements do not arise by themselves, but are causally conditioned; that is, they are included as a link in the overall causal chain, without being an exception to the entire infinite series of manifestations of a single material world. In philosophical language, the question of the conditioning of the ideational motives of human behavior by objective causes is the question of the relationship between subject and object, consciousness and matter. Bourgeois thinkers could not answer this question correctly. They either completely severed human consciousness from matter, or identified consciousness with matter, or, finally, slid into dualism. Only Marxism gave a scientific answer to this question. Marx and Engels were the first to prove that human consciousness, as a property of highly organized matter, and the objective world constitute a unity that is manifested and realized in the sensory objective practice of people, in their social-productive activity.

---

194 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th ed., Vol. I, p. 277.

195 *Ibid.*, p. 400.

"Integral and indivisible nature, expressed in two different forms—in material and ideal; integral and indivisible social life, expressed in two different forms—in material and ideal,—this is how we must view the development of nature and social life.

Such is the monism of materialistic theory"[196].

Regarding Lenin's remark that in practical terms Marxism reduces ethical views to the class struggle, the following must be said. V. I. Lenin, proceeding from the Marxist understanding of the essence of morality, points out that the criterion, the yardstick of moral assessment of people's behavior in an antagonistic society lies in the class struggle, which is an expression of the antagonistic mode of production. The working class, in its revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, develops the norms of its proletarian morality that correspond to its historical role and tasks. Under capitalism, the content of proletarian morality was drawn precisely from the class struggle of the working masses for their liberation, and consisted in an unquenchable desire to destroy capitalism, in hatred toward it, accompanied by a selfless struggle against it. Therefore, Lenin, addressing the youth in 1920, pointed out that "for the previous generation the task came down to overthrowing the bourgeoisie. At that time, the main task was the critique of the bourgeoisie, the development of hatred against it among the masses, the development of class consciousness, the ability to rally one's forces"[197].

V. I. Lenin, fighting against the idealistic voluntaristic understanding of morality, at the same time exposes fatalistic bourgeois objectivism. Struve, in his dispute with the

---

[196] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. I, pp. 312–313.

[197] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 409.

Narodniks, preached the reactionary view of the alleged existence of "...insurmountable historical tendencies which, as such, should serve, on the one hand, as a starting point, and on the other, as mandatory limits for the purposeful activity of individuals and social groups"[198].

In Struve's portrayal, the allegedly existing "insurmountable tendencies" in the historical process, like "fate" or "destiny", predetermine everything and reduce to zero the

significance of the individual and social groups. V. I. Lenin decisively criticizes Struve, showing that he, as opposed to a Marxist who explains the development of capitalist society through class struggle that determines the course of events, takes a position of defending capitalism. If Mikhailovsky portrayed history as the result of the arbitrary will of heroes, Struve denied any significance of the individual in social life. Both points of view are unscientific and reactionary.

Of world-historical importance are the works of V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin in which they developed the ideological, organizational, and tactical foundations of the Bolshevik Party —a party of a new type. In these works, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, ruthlessly fighting against Russian "Economists", anarchists, and Mensheviks, as well as against international opportunism, enriched Marxism with new ideas illuminating the path of the working class's struggle to create a new society. The ideas of V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin were a vital condition for the development of the revolutionary movement and a factor in forming proletarian morality within the working class.

Of exceptionally crucial importance for the fates of Marxism is V. I. Lenin's brilliant classical work *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*. In this book, V. I. Lenin developed the theoretical

198 Lenin. *Works*, 4th ed., Vol. I, p. 380.

foundations of the Bolshevik Party, thoroughly smashed the reactionary views of Russian Machists and their teachers—Mach and Avenarius—and from the standpoint of dialectical materialism summarized the achievements of science at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, primarily in the field of natural science.

The greatest service of V. I. Lenin lies in the fact that he exposed to its deep roots the reactionary essence of empirio-criticism and, through his exposing critique, knocked from the hands of the enemies of Marxism the weapon directed against the revolutionary Marxist worldview. The Russian Machists used empirio-criticism not by accident. It was precisely in this idealistic philosophical trend that they found the weapon sharpest-honed by bourgeois philosophers for the struggle against the Russian revolution.

Preaching subjective idealism mixed with agnosticism to please reaction, Mach, and after him his Russian followers (Machists), interpreted the question of the relation between freedom and necessity in a deeply unscientific spirit. The solution to this question is of paramount importance in the elaboration of ethical problems.

Mach put forward the claim that the deterministic point of view is allegedly limited only to the realm of "investigation," whereas in the realm of morality and social activity the question is left to "subjective" evaluation. Mach resolves issues of social life in a voluntaristic manner, i.e., he portrays it as a product of human will. Russian Machists accepted this view, which is hostile to Marxism, as the last word in science.

V. I. Lenin, exposing the Machists, reveals the gnoseological foundations for solving the question of the relation between freedom and necessity. He shows that Marxism proceeds from the recognition that the laws of the world around us and the

necessity of nature exist independently of human consciousness and will. "...The necessity of nature is primary, and human's will and consciousness—secondary. The latter must inevitably and necessarily adapt to the former..."[199] By comprehending the laws of real existence, necessity, we become masters of nature. It is not our will that calls necessity into existence, the laws of nature, as Machists portrayed it; rather, the laws of nature and necessity determine our will. Will is human's ability to direct their actions. And a human acts all the freer, the more accurately world is reflected in their consciousness. The criterion that our knowledge correctly reflects reality and that our volitional impulses coincide with the direction in which nature develops is practice, the social-productive activity of people. If practical activity leads to results theoretically expected, it means that our knowledge of nature is correct, and volitional impulses correspond to the direction of movement of reality itself. But from this it follows that the source of morality, the yardstick of moral assessments of human behavior, is rooted not in the properties of the human will, but in the conditions of people's social life.

These propositions of V. I. Lenin, with which he enriches the teachings of Marx and Engels on morality, lie at the basis of the Leninist doctrine on the essence of communist morality.

The essence of communist morality is comprehensively revealed by V. I. Lenin in his historic speech at the 3rd Congress of the Russian Young Communist League (RKSM) on October 2, 1920, which is a programmatic document in the field of the communist upbringing of young generations.

In this speech, V. I. Lenin first of all answers affirmatively to the question of whether communist morality exists. Enemies of the working class tried in every way, through false statements

---

[199] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XIII, p. 155.

having no basis under them, to attribute to Marxism the denial of morality.

"Often," says Lenin, "the matter is presented in such a way that we have no morality of our own, and very often the bourgeoisie accuses us, communists, of denying all morality. This is a method of substituting concepts, throwing dust in the eyes of workers and peasants"[200].

Neo-Kantians and supporters of a whole series of other reactionary bourgeois schools in philosophy and sociology labored particularly hard in this regard. They all asserted with one voice that Marxism supposedly reduces the life of society to the economic factor and therefore denies morality, the importance of goals, ideals, the role of the individual in history, etc. All these fabrications were needed by the ideologists of the bourgeoisie in order to slander Marxism in the eyes of the working people.

Rejecting this slander and falsehood, V. I. Lenin shows the fundamental, essential difference between communist morality and bourgeois morality. Bourgeois theorists, contrary to science, attributed a universally binding force for all times and peoples to moral concepts and ideas of good and evil born of the conditions of life in capitalist society.

V. I. Lenin emphasizes that "we reject any such morality taken from extra-human, extra-class concepts"[201].

Showing that bourgeois morality was spread in the interests of strengthening the rule of the exploiter classes, V. I. Lenin reveals the essence of communist morality.

"We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. Our morality is

---

200 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 410.

201 *Ibid.*, p. 410.

derived from the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat"[202]. Here V. I. Lenin expresses the idea, full of deep content, that the moral assessment of the behavior and actions of Soviet people has its source in the class struggle of the proletariat, that the entire direction of the life activity of a Soviet person is determined by the interests of this struggle.

The main task of our state during the period to which V. I. Lenin's speech relates consisted in suppressing the resistance of the overthrown exploiting classes and in strengthening the defense capability of the young Soviet republic. The practical activity of the Soviet people was subordinated to these tasks. "...The task of the struggle of the proletariat," said Lenin, "is not yet finished by the fact that we have overthrown the tsar and driven out the landowners and capitalists; and completing it is precisely the task of the order that we call the dictatorship of the proletariat"[203]. The highest duty, the highest moral obligation of Soviet people is the subordination of their desires and will to the task of the proletariat's struggle to strengthen the Soviet system. "The class struggle continues; it has only changed its forms. It is the class struggle of the proletariat so that the old exploiters cannot return, so that the scattered mass of ignorant peasantry may unite into one alliance. The class struggle continues, and our task is to subordinate all interests to this struggle"[204]. And explaining his thought, V. I. Lenin says: "And we subordinate our communist morality to this task. We say: morality is that which serves the destruction of the old exploiting society and the uniting of all working people around the proletariat, which is creating a new society of communists"[205].

---

202 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 410.

203 *Ibid.*, p. 411.

204 *Ibid.*

205 *Ibid.*

The question of the essence of morality is a question of assessing human behavior in society, one's relationship to other people and to society as a whole. In practical activity, people are directly guided by their feelings, desires wishes, convictions, and goals that they strive to achieve. In doing so, each person evaluates in a certain way behavior and actions—both their own and those of other people. Some actions one approves of or calls good and moral; others one condemns or calls bad or immoral. The question arises: where is the source of this assessment rooted? Why do we call some actions moral and others immoral? Bourgeois ideologists sought this source either in the properties of human consciousness or derived it from divine commandments. Such an understanding of the issue is false and unscientific.

"We say that this is deception, that it is fraud and dulling the minds of workers and peasants in the interests of landowners and capitalists"[206]. Marxism teaches that the criterion for moral assessments of human behavior in society lies in the conditions of people's practical life, in social relations. The feelings, desires, goals, and impulses that directly motivate human actions have objective content. This content is taken not from the sphere of the subject, but from the life of society—ultimately from the economic structure, the mode of production of material goods. Consequently, the rules of human behavior in relation to other people and to society as a whole are a reflection in human consciousness of the real relations formed between them in the process of producing material goods, which constitutes the basis of all social life and development. The totality of such rules forms a system of morality, i.e., norms or rules expressing the assessment of human actions and behavior.

---

206 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 410.

In a class society consisting of antagonistic, hostile classes, there can be no single morality. The moral unity of people is possible only in a socialist society, at the foundation of which lies the socialist mode of production.

In the course of social development, along with a change in the mode of production, people's moral views, their assessment of human behavior, and systems of morality also changed. Marxism-Leninism has scientifically proven that universal human assessments of the concepts of good and evil, good and bad, could not exist in a class society, and that the very concepts of "virtue" and "vice" were filled with the most varied content in different epochs. In capitalist society, alongside the dominant bourgeois morality, proletarian morality begins to form, reflecting protest against capitalist oppression and the drive toward the destruction of capitalism.

It is formed in the process of the proletariat's class struggle against the dominant exploiting classes. The carrier of proletarian morality is the Bolshevik Party. Among the moral qualities formed in the working class even before the proletarian revolution, as its class consciousness develops, are loyalty and devotion to its class, organization, discipline, selflessness, mutual support, hatred for the enemies of its class, and others.

The most important condition for the emergence and development of proletarian morality is the Marxist-Leninist worldview, the science of the laws of social development. The teaching of Marxism-Leninism is the ideational foundation for forming proletarian morality. Mastering Marxist teaching, workers acquire scientific knowledge about the laws of development of capitalism and the proletarian revolution. On the basis of Marxism-Leninism, workers determine their place in the common struggle for the victory of socialism and gain the necessary orientation in their practical revolutionary

activity. Marxist theory allows the working class to link its actions and deeds with the general tasks of the struggle for communism.

Proletarian morality, therefore, stems entirely from the tasks of the working class's struggle against the bourgeoisie and for the creation of a socialist society. Subsequently, the morals and habits developed by the working class over decades of struggle for political freedom become the property of the broad masses of working people.

In his speech "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues," V. I. Lenin reveals the essence of thoroughly false and hypocritical bourgeois morality.

"The old society was based on the principle that either you rob another or another robs you, either you work for another or he works for you, either you are a slave-owner or you are a slave. And it is understandable that people educated in this society absorb, so to speak, with their mother's milk, the psychology, habit, concept—either a slave-owner, or a slave, or a small property owner, a small employee, a small official, an intellectual—in a word, a person who cares only about having their own, and has no concern for others"[207].

In a capitalist society based on private property—which gives rise to competition among commodity producers—there can be no solidarity and harmony among people. Private property does not unite people; it divides them. The interests of the individual and society do not coincide here; they diverge. Under the capitalist system, therefore, a person acts out of personal calculations and personal gain, and may consider the interests of others only to the extent that they touch upon their own vital interests. The very atmosphere, nourished by the juices of

[207] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 412.

private property, gives rise in the people of capitalist society to such repulsive traits of human psychology as individualism, egoism, national strife, greed, avarice, deceit, misanthropy, and so on. The feeling of isolation and the desire for one's own well-being caused by the conditions of life itself are the most characteristic features of the people of capitalist society. "Man is a wolf to man"—this is the main principle of bourgeois morality. Therein lies the essence of bourgeois morality, the establishment of which bourgeois ideologists pass off as eternal principles. Bourgeois morality is thoroughly false because in it, under the guise of supposedly universal human interests and aspirations, self-serving interests and the domination of the exploiting classes are justified.

Extreme hypocrisy constitutes a distinctive feature of bourgeois morality. The immoral behavior of the bourgeoisie in practice is covered up with pompous, false talk about high moral principles. The morality of the reactionary bourgeoisie of our time is in a state of decay. Imperialists deliberately cultivate misanthropy in the people of capitalist society. Chauvinism and racism, the preaching of which takes on wider and wider proportions, serve as vivid evidence of this immorality.

Communist morality in its essence, content, and purpose is radically opposite to bourgeois morality.

Under socialism, which has been built in our country, there is no antagonism in the mode of production. Therefore, there are no economic reasons giving rise to opposing moral and political aspirations and views. Here, relationships between people in the process of production are characterized "...as relationships of comradely cooperation and socialist mutual aid of workers free from exploitation"[208]. On the basis of these

[208] J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 558.

socialist relations of production and the strengthening of socialist ownership of the instruments and means of production, the moral-political unity of the Soviet people arose and develops. In his historical report at the 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Comrade Stalin pointed out that on the basis of the common interests of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia that make up our socialist society, "...driving forces developed such as the moral-political unity of Soviet society, friendship of the peoples of the USSR, and Soviet patriotism"[209]. Consequently, within the very conditions of the material life of socialist society lies the foundation for qualitatively new, unprecedented in human history, genuinely human relations between people.

Here, people are conscious of the laws of movement of their own relations, which previously ruled over them as a blind, elemental force. Only here, under socialism, when people have come to master their own relations, does the individual achieve full freedom and the possibility of boundless intellectual and moral perfection. Here, relations of solidarity and comradely cooperation permeate all aspects of society's life. Only under socialism do personal interests not diverge, but completely coincide with the interests of the whole society. Only under socialism do public interests come to the fore. V. I. Lenin pointed out that in a socialist society, forward movement in all areas of life is possible with the creative participation of the entire population. He said that we will work to eradicate the accursed rule: "Each for himself, and God for all," in order to instill in the daily routine of the masses the rule: "All for one, and one for all.

The socialist revolution means the destruction of all forms of oppression of human by human. It creates a social system in

---

[209] *Ibid.*, p. 589.

which the interests of the individual are harmoniously combined with the interests of the whole society. Corresponding to this system is the new person, who radically differs from the person of capitalist society in feelings, views, convictions, and moral character. Soviet people have a completely different psychological makeup, a different world of ideas, a different attitude toward people, and a different understanding of their moral duties.

Communist morality is the sum of requirements regulating the behavior of Soviet people, requirements that meet the tasks of strengthening and developing the Soviet system, the tasks of the gradual transition from socialism to communism. The source of communist morality is the socialist mode of production.

Thus, communist morality is fundamentally and qualitatively different from all types of morality that have existed in human history. It is radically opposed to bourgeois morality, which is an expression of relations of domination and subordination, relations of exploitation of human by human.

The precepts (requirements) of communist morality express the interests and will of all Soviet people and therefore have binding force for all members of socialist society. The observance by members of socialist society of the requirements of communist morality is one of the conditions for the successful resolution of the tasks of the gradual transition from socialism to communism.

The significance of communist morality consists in the fact that it contributes to the development of socialist society, the growth of its power and strength, the rise of the material and cultural level of the Soviet people, and assists in strengthening the defense capability of our Motherland. Therefore,

upbringing of the young generation in communist morality constitutes the most important task of the Soviet school.

The upbringing of young generations in the spirit of communist morality is the upbringing of new people—people with communist consciousness and a collectivist psychology. The process of forming new human qualities in our country presupposes an unflagging, constant, decisive struggle against all remnants of the old, capitalist society, which are an obstacle on the path to the development of the socialist system.

V. I. Lenin, with exceptional persuasive force, shows that communist morality consists in "...united, solidary discipline and conscious mass struggle against the exploiters. We do not believe in eternal morality, and we expose the falsehood of all fables about morality"[210].

Noting the organizing role of communist morality, V. I. Lenin says: "Communist morality is the morality that serves this struggle, which unites the working people against all exploitation, against all small property, for small property places in the hands of one person that which was created by the labor of the entire society"[211]. And further, emphasizing the thought that "the basis of communist morality is the struggle for the consolidation and completion of communism"[212], he points out: "morality serves to enable human society to rise higher, to get rid of the exploitation of labor"[213].

These remarkable ideas of Lenin were and are being translated into life in our country. In revolutionary struggle, in the practice of socialist construction, the great party of Lenin—Stalin has raised and continues to raise in the Soviet people

---

210 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 413.
211 *Ibid.*, p. 412.
212 *Ibid.*, p. 413.
213 *Ibid.*

such qualities of the new person as were not and could not be known by any other non-Soviet society. Life-giving Soviet patriotism, a socialist attitude toward labor, a sense of friendship among peoples, socialist humanism, a sense of collectivism—these are the remarkable moral traits of Soviet people that elevate them above the people of capitalist "civilization". Comrade Stalin pointed out that "...the ordinary Soviet citizen, free from the chains of capital, stands a head taller than any foreign high-ranking official dragging the yoke of capitalist slavery on his shoulders"[214].

With all depth and power, the greatness of the moral qualities of the Soviet people manifested itself during the Great Patriotic War and manifests itself now, when the country is implementing the grand plans of the post-war Stalinist five-year plan. The Soviet people amazed the world with their moral endurance, heroism, and courage, which were so vividly manifested in selfless labor in the rear and on the front in the struggle against the German fascist invaders. Noting that the labor exploits of the Soviet people in the rear and the unfading martial feats of warriors at the front stem from ardent Soviet patriotism, Comrade Stalin wrote: "The strength of Soviet patriotism lies in the fact that it has as its basis not racial or nationalistic prejudices, but deep devotion and loyalty of the people to their Soviet Motherland, the fraternal partnership of working people of all nations of our country. In Soviet patriotism, national traditions of peoples and common vital interests of all working people of the Soviet Union are harmoniously combined. Soviet patriotism does not divide, but on the contrary, welds all nations and nationalities of our country into a single fraternal family. In this one must see the

[214] J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 590.

bases of the indestructible and ever-strengthening friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union"[215].

V. I. Lenin, speaking about the fact that at the basis of communist morality lies the struggle to build communism, points out: *"This is what constitutes the basis of communist upbringing, education, and learning... This is the answer to the question of how one should learn communism..."*[216] Consequently, the basis of all communist upbringing, education, and learning is the struggle to build a communist society.

And further, noting that youth must educate themselves as communists, V. I. Lenin emphasizes with all force: *"It is necessary that the whole business of training, educating, and teaching modern youth should be the upbringing of communist morality in them"*[217]. As we see, V. I. Lenin subordinates the whole matter of upbringing, education, and teaching to the upbringing of communist morality. From this it follows that the new person, who is raised by a socialist society, is not only a carrier of the most advanced science, technology, and culture, but also, above all, a carrier of new, most progressive socialist relations of production. The entire direction of a Soviet person's life activity, their aspirations, will, and desires are an expression of the struggle to build communism and are determined by the tasks of this struggle.

In our country, where a socialist mode of production has been created that gives scope to the development of productive forces which will satisfy all growing material and cultural needs, the formation of the moral character of Soviet people,

---

[215] J. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, 5th ed., pp. 160–161.

[216] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 413 (italics ours.—*V. Sh.*).

[217] *Ibid.*, pp. 409–410 (italics ours.—*V. Sh.*).

the upbringing in them of feelings, habits, convictions, and rules of behavior meeting the requirements of communist morality, is one of the most important tasks. The knowledge, experience, and skill with which the Soviet school arms the younger generation of Soviet people have their full significance only if they contribute to the upbringing of communist morality.

Communist morality is a set of requirements and norms regulating the behavior and actions of members of socialist society. And their behavior and all practical activity that meets the needs and tasks of the further development of the Soviet system is a necessary condition for the further continuation, renewal, and development of social production.

Thus, the central place in the whole system of preparing young generations into genuine creators and defenders of socialist society is occupied by the upbringing of communist morality.

Comrade Stalin in 1925, in his answers to questions asked by the editors of the newspaper *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, pointed out: "It is necessary that every Komsomol activist link their daily work in all areas of building society with the perspective of building a socialist society. It is necessary that they be able to conduct their daily work in the spirit and direction of realizing this perspective"[218].

The activity of the Soviet school is not limited to the task of arming the young generation with knowledge and passing on to it the experience of older generations. Communist upbringing means the formation in youth of communistic consciousness, communist morality, the development in them of Bolshevik character traits and will, arming them with systematic knowledge, understanding the scientific foundations of

[218] J. V. Stalin, *On Youth*, Partizdat, 1936, p. 178.

production, the ability to apply knowledge in life, as well as developing aesthetic feelings and physical strength in youth. Mastering science allows one to know the laws of development of nature and human society. On the basis of mastering the fundamentals of science, the only scientific, Marxist-Leninist worldview is formed. In the process of upbringing, emotions are formed, thinking develops, convictions, views, etc., take shape. The ideational foundation of communist morality is the Marxist-Leninist worldview. "In order to be a firm communist," wrote M. I. Kalinin, "one requires above all a firm communist worldview"[219].

Traits of communist morality that the Soviet school is called upon to raise in the younger generation are: Soviet patriotism, a socialist attitude toward labor and public property, socialist discipline, comradely solidarity, honesty and truthfulness, endurance and fortitude, courage and bravery, determination in overcoming difficulties, modesty, adherence to principles, a sense of Soviet national pride, and high adherence to ideas.

The Soviet school must raise in the young generation a sense of friendship among the peoples of the Soviet Union, a sense of patriotic pride in the successes of the Soviet system, and an awareness that the young generation is called upon to continue building the most perfect state in the world and the most advanced socialist culture. In a word, the school must raise from the young generation people whose moral character, knowledge, and culture are at the level of the requirements and tasks of the gradual transition from socialism to communism. It must "...raise a new generation that is cheerful, believing in its cause, not afraid of obstacles, ready to overcome any obstacles"[220]. The Soviet school, being a powerful factor in the

---

[219] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Upbringing*, 1945, p. 18.

[220] From the decree of the Central Committee of the AUCP(b) of August 14, 1946, "On the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*", *Pravda*, August 21, 1946.

communist upbringing of the younger generation, is guided in its activity by the policy of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state, which is the vital foundation of the Soviet system.

V. I. Lenin pointed out that "...together with the transformation of the old capitalist society, the teaching, training, and education of the new generations who will create communist society cannot be the old ones"[221]. Developing further the idea that communism is built from the material and sum of knowledge left to us by the old society, he notes: "Only by radically transforming the business of teaching, organization, and upbringing of youth will we be able to ensure that the result of the efforts of the young generation is the creation of a society unlike the old, i.e., a communist society"[222].

V. I. Lenin in his speech shows that learning communism means knowing how to "...take for oneself the entire sum of human knowledge and take it in such a way that communism is not something learned by rote for you, but is something thought through by yourselves, is those conclusions that are inevitable from the point of view of modern education"[223]. Vividly and in detail characterizing the limitations of the bourgeois school, V. I. Lenin notes that the most repulsive feature of bourgeois society is the rift between theory and practice, between book and life. This rift between theory and practice is completely intolerable in a socialist society. Therefore, in the process of upbringing, new generations must, while mastering all modern knowledge, "...turn communism into a guide for your practical work"[224].

---

221 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 403.
222 *Ibid.*, p. 404.
223 *Ibid.*, p. 408.
224 *Ibid.*, p. 409.

Upbringing of the young generations means preparing conscious, well-armed with modern knowledge, and highly principled participants in the great socialist construction. "Without drawing the entire mass of working and peasant youth into this construction, you will not build a communist society"[225].

Analyzing in detail the question of educating youth in the spirit of communist morality, V. I. Lenin shows with exhaustive completeness that the young generation can learn communism only by linking every step of its study, upbringing, and education with the continuous struggle of the proletarians and working people against the old exploiting society"[226].

V. I. Lenin emphasizes with special force that "...our school must give the youth the fundamentals of knowledge, give the ability to work out communist views for themselves, must make educated people out of them. It must, during the time while people are studying in it, make them participants in the struggle for liberation from the exploiters"[227]. And, revealing to the youth the perspectives for the development of the socialist revolution, the struggle for building a communist society, he stresses that it is necessary to learn, "...linking... every step of upbringing, education, and study inseparably with the struggle of all working people against the exploiters"[228].

The deep meaning of this directive of Lenin consists in taking the entire business of educating new generations in inseparable connection with their life, with the urgent tasks of the struggle of our country's working people for communism. The moral convictions of the individual, knowledge, and views acquire

---

225 *Ibid.*

226 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 413.

227 *Ibid.*

228 *Ibid.*, p. 414.

effective, real significance, turning into a motive for conscious, goal-directed behavior, only in practical activity.

In the knowledge of a young man or girl given to them by the school, the surrounding world is reflected. Without knowledge of the laws of development of nature and human society, active participation in building communism is unthinkable in a socialist society. But knowledge taken outside of connection with practical activity loses its meaning. Therefore, V. I. Lenin emphasizes the necessity of an upbringing for young generations that would be organically linked with life, with practical activity.

Only in practical activity does a person test and consolidate their knowledge and convictions; in it, they also realize them. In practice, consciousness as a law determines the manner and character of human actions and subjects their will to itself.

"To be members of the Youth League," says Lenin, "means to conduct matters so as to give one's work, one's ...forces to the common cause. That is what communist upbringing consists in. Only in such work does a young man or girl turn into a real communist. Only if they manage to achieve practical successes in this work do they become communists"[229].

In light of these remarkable instructions of V. I. Lenin, it becomes completely clear to us that the upbringing of new generations in the Soviet school is a process of incorporating them into the multifaceted life of Soviet society and, first and foremost, into labor and production activity. "Only in labor together with workers and peasants can one become real communists"[230].

---

229 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 415.

230 *Ibid.*, p. 416.

The task of educating the Soviet people in the spirit of communist consciousness, raising their ideational level, stems from the fundamental needs of the development of our socialist society.

The founders of Marxism pointed out that with the elimination of capitalism, the prehistory of human society ends and its true history begins. Under the conditions of socio-economic formations preceding socialism, social life was governed by elemental laws that manifested themselves regardless of human will and consciousness. The action of these laws led to consequences that people could not foresee.

V. I. Lenin wrote: "It has never been the case, nor is it now, that members of society imagined the sum total of those social relations under which they live as something definite, integral, imbued with some principle; on the contrary, the mass adapts unconsciously to these relations and to such an extent has no idea of them as special historical social relations that, for example, an explanation of exchange relations under which people lived for many centuries was given only in the most recent time"[231].

The Great October Socialist Revolution marked the beginning of a new era in history, when the development of productive forces and production relations is subordinated to conscious guidance by society itself. Under socialism, people themselves, on the basis of knowledge of the laws of social development, manage their own social relations and consciously create their history. Influencing the process of historical development presupposes the active creative participation in it of all the working masses, guided by the Communist Party. Therefore, the communist consciousness of the entire Soviet people and the constant increase in their ideational equipment become the

[231] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 122.

decisive condition for the flourishing of the power and strength of our socialist state.

The socialist mode of production created in our country is the highest type of social production, the most progressive compared to all that existed before. This mode of production gives full scope to the development of productive forces at accelerated rates.

It is known that the material-technical basis of the socialist economic system is large-scale machine production. Over the years of the socialist state's existence, branches of the national economy have been equipped with first-class machine technology. The gradual transition from socialism to communism in our country will mean the development of productive forces to such a level that will allow producing in abundance the material goods necessary to satisfy society's needs. Achieving such a stage of development presupposes preparing from the young generations members of society who are highly cultured and master all achievements of modern science. People—creators of history—are the most important element of the society's productive forces.

"...Development and improvement of instruments of production were carried out by people who had a relation to production, and not independently of people—consequently, along with the change and development of instruments of production, people, as the most important element of productive forces, also changed and developed; their production experience, their skills for labor, their ability to use instruments of production changed and developed"[232].

Consequently, the question of educating the younger generation is a question of preparing the builders of communist

[232] *History of the CPSU(b). Short Course*, pp. 118–119.

society, armed with advanced science and technology, who have mastered production experience and all the culture of humanity, people with communist consciousness.

Comrade Stalin discovered in the Stakhanovite movement the condition for the transition from socialism to communism. This condition consists in raising the cultural-technical level of the working class to the level of engineering and technical workers. "There are no grounds to doubt that only such a cultural-technical rise of the working class can undercut the foundations of the antithesis between mental labor and physical labor, that only it can ensure that high labor productivity and that abundance of consumer goods that are necessary in order to begin the transition from socialism to communism"[233].

Noting that the Stakhanovite movement arose in connection with new equipment with which our country's enterprises are equipped, Comrade Stalin pointed out that "...it opens for us that path on which alone one can achieve those highest indicators of labor productivity that are necessary for the transition from socialism to communism and the elimination of the antithesis between mental and physical labor"[234].

Social production under socialism represents a broad field for the creative application of all abilities, calling, and inclinations of every individual. "The peculiarity of the Soviet system consists precisely in the fact that it ensures the rapid growth of people, their abilities, their talents, so that yesterday's little-known people can become public figures deserving universal respect in a short time"[235].

Every individual under socialism, in the interests of all the people, is placed in conditions for the comprehensive

---

233 J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 496.

234 *Ibid.*

235 *Address of the CC CPSU(b) to all voters*, 1937, p. 13.

improvement of their physical and mental strength. In our country, the comprehensive development of the personality represents a practical task and is an object of care and attention of the socialist state.

An obligatory principle of all educational activity of the Soviet school is the words of V. I. Lenin, full of the deepest meaning: "It is necessary that the Young Communist League educate everyone from a young age, from twelve years old, in conscious and disciplined labor"[236].

Over the past 30-plus years, the living conditions of our country have changed beyond recognition. Under the leadership of the great party of Lenin–Stalin, through the creative efforts of the working people, our country has been transformed into a powerful socialist state. The moral character of the Soviet people has been transformed.

In the great cause of re-educating older generations and educating youth in the spirit of communist morality, which was and is being carried out by our socialist state, the leading role belongs to the party of Lenin–Stalin.

"*Soviet Pedagogy", 1947, No. 11.*

[236] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 417.

N. I. BOLDYREV

ON THE QUESTION OF MORAL EDUCATION IN THE SOVIET SCHOOL

The Soviet school is called upon to raise a new person—an active and conscious builder of communism. This new person must be educated in the spirit of communist morality.

That is why the moral education of our children and youth is the most important element of communist upbringing. Over the years spent in school, Soviet schoolchildren not only master versatile knowledge, but are also educated in the spirit of new, communist morality.

The high moral qualities of Soviet people—their fiery love for the motherland, socialist humanism, high discipline, communist attitude toward labor and public property, truthfulness and honesty, comradely mutual aid, courage, and heroism—all this to a significant extent is the result of the fruitful educational work of the Soviet school.

Moral education in the Soviet school is directed toward developing and consolidating in students high ideational equipment and communist consciousness, toward raising high moral feelings in them, and training them to fulfill the norms and rules of communist morality.

The Central Committee of the AUCP(b) in its decrees on the school has repeatedly pointed out the exceptionally important significance of consistent communist education in the Soviet school, and the need to step up the struggle against any attempts to instill elements of anti-proletarian ideology in our children. In light of these directives, the role and importance of moral education in the Soviet school increases immeasurably.

All educational and instructional work in our school must be directed toward raising in the younger generation selfless devotion to the cause of communism, love for the great Motherland—the USSR, and burning hatred toward the enemies of the people.

In our country, wonderful conditions have been created for the socialist remolding of people, for the flourishing of communist morality. The victory of socialism in the USSR, the steady rise of our socialist economy, and the strengthening of the moral-political unity of the Soviet people—all this forms fertile ground for the growth of new people, for educating the younger generation in the spirit of communist morality.

In carrying out the tasks of moral education, the Soviet school proceeds from the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on communist morality.

Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin in their statements on the education of new people clearly defined the paths of moral education and the paths for developing communist morality. At the same time, they gave a crushing critique of bourgeois morality, exposed its falsehood and hypocrisy, and showed the connection of any morality with the social system.

In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels wrote that "...together with the conditions of life of people, with their social relations, with their social existence, their representations, views, and concepts—in a word, their consciousness—also change"[237].

Morality is one of the forms of social consciousness, and by virtue of this, it is ultimately conditioned by the economic basis of society, "conditions of life of people their social relations".

---

[237] K. Marx, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Selected Works in two volumes, Vol. I, p. 165.

Engels formulated this thought with particular clarity in *Anti-Dühring*. He wrote: "...people, consciously or unconsciously, derive their ethical views, in the final analysis, from the practical conditions of their class position, from the economic relations of production and exchange"[238].

Thus, morality cannot be viewed in isolation from the economic relations existing in a given society.

The moral, spiritual character of people is ultimately determined by the conditions of society's life.

Morality and norms of human behavior take shape in connection with the entire circle of social ideas and social phenomena.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism always emphasized that in a class society, morality bears a class character.

Engels, sharply criticizing Dühring, who preached the idea of the possibility of the existence of universal, extra-class morality in a class society, wrote: "...every theory of morality has hitherto been in the last resort the product of the economic stage which society had reached at that particular epoch. And as society has hitherto moved in class antagonisms, morality was always a class morality: it either justified the domination and the interests of the ruling class, or ever since the oppressed class became powerful enough, it represented its indignation against this domination and the future interests of the oppressed. That in this process, as in all other branches of human knowledge, on the whole progress is made in morality —that cannot be doubted. But we have not yet passed beyond class morality"[239].

---

238 K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XIV, p. 93.

239 F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Gospolitizdat, 1948, p. 89.

Engels showed that in capitalist society the feudal aristocracy, the bourgeoisie, and the proletariat each have their own special morality. However, the dominant morality in capitalist society is bourgeois morality. The founders of Marxism taught that there can be no identical morality for all times and peoples.

Summarizing Feuerbach's views on questions of morality, Engels wrote: "With Feuerbach's morality it happened just as with all its predecessors. It is cut out for all times, for all peoples, for all conditions; and precisely for that reason it is nowhere and never applicable"[240].

V. I. Lenin at the 3rd Congress of the Komsomol, defining the tasks of the Komsomol in the matter of communist moral education, said: "All such... morality taken from extra-human, extra-class concepts, we reject. We say that this is deception, that it is fraud and dulling the minds of workers and peasants in the interests of landowners and capitalists"[241].

And further: "...For us morality, taken outside human society, does not exist; this is deception. For us morality is subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat"[242].

Thus, the founders of Marxism-Leninism not only proved the existence of a link between morality and the conditions of material life of society, but also showed its historical-class character.

To illustrate and clarify these propositions, let us examine the question of moral education in bourgeois society.

In bourgeois society, morality is conditioned by the dominance of private property and the presence of antagonistic classes.

---

240 K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XIV, pp. 660–661.

241 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, 3rd ed., p. 410.

242 *Ibid.*, pp. 410–411.

Bourgeois morality legalizes, elevates into a rule the oppression of millions of people, and justifies the exploitation of human by human.

"The old society," said V. I. Lenin in his speech at the 3rd Congress of the Komsomol, "was based on the principle that either you rob another or another robs you, either you work for another or he works for you, either you are a slave-owner or you are a slave. And it is understandable that people educated in this society absorb, so to speak, with their mother's milk, the psychology, habit, concept—either slave-owner, or slave, or small property owner, small employee, small official, intellectual—in a word, a person who cares only about having their own, and has no concern for others"[243].

Characteristic of capitalist society is the depersonalization of people, the suppression of human individuality. Soviet writers Ilf and Petrov in their book *One-Story America* tell of how, when inspecting a large hydroelectric station, the engineer Thomson could not give the name of the author of the project for this grandiose structure.

"Probably," said Thomson, smiling, "if you ask some builder who is mounting the turbines here, he will not be able to give my name. He will simply say that the installation is being carried out by the General Electric Company. Engineers in our country do not enjoy fame. Only firms are famous with us".

This episode vividly demonstrates the setting of capitalism for the depersonalization of people.

A genuine human existence is impossible under capitalism. In a capitalist society based on exploitation, on the oppression of human by human, a "war of all against all" continuously takes place. Bourgeois morality rests on the principles: "each for

---

[243] *Ibid.*, p. 412.

himself, one god for all," "man is a wolf to man," "if you don't cheat, you don't sell," "my house is on the edge—I know nothing," etc.

Wolfish relations between people, suppression of human personality, individualism, hypocrisy, deceit, and Pharisaism—such are the most characteristic features of bourgeois morality.

These traits the bourgeoisie strives to drum into the heads of the younger generation through school, through the entire system of bourgeois upbringing. Marx wrote: "...the bourgeois understands by moral upbringing the drumming-in of bourgeois principles..."[244] Covering itself with pompous phrases about eternal, universal human morality, the bourgeois school instills in children reverence for the "inviolability" of private property and educates the children of working people in the spirit of submissiveness to exploiters. The bourgeois school strives to instill in its pupils that workers must always work for capitalists, that equality on earth cannot be established, and that poverty does not interfere with happiness.

The writer Ilya Ehrenburg in the article "The Morality of Their Morality" cites the following excerpts from a French school textbook on "morality":

On property. "Property is the result of work, as it is obtained with the help of work. This is a right on which modern society rests, and if not all people are equal, this stems, with rare exceptions, from the fact that not everyone has equal abilities".

On equality. "Justice does not demand equality. On the contrary, complete equality would be a crime".

On poverty. "Poverty is the natural state of the majority of people, and it never interferes with happiness"[245].

---

244 K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. V, p. 547.

245 *Izvestia*, March 2, 1935.

These principles of bourgeois morality are drummed into the heads of students not only in French schools, but also in schools of other capitalist countries.

Fulfilling the social order of their capitalist masters, bourgeois pedagogues strive to raise the children of working people into submissive and obedient servants for the bourgeoisie, to raise passive and uninitiative "citizens" incapable of active struggle against their oppressors. A great service to the bourgeoisie in the matter of educating the younger generation in the spirit of bourgeois morality is rendered by religion, the church. The entire system of out-of-school measures in capitalist countries is also directed toward the development and consolidation in children of traits of bourgeois morality.

For example, the main tasks of children's agricultural clubs in the USA are: educating farmers who are obedient to the existing order, developing private-property interests in children, involving children in competition, striving to awaken hatred toward the working class, and in this way delaying the rural population from fleeing to cities overcrowded with the unemployed, etc.

Children's scout organizations in capitalist countries are organized mainly to subject the children of working people to bourgeois ideology, to educate them in the spirit of bourgeois morality. The main tasks of scout organizations are preparing good soldiers out of the children of the proletariat and petty bourgeoisie, "loyal" servants of their government, and exemplary "parishioners" of the church. Every scout in England daily, like a prayer, reads the second point of the scout law, which states: "A scout is loyal to the king, superiors, parents, his motherland, and his masters. He must stand up for them under all circumstances against any of their enemies, and even against one who speaks ill of them".

Thus, the entire system of upbringing in capitalist countries is directed toward developing in children habits of bourgeois morality, toward consolidating norms of behavior corresponding to bourgeois society.

From an early age, the bourgeoisie strives to instill in children a passion for gain, exploiter egoism, and bestial hatred toward everything revolutionary and progressive. The most reactionary strata of the bourgeoisie preach racism, misanthropy, anti-humanism, and zoological chauvinism in their schools.

A. M. Gorky in his speech addressed to students of School No. 56 of the Sokolniki district of Moscow, as early as 1928, said: "The bourgeois world, which is saturated with blood, is doomed to extinction"[246]. Capitalism leads humanity to physical and moral degeneration, and therefore it must and will be destroyed together with its mean "morality".

Fundamentals of Communist Morality

Communist morality grows out of the base of new social relations.

Our socialist economy creates excellent conditions for the flourishing of communist morality. However, elements of communist morality arise already in the depths of bourgeois society. The creator and carrier of it is the proletariat. In the process of the formation and growth of class consciousness of the proletariat, the foundations of communist morality are worked out. Among advanced representatives of the working class, in the course of the struggle against capitalism, such qualities are worked out as hatred toward exploiters, organization, discipline, an active attitude toward reality, confidence in the rightness of one's cause, endurance, persistence, and determination.

---

[246] M. Gorky, *On Youth and Children*, "Molodaya Gvardiya", 1938, p. 35.

V. I. Lenin, characterizing the moral character of the proletariat, wrote: "Endurance, persistence, readiness, determination, and the ability to test a hundred times, try a hundred times, and achieve the goal no matter what—these qualities the proletariat developed in itself for 10, 15, 20 years before the October Revolution; it developed them during the two years after this revolution, enduring unprecedented hardships, hunger, ruin, and distress. These qualities of the proletariat are the pledge that the proletariat will win"[247].

The proletariat is the most advanced, rising class, and therefore pessimism and decay are alien to it. The proletariat is the carrier of a progressive ideology, the carrier of the best traits, best properties, and qualities of humanity. The presence of these qualities provides the working class and its party with immense authority among the working people and helps it to "...captivate with its selfless heroism of revolutionary struggle against capital the whole mass of working and exploited people..."[248]

The struggle for building and strengthening communist society constitutes the basis of communist morality.

V. I. Lenin wrote: "At the basis of communist morality lies the struggle to strengthen and complete communism"[249].

To be a moral person in the communist sense of the word means giving all one's strength and energy, giving one's life to the cause of the struggle for "strengthening and completing communism".

Communist morality, in its ideals and goals, is a universal human, all-national morality. Every working person,

---

247 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXV, 3rd ed., pp. 151–152.

248 *Ibid.*, Vol. XXIV, p. 339.

249 *Ibid.*, Vol. XXX, p. 413.

participating in the struggle against capitalism, in the struggle to create a communist society, develops in themselves new moral qualities characteristic of communist morality and ethics.

"For us morality," said Lenin, "is subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat... Morality is that which serves the destruction of the old exploiting society and the uniting of all working people around the proletariat, creating a new society of communists"[250].

In the Soviet Union, broader and broader masses of working people are drawn into the construction of a communist society. As new social relations grow and expand, communist morality becomes nationwide.

Over the years of Soviet power's existence, colossal work has been done in our country to create a new socialist economy—the most advanced in the world—and also to create and raise new people: courageous and heroic people. The Soviet citizen acquires a new moral character. Every day, every hour brings us more and more new facts of the courage and heroism of Soviet people, facts of selfless love for the socialist Motherland. The Soviet Union, populated by fiery patriots, represents a giant laboratory in which people of Stalinist temper are formed and grow.

The Ideal of the New Person

Moral education in the Soviet school is directed toward educating a new person—a person worthy of our great Stalinist era.

What should this new person be like? What is their moral character?

---

[250] *Ibid.*, pp. 410–411.

The ideal of the new person is, first of all, the founders of Marxism-Leninism: Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. They are the embodiment of communist morality and the personification of the best moral qualities of the proletariat. Their life and activity serve as an example for all humanity. All genuinely advanced people have no higher dream than to educate in themselves the traits of the founders of Marxism-Leninism.

Marx was a great revolutionary and scientist. He, as Engels said at Marx's grave, "...discovered the law of development of human history..., the law of motion of the modern capitalist mode of production and the bourgeois society generated by it"[251]. Wilhelm Liebknecht, characterizing Marx and his personal qualities, indicated that he "was the most generous and just man... he was the embodiment of truth". An interesting document characterizing Marx has survived—these are his answers to a series of questions asked of him by his daughters. We cite some questions of this questionnaire and Marx's answers to them.

The virtue you value most in people. — Simplicity.

Your distinguishing trait. — Unity of purpose.

Your idea of happiness. — To fight.

Your idea of misery. — Submission.

The vice you detest most. — Servility.

Your favorite motto. — Nothing human is alien to me.

Such was K. Marx—one of the greatest people of human society.

---

[251] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XV, p. 652.

Engels, the closest friend and comrade-in-arms of Marx, was also a great revolutionary and scientist. Lenin wrote that Marxism was created by two scientists and fighters—Marx and Engels. K. Marx and F. Engels, through their joint many years of work, as well as through personal relations, visually realized, in the expression of P. Lafargue, "...that ideal of friendship portrayed by ancient poets".

When F. Engels died in 1895, V. I. Lenin, in a brilliant article about him, gave a vow on behalf of Russian revolutionaries to hold high the revolutionary banner of Marxism. This promise V. I. Lenin fulfilled with honor.

The moral character of the great Lenin, leader of the most revolutionary class, organizer and leader of the AUCP(b), creator of the first Soviet state in history, was masterfully drawn by Comrade Stalin.

In his speech at an evening of Kremlin cadets on January 28, 1924, J. V. Stalin spoke with great love about the unforgettable traits of Lenin.

He said that Lenin was "...a mountain eagle who knew no fear in struggle and boldly led the party forward along the uncharted paths of the Russian revolutionary movement"[252].

Comrade Stalin pointed out that the simplicity and modesty of Lenin, "...the striving to remain unnoticed or, at any rate, not to stand out and not to emphasize his high position—this trait represents one of the strongest sides of Lenin..."[253]

"Hatred toward whining intellectuals, faith in one's own strength, faith in victory..."[254], according to the words of J. V. Stalin, are also characteristic traits of Lenin.

---

252 J. V. Stalin, *On Lenin*, "Molodaya Gvardiya", 1937, p. 40.

253 *Ibid.*, p. 42.

254 J. V. Stalin, *On Lenin*, "Molodaya Gvardiya", 1937, p. 43.

Lenin was not boastful of victory, and this feature in his character "...helped him to soberly weigh the forces of the enemy and insure the party against possible surprises"[255]. After victory, Lenin usually became "...especially vigilant and watchful".

Lenin considered principled policy to be the only correct policy. He, as a party leader, valued the opinion of the party majority, but he "...never became a prisoner of the majority..."[256]

Lenin always believed in the creative forces of the proletariat, in the creative forces of the masses, and therefore he tirelessly called: "...to learn from the masses, to comprehend their actions, to carefully study the practical experience of the struggle of the masses"[257].

Lenin was a genius of revolution, "...a genius of revolutionary explosions and a supreme master of revolutionary leadership"[258]. Lenin's brilliant insight helped him "...to outline the correct strategy and a clear line of conduct at the turns of the revolutionary movement"[259].

Thus Comrade Stalin characterized the moral character of V. I. Lenin.

In his speech to the voters of the Stalin election district of Moscow on December 11, 1937, Comrade Stalin called to constantly "...have before oneself the great image of the great Lenin and emulate Lenin in everything". In this speech, Comrade Stalin painted the moral character of a political figure of the Leninist-Stalinist type.

---

255 *Ibid.*, p. 44.
256 *Ibid.*, pp. 44–45.
257 *Ibid.*, p. 48.
258 *Ibid.*
259 *Ibid.*, p. 51.

Comrade Stalin pointed out that deputies of the Soviet people, like V. I. Lenin, must be equal to their great tasks; be fearless in battle; be vigilant and merciless toward enemies of the people; be free from panic, not give in to dizziness from success and not get boastful; be wise and deliberate when resolving complex issues; be truthful and honest; love their Motherland, love their people, as V. I. Lenin loved them.

All these Leninist traits are embodied in Stalin.

"Stalin is Lenin today. His surname gives us his image. Stalin —steel (*stal'*). He is unbending and flexible, like steel. His strength is his peerless common sense, the breadth of the scope of his knowledge, his amazing internal composure, passion for clarity, relentless consistency, speed, firmness, and power of decisions..."[260]

Stalin, like Lenin, shows vivid examples of courage and fearlessness in the struggle against the enemies of the working people, examples of boundless devotion to the cause of the working class, to the cause of communism. "You can be sure, comrades," Stalin said, "that I am ready in the future to give to the cause of the working class, to the cause of the proletarian revolution and world communism, all my strength, all my abilities, and, if necessary, all my blood, drop by drop"[261].

Comrade Stalin, by the example of his life, visually demonstrates that the basis of communist morality is the struggle for the cause of the working class, for the strengthening and enhancement of the socialist state.

"If every step in my work to elevate the working class and strengthen the socialist state of this class were not directed

---

[260] H. Barbusse, *Stalin*, "Khudozhestvennaya Literatura", p. 109.

[261] *Pravda*, December 22, 1929.

toward strengthening and improving the position of the working class, I would consider my life useless"[262].

Acquainting students of the Soviet school with the life and activity of the founders of Marxism-Leninism is one of the main tasks in the moral education of the younger generation. Our children must know how the leaders of the working class lived and fought. The life and activity of the founders of Marxism-Leninism must serve as an example for the younger generation. Soviet schoolchildren must educate and consolidate in themselves the moral qualities of the greatest people of humanity—Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

The images of the best comrades-in-arms of Lenin and Stalin, the images of the best Bolsheviks—the advanced people of our era—also possess immense educational power.

The life and activity of such Bolsheviks as Sverdlov, Dzerzhinsky, Kirov, Ordzhonikidze, Kuibyshev, and others serve as a remarkable example for the younger generation.

V. I. Lenin, in his speech dedicated to the memory of Y. M. Sverdlov, clearly defined those traits, those moral qualities that a Bolshevik must possess.

First of all, Lenin pointed out the close, vital connection of Y. M. Sverdlov with the masses: "...this professional revolutionary never, not for a minute, detached himself from the masses"[263]. Characterizing Sverdlov were such traits as mercilessly firm reprisal "...against exploiters and enemies of the working people"[264], the ability to organize the masses for the struggle against difficulties, for the struggle for the cause of the revolution.

---

262 *Pravda*, September 20, 1937.

263 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXIV, 3rd ed., p. 80.

264 *Ibid.*, p. 79.

Lenin and Stalin highly valued the organizational talent of Yakov Mikhailovich Sverdlov. Comrade Stalin wrote about Sverdlov:

"An organizer to the marrow of his bones, an organizer by nature, by skill, by revolutionary upbringing, by intuition, an organizer of his entire tumultuous activity—such is the figure of Y. M. Sverdlov"[265].

The heroic image of the steadfast, fearless revolutionary Felix Edmundovich Dzerzhinsky also serves as an example for new generations. Dzerzhinsky was the embodiment of iron will, revolutionary vigilance, organizational talent, heroic bravery in the struggle against enemies of the people, and boundless devotion to the cause of the party of Lenin–Stalin. In the image of Felix Dzerzhinsky were concentrated the best moral qualities of Bolsheviks—fearlessness, revolutionary vigilance, genuine humanism, and an indestructible force of will and energy.

"Knowing no rest, shunning no dirty work, giving all his strength, all his energy to the cause entrusted to him by the party—he burned out in stormy work for the benefit of the proletariat"[266]—with such words Comrade Stalin characterized Dzerzhinsky.

Vladimir Mayakovsky considered the fiery, heroic life of Felix Dzerzhinsky an example for Soviet youth.

Young man

considering

---

[265] V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, *On Yakov Mikhailovich Sverdlov*, Partizdat CC AUCP(b), 1937.

[266] *Pravda*, September 11, 1937.

how to live,

deciding

to whom to model life after,

I say,

without hesitation:

— Model it

after Comrade

Dzerzhinsky!

The bright, heroic character of Sergei Mironovich Kirov, his battle-hardened, colorful life as an underground revolutionary, a brave fighter of the Civil War, a fiery tribune, and an indefatigable fighter for the victory of communism, also gives a wonderful example of the new person of the great Stalinist era. In the character of S. M. Kirov, the typical traits of a Bolshevik—a loyal comrade-in-arms of Lenin and Stalin—are especially vividly concentrated. The entire life of S. M. Kirov teaches heroism, selfless love for the people, courage, and Bolshevik vigilance.

The image of S. M. Kirov is one of the most beloved images in Soviet poetry. In poems and epics dedicated to Kirov, the dear and beloved image of the heroic Bolshevik and remarkable person is vividly shown.

The wonderful character of S. M. Kirov, his friendly attitude toward people, the modesty of a Bolshevik, and the enthusiasm of a builder and organizer are conveyed in poems and epics written in all languages of the peoples of the USSR.

The Dagestani poet Suleyman Stalsky wrote in his song about Kirov:

Stronger than a lion was he, a hero,

Having created a truly strong order,

For the poor he stood like a mountain,

His writings nothing can wash away—

He wrote with a fiery pen.

The poet Viktor Gusev in his poem "Favorite of the Party" emphasizes S. M. Kirov's love for life.

The whole country stands over your grave,

Ready for battle,

for the final battle,

And says across all borders,

Comrade Kirov,

in your words:

"How one wants to live,

how joyfully to live

On the old earth,

remade by us!"

The images of fiery Bolsheviks—Sergo Ordzhonikidze, Valerian Kuibyshev, Mikhail Ivanovich Kalinin, and other closest comrades-in-arms of the great Stalin—are a wonderful example for new generations of fighters for communism and provide exceptional material for the moral education of Soviet children and teenagers.

The names of folk heroes—Chapaev, Shchors, Lazo, Kotovsky, and many others who died the death of the brave in battles for socialism—will always attract the attention of the Soviet people. Their heroic deeds, their boundless courage, and

unquenchable hatred for oppressors will always inspire upcoming generations to new and greater feats.

Vivid images of the best people of our Motherland, images of proud Stalinist falcons—Soviet aviators, fearless tank crewmen, glorious border guards, famous combine operators, and best Stakhanovites—represent an inexhaustible source for educating Soviet patriotism, loyalty to the great party of Bolsheviks, devotion to the cause of the working class, and other high moral qualities in our children and youth.

A new type of people—people of Stalinist temper—is educated in our country from earliest childhood. The children of the Soviet Union honor the memory of the fearless pioneer Pavlik Morozov, who exposed the counter-revolutionary schemes of his father and paid for it with his life. Through the care of the party of Lenin–Stalin and the Soviet government, exceptional conditions have been created in the Soviet Union for comprehensive, harmonious development, for educating the younger generation in the spirit of communist morality.

Main Tasks of Moral Education in the Soviet School

The Soviet school, in its moral education, proceeds from the following directive of V. I. Lenin: "The whole object of training, educating and teaching the youth of today should be to imbue them with communist morality."[267]

All educational and instructional work in our school must be directed toward developing and reinforcing habits of communist behavior in children and adolescents—toward educating active fighters for communism.

V. I. Lenin, in his speech at the III Congress of the Komsomol, stated: "Only by radically remoulding the teaching, organization and training of the youth shall we be able to

[267] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, 3rd ed., pp. 409–410.

ensure that the result of the efforts of the younger generation will be the creation of a society that does not resemble the old one, i.e., a communist society."[268]

Comrade Stalin has also repeatedly pointed out the connection between the work of educating the younger generation and the struggle to build a new society. In his report on the results of the XIII Party Congress, he said:

> "One of the essential tasks of the party in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat consists in developing work to re-educate the old generations and educate new ones in the spirit of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. Old habits and customs, traditions, and prejudices inherited from the old society are the most dangerous enemy of socialism. They, these traditions and habits, hold millions of the working masses in their grip; they sometimes engulf entire layers of the proletariat; they sometimes create the greatest danger to the very existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, the struggle against these traditions and habits, their obligatory overcoming in all spheres of our work, and finally, the education of new generations in the spirit of proletarian socialism—these are the immediate tasks of our party, without the execution of which the victory of socialism is impossible."[269]

The struggle against the traditions and habits of the old society, overcoming them, and educating our children and youth in the communist spirit must be laid at the foundation of moral education in the Soviet school.

---

[268] *Ibid.*, p. 404.

[269] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 248.

The goals and tasks of moral education in our school essentially boil down to educating new people capable of ultimately establishing communism.

The most important task of moral education in the Soviet school is the *formation and reinforcement of communist views and convictions in students, and the development of their consciousness*. Without this, it is unthinkable to educate the younger generation in the spirit of high ideological commitment and communist consciousness.

The development of the communist consciousness of the working masses has always been at the foundation of the educational work of the Bolshevik Party. As early as 1906, V. I. Lenin wrote: "The development of the consciousness of the masses remains, as always, the basis and main content of all our work."[270]

Communist morality is inextricably linked with the communist worldview. Therefore, influencing the consciousness of students must become one of the most important means of moral education. Only on the basis of a planned and purposeful impact on the consciousness of students is it possible to ensure the formation of their communist views and convictions, and, ultimately, a communist worldview.

Educating communist consciousness in students ensures that the younger generation develops the ability to critically approach the evaluation of their actions and conduct, as well as the ability to correctly determine the correctness of this conduct from the perspective of the requirements of communist morality.

Communist moral behavior is a logical consequence of a genuinely communist worldview and relies on the awareness of

---

[270] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. X, 3rd ed., p. 53.

the social meaning of personal behavior. Therefore, moral education presupposes that students possess a broad general horizon and knowledge of the laws of social development.

The tasks of the Soviet school are not limited to developing communist views and convictions in students. It is necessary to ensure that students always follow these views and convictions in their lives and activities.

The norms and rules of moral behavior acquire a specific meaning and significance only when they are embodied in concrete actions and deeds, when they are realized not in words, but in deeds.

Moral education presupposes *systematic cultivation of habits and customs of communist behavior in students*. It is, in the words of A. S. Makarenko, an "exercise in life."

During their years at school, students must not only master the principles of communist morality and become aware of moral norms, but also acquire habits of communist behavior. These habits should become their second nature.

The durability of habits and customs of communist behavior in students is no less important than the durability of the knowledge imparted to them on the fundamentals of science.

Usually, every person manifests themselves not only in words and actions, but also in feelings and emotions. Feelings and emotions have a particularly strong influence on the behavior of children and adolescents. Primary school children usually express their feelings of joy and sorrow, resentment and annoyance more vehemently and openly. Adolescents, although they strive to hide their feelings and experiences from those around them, nevertheless depend significantly on feelings and moods in their behavior.

Therefore, in the process of moral education at school, attention should be paid not only to the formation of consciousness and to the cultivation and reinforcement of habits and customs of communist behavior, but also to the *education and development of moral feelings in schoolchildren*.

At the same time, it is necessary to teach children and adolescents to subordinate their feelings and desires to their views and convictions.

Particularly great importance in moral education is attached to the development and reinforcement of a sense of self-dignity, a sense of duty, and honor in students.

A person's behavior, their moral actions, and their deeds are largely determined by their volitional qualities and character.

A person lacking willpower and weak in character is incapable of heroic deeds. Only people possessing strong willpower and a steadfast character can perform highly moral, heroic actions and feats. Therefore, *educating our children and youth to have strong willpower and a steadfast character is one of the most important tasks of moral* education. Education and reinforcement of such Bolshevik character traits in students as clarity of purpose, adherence to principles, single-mindedness, persistence, initiative, decisiveness, and the ability to overcome any difficulties are of particularly great importance.

Students in Soviet schools are the future citizens of the Soviet land. Whatever sector of socialist construction they find themselves in after school, they will have to *fulfill the duties of citizens of the USSR prescribed by the Stalinist Constitution*.

Therefore, during their school years, students must not only thoroughly study the fundamental law of the Soviet state—the Constitution of the USSR—but also learn to honestly and

conscientiously fulfill those duties and precepts established in the articles of the Stalinist Constitution.

The Soviet school must teach children—and especially adolescents and youths (students of the upper grades):

a) to sacredly observe the Stalinist Constitution—this law of our laws;

b) to unconditionally fulfill all Soviet laws that protect the interests of the working people;

c) to maintain labor discipline;

d) to cherish and strengthen public socialist property as the sacred and inviolable foundation of the Soviet system, as the source of wealth and might of our Motherland;

e) to skillfully, convincingly, and consciously defend the Soviet socialist Motherland;

f) to respect and strictly observe the rules of socialist community life.

Every Soviet person, wherever they may be and in whatever role they act, is obligated to honestly fulfill their public duty. In a socialist society based on moral-political unity, this duty is truly public—that is, a duty to one's people and to one's state. Strict observance of the requirements of the Constitution and other laws, execution of everything beneficial to society, struggle against everything that harms it, readiness for self-sacrifice for the sake of the freedom, honor, and independence of one's Motherland—such is the main content of a citizen's public duty in our country.

The Soviet school must prepare its students to fulfill this public duty. In the process of educational work, children and adolescents must be accustomed to the honest fulfilment of duties to society and to the state. The primary and most

understandable duty to the state for students is their studies and disciplined behavior at school. Therefore, the struggle for excellent and good knowledge, and for high conscious discipline, is not a private matter between teacher and student, but a general state and public affair.

In the process of moral education, the Soviet school must in every way develop and cultivate a conscious, purposeful, and active love for the socialist Motherland in our schoolchildren, educating them *in the spirit of life-giving Soviet patriotism*.

Born of the Great October Revolution and the socialist system, Soviet patriotism has become a powerful driving force of our society. It helps Soviet people overcome all difficulties and obstacles in their path, rekindles in them the flame of noble striving for heroic deeds in the name of the prosperity of their socialist fatherland. Soviet patriotism is a great moral force. Ultimately, it determines the behavior of Soviet people and serves as the source of their heroism, courage, and spiritual nobility.

Soviet patriotism is active in nature. It is expressed not in verbal declarations of love for the Motherland, but in practical service to it. We call a true patriot someone who strives through their deeds to glorify the Soviet Motherland, and who is ready to give their life for it.

The Soviet school teaches children and adolescents to passionately love their Motherland, awakening in them the desire and striving to help their people and the Soviet state through concrete deeds.

Communist morality is incompatible with national narrow-mindedness, or with preaching the superiority of one nation or race over others. Therefore, patriotic education in the Soviet school is combined with educating students in the spirit of friendship among all the peoples inhabiting the Soviet Union,

and in the spirit of respect for the rights of other peoples—both large and small. Through concrete examples, students learn the significance and strength of the friendship of peoples, becoming accustomed to treating representatives of other nationalities correctly. Thus, educating Soviet schoolchildren in the spirit of Soviet patriotism is organically combined with international education.

Moral education in the Soviet school also includes *educating children and youth in the spirit of socialist humanism*, in a spirit of sensitive and attentive attitude toward people. Socialist humanism is the exaltation of the working person, attention to them, and care for them. Socialist humanism teaches us to value every person capable of benefiting our Motherland and the cause of communism.

The leader of the Soviet people, Comrade Stalin, in one of his speeches, called man the most valuable and decisive capital of all capitals existing in the world. The greatest humanist of our time, A. M. Gorky, wrote: "Man—it has a proud ring to it." Care for man, respect for human dignity, and the exaltation of working people have become guiding principles of Soviet morality.

Starting from an early age, the Soviet school teaches its charges to value and respect people, to be attentive to elders, to help comrades, and to care for parents.

The most important quality of a Soviet person is a *new communist attitude toward labor and toward the results of this labor—socialist property*.

A honest and conscientious attitude toward labor has become the benchmark for evaluating a person's moral behavior in our society as it moves toward communism.

Starting from the first grades, the Soviet school must instill in students a love for labor and an understanding of its significance, fostering a persistent desire to work with enthusiasm and soul, and teaching them to take an honest approach to assigned work.

M. I. Kalinin, in his speech at a conference of exemplary teachers, listed love for labor and an honest attitude toward it among the qualities of the new person that a teacher must educate in students: "...*One must love labor*," he said. "*Not only love it, but also treat labor honestly, firmly remembering that if a person lives, eats, and does not work, it means they are devouring someone else's labor*."[271]

Students in Soviet schools must firmly grasp that labor has always been, is, and will be the basis of human well-being, and that all material and spiritual values are created by human labor.

It must be explained to students that labor acquires particularly great significance in a socialist society, since Soviet people work not for exploiters, but for themselves and for society.

The education of a communist attitude toward labor is closely linked with the education of a new attitude toward the results of this labor—toward public socialist property.

A thrifty attitude toward public property is one of the new moral traits of the Soviet person that distinguishes them from people in the capitalist world.

Capitalism could not and cannot accustom people to take care of the public good. The entire way of life in capitalist society instills in people a disregard for public property and accustoms them to dipping into the state treasury.

---

[271] M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education and Instruction*, Ed. APN RSFSR, 1948, p. 156.

Capitalism is characterized by a wastefulness of human strength and material resources. This wastefulness assumes particularly large proportions during periods of economic crises, which are usually accompanied by the mass destruction of colossal value.

In contrast to capitalism, a thrifty attitude toward public property—the foundation of the well-being and happiness of working people—is organically inherent in the socialist system.

The Bolshevik Party educates Soviet people in the spirit of a truly proprietary attitude toward the public good and accustoms them to thriftiness. The Soviet general education school plays a major role in educating these qualities in younger generations.

One of the key tasks of moral education in the Soviet school is *educating students in the spirit of conscious discipline*.

Whomever our students become in the future, wherever their life path leads them, everywhere they will encounter the requirements of unbreakable discipline. Discipline is necessary in the army, in production, in any institution, and in everyday life.

Therefore, the Soviet school strives to accustom students to an honest and conscious attitude toward assigned work, and to the fulfillment of the rules and laws of Soviet society. Starting from the first grades, teachers accustom pupils to neatly and conscientiously perform academic tasks and assignments from children's public organizations, developing habits of subordinating personal desires and interests to the common interests of the school and the children's collective.

School discipline is a necessary condition for the successful education and instruction of children and youth. Without students observing established rules of conduct, normal and fruitful educational work in school is impossible. Therefore,

Soviet pedagogical science considers discipline a necessary prerequisite for the successful organization of the entire process of instruction and education.

At the same time, conscious discipline is regarded in the Soviet school as an essential part of the moral education of students, for it presupposes the cultivation of necessary convictions and habits that determine disciplined behavior in students not only at school, but also in their subsequent life and activities after graduation. Disciplined behavior is a very important moral trait of personality; therefore, the Soviet school pays great attention not only to giving students the necessary knowledge, but also to training them in discipline and organization.

The main feature of Soviet discipline is its conscious character. The Soviet school educates students in conscious discipline based on their understanding of existing norms and rules.

One of the most important qualities of a Soviet person is collectivism—the ability to live and work in a collective. In contrast to the individualism of bourgeois society, which condemns man to solitude among people, the socialist system is based on the collectivism of working people, and on combining personal interests with the interests of the collective and society.

Collectivism signifies a fundamental turn in human relations. Instead of the brutal bourgeois principle of "man is a wolf to man," the principle of "man is a..." became the law of communist morality friend to man." In the consciousness of the working people of socialist society, the principle "all for one, and one for all" penetrates deeper and deeper. A person in our country does not experience the tragedy of loneliness. They constantly feel their inseparable connection with the multi-million Soviet people. Their labor is part of the common labor for the good of the Motherland.

The general education school plays a very substantial role in educating collectivism in younger generations. During their years at school, the ideas of collectivism are developed and reinforced in our children and adolescents. The Soviet school accustoms students to living and working in a collective, developing in them the ability to subordinate personal interests to the tasks of the collective and to combine individual requests and strivings with the activity of the collective.

As a result of properly organized collective life among Soviet school students, respect for the rules of socialist community life is developed, and habits of cultured behavior in society are reinforced.

In joint academic work and collective labor, Soviet school students cultivate and reinforce qualities such as comrade-like mutual aid, respect for comrades, readiness to assist a comrade in a difficult moment, etc. Therefore, collectivism is closely linked to socialist humanism.

Educating students of our school in the spirit of collectivism presupposes a struggle against the antipodes of collectivism—individualism and egoism. These remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of Soviet people sometimes penetrate into the children's environment and hinder the creation of a cohesive, friendly children's collective at school.

Meanwhile, it is well known that a cohesive, strong collective is the foundation of foundations of the Soviet educational system.

The most important task of moral education in the Soviet school is *the education of truthfulness and honesty*. In our socialist society, based on mutual trust and respect among people, there should be no place for lies and hypocrisy. Lies and deception are birthmarks of bourgeois society, which is built on the principle of "if you don't deceive, you don't sell."

Hypocrisy, lies, and insincerity have a corrosive effect on the formation of children's character and moral character. In contrast, straightforwardness, truthfulness, and honesty strengthen character and ennoble the moral character of students.

In the process of educational work, children must be accustomed to telling the truth and not hiding their actions from teachers and parents. They must be taught to fight against all kinds of hypocrisy, secretiveness, and double-dealing.

It goes without saying that the task of educating truthfulness and honesty must be considered from the standpoint of the interests of socialist society.

Educating truthfulness and loyalty to one's word in Soviet schoolchildren is closely linked to developing a sense of human dignity in them. A person who respects the Soviet collective will not lie. They will always find the courage to tell the truth.

Starting from an early age, children must be accustomed to ensuring that their words match their deeds. If a student makes a promise to a teacher, parents, or other family members, they must fulfill it despite obstacles. Accuracy in fulfilling any promise is a necessary quality in the behavior of our children.

One of the tasks of moral education in the Soviet school is *educating friendship and comradeship in our schoolchildren*. Relationships among people in Soviet society are characterized as relationships of comrade-like cooperation. Joint work at common factories and mills, on common land, and according to a single plan contributes to the creation and development of mutual respect and trust, and to the development of friendly and comrade-like ties among Soviet people.

Friendship and comradeship are high and noble feelings. In the name of friendship, people perform self-sacrificing acts and undertake glorious, heroic feats. Under the influence of friendship and comradeship, people become better, more responsive, and more warmhearted.

The striving for friendship and comradeship is one of the best qualities of Soviet people, who are jointly building a new, communist society.

As a result of skillfully organized moral education of children and youth, the Soviet school must accustom them to the conscious fulfillment of the rules of socialist community life.

The rules of socialist community life are the unwritten statute of new, wonderful relationships between Soviet people that arose in socialist society. These rules are not in the laws and decrees of the Soviet state. But they flow from the Stalinist Constitution and are based on the core principles of communist morality.

Our morality demands from Soviet people fraternal help for one another, a fraternal attitude toward working people of all nations and races, a comrade-like attitude toward women as equal members of society, careful concern for children and the elderly, and respect for human dignity.

Educating these qualities in students is a major task of moral education in the Soviet school. Along with cultivating positive qualities, the school must eradicate rudeness, tactlessness, and other negative qualities in students that contradict the rules of socialist community life.

Consequently, moral education in the Soviet school is a complex and multifaceted process. It encompasses a wide range of tasks and ensures the formation in our schoolchildren

of new moral traits necessary for a person in a socialist society moving toward communism.

The successful implementation of the tasks of moral education in the Soviet school is possible only if a number of fundamental, scientifically grounded requirements are observed. These requirements or principles of moral education in the Soviet school include: communist single-mindedness of the entire process of moral education, its effectiveness, consistency, and systematic nature; unity of demands on students; education in and for the collective; combining the influence of the teacher's authority with the development of student independence; relying on the positive and overcoming the negative; combining high expectations of students with respect for them; concrete nature of demands on students; and taking into account age characteristics and individual differences among students.

The skillful application of all these principles significantly increases the effectiveness of moral education.

When defining the tasks of educating students in our school in the spirit of communist morality, one must under no circumstances forget that our morality is dictated by the interests of the struggle for communism. Everything that contributes to the victory of communism is moral, and conversely, everything that hinders the struggle for a communist society, interferes with, and harms the cause of communism—is immoral.

Main Ways, Means, and Methods of Moral Education in the Soviet School

A detailed treatment of the question of ways and means of moral education in the Soviet school is the subject of a special article. Therefore, below, only the general outlines of the main

means and, partially, methods of moral education are characterized.

Academic work in school plays a decisive role in moral education.

Moral education in our school is carried out in close connection with mental education. It is implemented primarily *in the process of teaching*.

By imparting genuine scientific knowledge, the Soviet school simultaneously develops communist habits and concepts in children and adolescents. While the pre-revolutionary school sought to kill the working class children's interest in science, curiosity, initiative, and activity, the Soviet school, on the contrary, develops in its students an interest in knowledge, inquisitiveness, and curiosity. Our school instills activity, courage, and fearlessness in children and youth, instilling new norms of behavior.

A. M. Gorky, in a letter to the literary club of a vocational technical school in Pokrovsk in 1928, wrote:

> "...History has entrusted you, the youth, with a great task—to be preachers of a new attitude toward man, teachers in building a new life. This obligates you to study together and diligently, to study above all."[272]

Mastering knowledge is a necessary condition for developing a "new attitude toward man." Subjects such as history, the Constitution of the USSR, literature geography, natural science, and others provide rich material for accomplishing the tasks of moral education.

---

[272] M. Gorky, *On Youth and Children*, "Molodaya Gvardiya", 1938, p. 29.

In developing habits of communist behavior, a major role is played by the *school regime*. We often underestimate the educational significance of the school regime, yet it exerts an enormous influence on the education of children.

Educating conscious discipline, a socialist attitude toward labor, and habits of cultured behavior—all this largely depends on the school regime and routine. If, for example, a school does not fight against lateness to class, does not demand mandatory completion of homework, and generally does not accustom children to order, such a school will not fulfill the task of educating children in the spirit of conscious discipline.

The personal example of the teacher and adults in general is of great importance in moral education. Children are inclined to imitate. The actions and deeds of adults have an enormous influence on children's behavior. This influence can be positive or negative. Quite naturally, a teacher must set positive examples for children through their behavior and appearance. Pioneer leaders and parents must also be more demanding of themselves, knowing that they educate children through their personal example.

Nor should one forget about the influence of the *children's collective*, or the example of comrades. Children often imitate comrades with stronger characters. A teacher must know the individual characteristics of children and, in the process of educational work, take into account their mutual influence. Knowing the mutual influence of children on one another, a teacher can limit or neutralize negative influence while simultaneously creating conditions that ensure the positive influence of the best students.

It was already pointed out above that *the example of the leaders of the Bolshevik Party* is a powerful educational tool.

Conversations about the lives of great people, and about the lives of the leaders of the working class—Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin—help the school educate active builders of communism who are passionately devoted to the cause of the Bolshevik Party and the cause of the working class.

All our heroic reality is one of the most important means of educating the younger generation in the spirit of communist morality.

In the article "On Irresponsible People and the Children's Book of Our Days," M. Gorky wrote:

> "It is inherent in a child's nature to strive for the bright and unusual. What is unusual and bright for us in the Soviet Union is the new that is created by the revolutionary energy of the working class. This is what must capture children's attention; this should be the main material for their social education. But this must be told, this must be shown talentfully, skillfully, in forms easily digestible."[273]

Thus, the heroic deeds, courage, and heroism of Soviet people performing feats in the name of the interests of their Motherland must become the primary material for the moral education of the younger generation. Schoolchildren should be told about the heroic deeds of Soviet people not only in lessons, but also in extracurricular time.

Along with school instruction, a significant role in educating Soviet schoolchildren in the spirit of communist morality is played by *extracurricular and out-of-school work*.

By helping to organize students' leisure time intelligently and culturally, extracurricular and out-of-school work

---

[273] M. Gorky, *On Youth and Children*, "Molodaya Gvardiya", 1938, p. 77.

simultaneously contributes to broadening the socio-political horizon of children and adolescents. It accustoms them to organized and disciplined behavior in society, and develops in them a sense of collectivism, friendship, and comradeship.

Particularly widespread development in the Soviet school has been given to such forms of extracurricular work as: conducting political information sessions on current affairs for upper-grade students, extracurricular reading, literary evenings, debates, and reader conferences, field trips to local lore museums and exhibitions, hikes and trips to study one's region, territory, or republic, meetings and talks with notable people—Heroes of the Soviet Union and Heroes of Socialist Labor, collective visits to cinema and theaters, publishing wall newspapers and school journals, holding revolutionary holidays and memorable dates. All these forms of extracurricular work help format the new moral character in Soviet student youth.

For example, while watching feature films and new plays intended for children and youth, Soviet schoolchildren see bright images of beloved national heroes on screen and stage—images of new Soviet people who are bearers of communist morality. In their behavior and life, they strive to imitate these beloved heroes.

Great assistance to the Soviet school in carrying out the tasks of moral education is provided by *out-of-school institutions*. Palaces and Houses of Pioneers, children's technical and agricultural stations, houses of artistic education, children's parks and stadiums, children's theaters, and libraries—all these institutions conduct diverse work on the communist education of children and youth. They contribute to preparing all-around developed people, active and conscious builders of communism, from among Soviet schoolchildren.

Of all types of extracurricular work, *extracurricular reading* exerts a particularly strong influence on the formation of the moral ideals of our schoolchildren.

Fiction is a powerful tool for moral education. Through its vivid imagery, it captivates children and excites in them a desire to imitate the heroes of literary works.

In the creative works of great writers, one can find much educational material. Let us cite, for example, several statements by our Russian classics about love for their Motherland.

A. S. Pushkin, in the poem "To Chaadaev" in 1818, wrote:

While freedom's flame within us burns,

While hearts to honor true remain,

My friend, unto our motherland

Let us our souls' fine impulses dedicate.

N. P. Ogarev, in the poem "My Native Country," written in 1858, exclaims:

Tsarist decrees shall not destroy

The youthful strength of Rus'.

Nor Tatar landlords,

Nor German bureaucrats!

Mother Volga, wide and free,

Shall not flow backward in its course,

And along a blessed path,

Free Rus' shall speed forward.

V. G. Belinsky, in a review of the "Calendar for 1840," prophetically predicted:

> "We envy our grandchildren and great-grandchildren, who are destined to see Russia in the year 1940—standing at the head of the educated world, giving laws to science and art, and receiving reverent tribute of respect from all enlightened humanity."

Many more vivid statements by classics of Russian literature could be cited which, when skillfully used by a teacher, homeroom teacher, or Pioneer leader, serve as a fine tool for the political education of children.

Works of our Soviet literature must to an even greater degree be used to educate the younger generation into people of the Stalinist character.

A. A. Zhdanov, at the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers (1934), called our Soviet literature the most ideological and advanced. He emphasized the educational role of Soviet literature with particular force:

> "In our country, the main heroes of literary works are the active builders of a new life: working men and women, collective farm men and women, party members, business managers, engineers, Komsomol members, and Pioneers. These are the main types and main heroes of our Soviet literature. Our literature is saturated with enthusiasm and heroism. It is optimistic, and its optimism is not based on some zoological, 'gut' feeling. It is optimistic in essence, because it is the literature of the rising class of the proletariat—the only progressive and advanced class. Our Soviet

literature is strong because it serves a new cause—the cause of socialist construction."[274]

Works by Soviet writers A. M. Gorky, V. Mayakovsky, N. Ostrovsky, A. Tolstoy, M. Sholokhov, and others are a powerful tool of communist education. Great also is the role of children's literature, the main task of which is to assist the school in communist education.

One of the most important means of educating Soviet schoolchildren in the spirit of communist morality is *participation in socially useful labor*.

V. I. Lenin repeatedly pointed out the educational role of labor. As early as 1920, in his speech at the III Congress of the Komsomol, V. I. Lenin stated that without combining instruction with practical work and public labor, it is unthinkable to educate youth in the communist spirit. "Only in labor together with workers and peasants," taught V. I. Lenin, "can one become a real communist."

Love for the socialist Motherland in Soviet children and youth is manifested not only in thoughts and feelings, but also in practical deeds aimed at strengthening and glorifying the Soviet state.

In recent years, Soviet schoolchildren have been taking an active part in landscaping their schools, protecting and harvesting crops, and improving villages and towns. Urban Pioneers actively participate in the radiแข่งขัน and electrification of sponsored rural schools. They participate in making visual aids for classrooms, collect herbaria and collections, gather medicinal herbs, and carry out other socially useful work.

---

[274] A. A. Zhdanov, *Soviet Literature—The Most Ideological, Most Advanced Literature in the World*, Partizdat, 1934, p. 11.

Various types of socially useful work introduce children to public life and reinforce habits of communist behavior in them (collectivism, activity, ability to overcome obstacles, discipline, etc.). By performing public work, our schoolchildren develop and reinforce new traits inherent in citizens of the socialist fatherland.

In organizing and conducting socially useful work, Komsomol and Pioneer organizations provide great assistance to the school and teacher. They are usually the initiators of this work. They help the teacher organize various types of socially useful work and involve Pioneers and schoolchildren in it.

Komsomol and Young Pioneer organizations usually render great assistance and cooperation to the teacher in conducting extracurricular work for the moral education of studying youth.

Moral education in the Soviet school is carried out not only by influencing the consciousness of students, but also through impact on their feelings, actions, and behavior. Therefore, teachers of the Soviet school in the process of moral education must use a variety of educational means and diverse methods.

The primary method of moral education used in the Soviet school is **persuasion**—an influence on the consciousness of students aimed at forming and reinforcing positive moral qualities in them, as well as eliminating negative traits in their character and behavior. Persuasion has nothing in common with lecturing or abstract reasoning. Students are taught the norms and principles of communist morality using concrete examples in an accessible form. In the process of persuasion, students form their own views, which help them consciously and convincingly adhere to the norms and rules of communist behavior.

A large role in moral education should also be occupied by **habituation** (accustoming), through which students develop

and reinforce habits of behavior in the spirit of communist morality. Children and adolescents usually absorb moral principles and norms much better when they apply them in practice, in real life. Everything that students acquire with the expenditure of their own efforts is learned more firmly and thoroughly compared to what is given to them in finished form.

Among the methods of educational influence, a prominent place in our school is occupied by **encouragement**. It is applied in the form of *approval, praise, and rewards*. Words of approval and praise have a very positive effect on children. They encourage them to strive for new successes in behavior. Rewards also stimulate the development and consolidation of positive moral qualities in children. To deserve encouragement, children strive to behave better and avoid violating established rules. Encouragements usually instill greater confidence in students regarding their own strengths.

In individual cases, to eliminate harmful skills and habits formed in children, various **measures of penalty** can and should be applied. The most common of these are: an oral reprimand from the teacher, a written note in the student's record book or class register, a reprimand in front of the class, a transfer of the student to another (parallel) class or to another school, and finally, as an extreme measure, expulsion from school for up to one year.

It goes without saying that in our school, where education is based on principles of humanism and respect for the individual, physical punishment of students must not be permitted under any circumstances.

***

Educating the younger generation in the spirit of communist morality requires persistent joint work from both family and school.

The child spends most of their time in the family; therefore, naturally, the family cannot stand aside. Parents, alongside the school, bear responsibility for raising their children, and thus they must constantly monitor their behavior and guide their development along the right path. Family and school must act as a united front on the child and jointly educate them in the spirit of communist morality.

A major role in educating children and youth is played by Komsomol and Young Pioneer organizations. Through school Komsomol organizations and Young Pioneer detachments, the Lenin-Stalin Komsomol extends its influence over a multi-million army of Soviet schoolchildren and helps raise them in a communist spirit.

The decisive role in the communist education of the growing generation belongs, without a doubt, to the teacher. The quality of all educational and instructional work is determined primarily by the teacher. They ensure Bolshevik order and discipline in the school and, together with academic work, organize the effort toward the Lenin-Stalin education of children and youth.

In educational work, the role of teachers who act as **homeroom teachers** (*class leaders*) is especially great. They are entrusted with the honorable and responsible task of guiding the children's collective, developing and consolidating in children the noble traits of citizens of a great socialist state.

Educating children in the spirit of communist morality is a difficult matter. It requires daily attention from the teacher, along with deep and comprehensive knowledge.

A. M. Gorky wrote in the article *"On the Old and the New"* in 1927:

> "To love children—even a hen knows how to do that. But knowing how to educate them is a great state matter requiring talent and broad knowledge of life." [1]

The Party of Lenin—Stalin and the Soviet government are doing everything possible to ease the labor of the Soviet teacher-educator of the nation's young generation of socialism. Therefore, there is no doubt that the Soviet school will successfully solve the task of educating the younger generation in the spirit of communism, in the spirit of selfless devotion to the Communist Party and to the leader of peoples, the great Stalin.

"Soviet Pedagogy", 1939, No. 1.

1 275

275 *M. Gorky, "On Youth and Children", "Molodaya Gvardiya", 1938, p. 24.*

N. K. GONCHAROV

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences

EDUCATION OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST WORLDVIEW

A child comes to school with certain concepts and ideas about the world around them and about social relationships. Their concepts, ideas, and attitudes toward their surroundings are not something given from the start. Nor is it a social instinct, as bourgeois educators and psychologists claim. A child's ideas and concepts are the result of family education, upbringing in preschool institutions, and the influence of their environment.

Our Soviet child has their own views on their surroundings that are completely different from those of a child in an exploitative society. One only needs to look at the visual artistic creativity of our preschoolers to see how brightly children reflect our reality in drawings and illustrations for tales such as for example, *"Baba Yaga"*, *"Kolobok"*, *"The Tale of the Fisherman and the Fish"*, etc., as well as in their creative and play activities.

It would be wrong, of course, to assert that a child comes to school with a full system of views, representations, and concepts. 7-year-old children have only the most elementary representations and concepts about what directly surrounds them; they have only some as-yet undifferentiated ideas about nature and human society.

At this age, they do not and cannot have a comprehensive worldview. However, their feelings, experiences, moods, existing representations, and concepts carry a definite character, have a Soviet orientation, and represent favorable ground for forming the foundations of a scientific worldview.

The task of the school is to equip students with solid foundations of a scientific worldview throughout all years of study, in the course of all educational work (both inside and outside the classroom). With each passing year, the role and responsibility of the school and Soviet teachers grow in fulfilling this critical task of communist education.

More than 32 million students are enrolled in our country's schools. Our further movement toward communism depends on the work of the school and the quality of instruction and upbringing. The school must prepare active builders of a communist society, patriots of the Soviet Motherland. Comrade Stalin teaches us that *"youth is our future, our hope... Youth must replace us, the old ones. It must carry our banner to the victorious end."*[276] Therefore, the entire process of education and instruction must be subordinated to the tasks of building communism.

The development of a child occurs in the process of education and instruction. Therefore, the formation of the foundations of a scientific worldview in students depends on the ideological and political orientation of the teacher and the quality of education.

But what do we understand by the foundations of a scientific worldview?

The only true scientific worldview is the **Marxist-Leninist worldview**, the emergence of which marked a genuine revolution in views on the development of nature and society.

Marxism-Leninism, as the only scientific worldview, not only explains the world and formulates the fundamental laws governing human society's development—including the transition from one socio-economic formation to another—but

---

[276] *I. V. Stalin, "Questions of Leninism", 11th ed., p. 420.*

also shows how, relying on these laws, one can destroy capitalism and build a new, communist society.

Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, using the scientific and revolutionary method of knowledge—materialist dialectics—struck a decisive blow to all idealist concepts regarding nature, society, and human thought. They unfolded, in all its richness and brilliance, a remarkably coherent, monolithic, and thoroughly scientific dialectical-materialist worldview. In light of this worldview, the decay of bourgeois ideology was exposed with particular force, along with its reactionary, hostile character toward all science and progress.

The dialectical-materialist worldview is the worldview of our Bolshevik Party—the most powerful weapon in its hands for creative, revolutionary-transformative activity, for combating remnants of capitalism in people's consciousness, for forming the new human, and for driving successful movement toward communism. It cannot be contemplative, passive, or apolitical. V. I. Lenin taught that *"...materialism includes, so to speak, party spirit (partiinost), obliging one to directly and openly adopt the standpoint of a specific social group when evaluating any event."* [277]

By educating students in our school in the spirit of a scientific Marxist-Leninist worldview, we prepare people dedicated to the socialist Motherland, endowed with new, socialist views on work, socialist property, and interpersonal relationships.

Educating the foundations of a scientific worldview is closely tied to cultivating communist morality. The effectiveness of a worldview manifests in labor, in life, and in attitudes toward people. A person with firm scientific views ...views and convictions always strives to put those views and convictions

[277] *V. I. Lenin, Works, 2nd ed., Vol. I, p. 276.*

into practice. The high moral character of Soviet citizens is demonstrated daily in work; it was evidenced in armed combat against German-fascist invaders and Japanese imperialists. Firmness of conviction and confidence in the righteousness of our cause are explained by certainty in the inevitable victory of communism.

Scientific knowledge of the laws of nature enables us, under our social relations, to rapidly develop agriculture, grow high crop yields, breed new plant varieties, improve livestock breeds, and enhance production technology in general. Knowledge of the laws of human society's development allows us to successfully build a communist society.

That is why one of the most important tasks facing our school is educating students in a correct understanding of nature and society.

It is clear that the formation of a student's worldview does not end in school, but the foundations of a Marxist-Leninist worldview are laid and reinforced there from the very first years of instruction. Students gradually develop concepts and representations of the world as a unified whole. They are gradually brought to understand how the organic world arose from the inorganic world, and how such a complex organism as man appeared and developed. Elementary concepts of the unity of the organic and inorganic worlds and the regularities of their development make it possible to instill the foundations of a scientific worldview in students.

***

The educational content in our school provides full opportunity to cultivate a materialist understanding of nature and society in students—within limits accessible to their age, of course. One can say that there is not a single subject taught in our school that could not be used to foster the foundations of a Marxist-

Leninist worldview. However, an academic subject on its own does not automatically determine the character of a student's worldview. Education in school is not a spontaneous process, but an organized, purposeful, and thoroughly thought-out process.

It was precisely this side of the issue that M. I. Kalinin always highlighted:

> "In my opinion," he said, "education is a definite, goal-oriented, and systematic influence on the psychology of the educated person in order to instill qualities desired by the educator. It seems to me that such a formulation... generally covers everything we put into the concept of education: the installation of a specific worldview, morality, rules of human conduct, the development of traits of character and will, habits, tastes, and physical traits..." [278]

School subjects must be presented in a way that makes them accessible for perception and gives a correct materialist explanation of phenomena in nature and human society.

Mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology—by revealing the underlying connections between natural phenomena and formulating them into general and specific laws of motion and development—lead students to a scientific materialist understanding of nature as a whole, thereby forming the natural-scientific foundations of a Marxist-Leninist worldview.

Among this group of subjects, biology holds a special place as the science of the origin and development of living nature.

Living nature (the plant and animal world) is the product of historical development spanning millions of years. It is very

---

[278] *M. I. Kalinin, "On Communist Education", 1945, p. 60.*

important for students to understand, as V. N. Stoletov writes, that *"cultivated forms of plants and animals, well-adapted to human needs, do not fall ready-made from the sky. They are created by centuries of human labor... But the past path of human activity in this area was empirical... Today it can no longer satisfy us."*[279]

When studying biology in school, it is necessary to lead students to understand that the organic world, which forms part of the material world, develops dialectically; to show, in forms accessible to students, the reactionary nature of idealist teachings in biology. It is necessary to demonstrate that proper conditions for developing scientific biology have been created only in our country. Soviet biological science features major scientists—I. V. Michurin, T. D. Lysenko, and others—and represents a new stage in biology's development. The immense successes of Soviet biological science are explained by the fact that the Lenin-Stalin teaching arms biologists with an advanced theory and the truest tool for studying and influencing nature. The link between theory and practice—this crucial principle of Marxism-Leninism—enables Soviet biologists to generalize experience and put theory at the service of the socialist economy.

Further, it is necessary to show students in an accessible form that *"two diametrically opposed directions have emerged in biological science: one direction is progressive, materialist, Michurinist, named after its founder, the outstanding Soviet natural scientist and great transformer of nature I. V. Michurin; the other direction is reactionary-idealist, Weismannist (Mendel-Morganist), the founders of which are reactionary biologists—Weismann, Mendel, Morgan."*[280]

---

279 *"Kultura i Zhizn" (Culture and Life), No. 22, August 11, 1948.*

280 *From the resolution of the session of the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences named after V. I. Lenin on the report of Academician T. D. Lysenko "On*

It should be noted that to accomplish these educational tasks, biology textbooks in our schools must be radically revised, as they incorrectly address modern biological science. Michurinist theory has not found proper reflection in textbooks, and there is a lack of critique against idealism. Major shortcomings also exist in natural science teaching methodologies.

The methodology written by full member of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences B. E. Raikov is completely anti-scientific, non-ideological, and apolitical. From liberal-bourgeois positions, Prof. Raikov handles the issues of teaching natural science.

Not a word is said in it about the achievements of Michurinist biology. All this methodology, if I may say so, is permeated with servility toward foreign reactionary biological "theories".

To build the foundations of a dialectical-materialist worldview, connecting the study of biology with practical work plays a huge role. The best teachers in our country have done significant work in this regard. The journal *"Soviet Pedagogy"* has already noted how, for example, teacher comrade Baklykov from Shurinskaya Elementary School created a team of young high-yield masters and grew 36.18 centners per hectare on a 10-hectare plot. Comrade Baklykov was awarded the title Hero of Socialist Labor, and four students were awarded "For Labor Valor" medals. The children developed a love for labor and an increased interest in knowledge.

The name of Hero of Socialist Labor Ainabat Begencheva became widely known when she initiated high-yield school agricultural plots. Thousands of teachers and leading collective farmers enthusiastically supported this initiative by the Turkmen collective farm worker. The task now is to broadly disseminate this experience, analyze it theoretically, and draw

---

the Situation in Biological Science", "Pravda", August 12, 1948.

conclusions to improve educational quality and raise the human of socialist society.

Michurinist biology must be taught in school, because it alone scientifically explains organic development and arms us with genuine methods to improve crop and animal species. Soviet students must participate practically in applying Michurinist teaching.

***

A huge role in instilling the foundations of a Marxist-Leninist worldview belongs to humanities subjects.

The teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin regarding society and its laws elevated social sciences to the path of truly scientific knowledge of the historical process and became a force accelerating social development. The materialist teaching on the laws of societal development serves as a powerful weapon and theoretical basis for all activities of the Party and Soviet State in economic, political, cultural, and ideological spheres. The brilliant insights of V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin on society's development allow us to direct events and build communism successfully.

Teaching subjects like history, native language, literature, and the Constitution offers rich opportunities to form a Marxist-Leninist worldview in students.

Even in elementary school, students receive basic ideas about society and social relations. They learn that alongside our socialist society, another world exists—a world of exploitation and oppression: the capitalist world.

The teacher's primary task is to show the advantages of the Soviet system over the bourgeois one, highlighting our immense achievements across all spheres of life. In doing so,

the teacher fosters Soviet patriotism and national pride in the younger generation.

Studying history should not be reduced to memorizing isolated facts. Students, especially in middle school, must learn to analyze facts and establish causal relationships. *"Only such a history course,"* states the Decree of the SNK USSR and CC VKP(b) of May 16, 1934, *"can ensure the necessary accessibility, clarity, and concreteness of historical material, upon which proper generalization leading to a Marxist understanding of history becomes possible."*[281]

When studying history, students must be led to understand that the foundation of social development consists of the material conditions of life, primarily social material production. By focusing on the struggle of progressive forces against outdated, reactionary ones, the teacher forms elements of a progressive, scientific Marxist-Leninist worldview.

The history of society is a history of class struggles. Students must understand that only the Great October Socialist Revolution freed working people from oppression, initiating a new era in human history.

In this regard, students must see the immense role played by the Communist Party and its leaders—V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin. Students must realize that as an agent of objective history, the Communist Party played and plays an outstanding role. Its advanced revolutionary ideas, untiring energy, and all-conquering will united working masses in past struggles against landlord-bourgeois systems, accelerating the proletarian revolution, and now organize masses to build a communist society. When studying the Soviet period—the most heroic period in USSR history—it is easy to show how the Bolshevik

---

281 *"Directives of the VKP(b) and Decrees of the Soviet Government on Public Education", Issue 1, APN RSFSR Publishing House, 1947, p. 171.*

Party led the struggle for socialist victory, guiding the energy of the Soviet people toward great transformations.

In studying the Soviet period, students should understand that Soviet society's growth was a triumph of conscious, planned guidance by the Party and State. This leads students to see the fundamental difference between the laws governing socialist vs. capitalist development where spontaneous, blind forces operate.

When presenting historical facts, events, and underlying connections, one must appeal not only to intellect but also to emotion. History provides many examples, especially national history. Above all, the lives and activities of our leaders—V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin—and prominent figures of our party and state offer rich material to cultivate noble patriotism, unbreakable will, and other qualities necessary for builders and defenders of communism.

Fiction literature, especially Soviet literature, provides rich material for shaping a Marxist-Leninist worldview. Belinsky, characterizing the social significance and originality of Russian literature, wrote:

> "It (literature) is already an organized, active force, intertwined through living shoots with various societal needs and interests... It can be compared to fields in spring attire: although the greenery is not brilliant in color, it spreads everywhere; a wonderful time of year is coming."[282]

After the Great October Socialist Revolution freed humanity, fiction literature gained every opportunity to flourish. Soviet literature is the most advanced, revolutionary, and

---

[282] *V. G. Belinsky, Complete Works, ed. S. A. Vengerov, Vol. XI, p. 107.*

ideologically grounded literature, utilizing the method of socialist realism.

Socialist realism is called upon to educate our youth to be highly principled, brave, decisive, unfearful of difficulties, and ready to overcome them.

Raising the level of ideolical orientation in teaching literature —as required by Party decisions on ideological matters— means strengthening the educational impact on youth.

Lack of ideology and apolitical approaches in literature teaching hinder a deep, solid grasp of the material and negatively affect worldview formation.

Teaching fiction literature, no matter how ideologically rich it may be, can educate our youth in the spirit of a Marxist-Leninist worldview only if the teaching itself is non-formal, creative, and politically targeted. Formalism is harmful in any subject, but especially in literature, as it prevents students from understanding that literature reflects life itself.

Subjects like logic and psychology have been introduced into our general education curriculum. These subjects, by providing knowledge about the laws of human thought, are of great importance for instilling the foundations of a Marxist-Leninist worldview. Learning elementary logic helps students develop proper thinking habits and grasp scientific concepts and laws. Elementary logic, like other sciences, arose from human practice.

V. I. Lenin, in contrast to bourgeois scholars who view logic as a pure thought process, emphasized its connection to human practice: *"...the practical activity of man had to lead the consciousness of man to the repetition of various logical figures millions of times, so that these figures could acquire the significance of an axiom."*[283]

[283] *V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 164.*

Elementary logic, while helping students understand the laws of thought, simultaneously promotes cognitive development.

By studying psychology, students acquire a materialist understanding of the human psyche and learn the process of thought, along with the laws governing sensations, perceptions, judgments, and concepts. A correct scientific understanding of human psychology facilitates a scientific view on the development of nature and society. Studying logic and psychology helps students comprehend that matter is primary, and that thought is a product of highly organized matter—specifically the brain, which is the organ of thought. Therefore, thought cannot be separated from matter without falling into crude error.

***

Our school improves its educational quality year after year. However, there are still teachers who remain indifferent to how correctly students understand and explain surrounding reality, overlooking manifestations of prejudices and superstitions. Meanwhile, our pedagogical press still does little to help teachers raise communist educational quality.

Students, especially younger ones, are very impressionable and absorb influences from family, peers, and environment like a sponge.

In daily life, they often hear anti-scientific explanations of natural and social phenomena, encounter remnants of capitalism, and face religious prejudices from adult family members. Sometimes children and adolescents are drawn into religious rites. Clearly, a teacher cannot ignore such facts or remain indifferent to how a child's worldview is formed. The teacher is obligated to direct the child's worldview, helping them perceive and relate to reality correctly.

The indifferent attitude of some teachers toward religious manifestations in certain students is explained, in our view, by the fact that pedagogical training institutions do not pay due attention to anti-religious work among students—future teachers.

In pedagogy curricula for higher educational institutions, there is no section addressing anti-religious education, and in relevant textbooks this topic is covered superficially. Not all teachers correctly understand the Soviet state's relationship to religion. There are still teachers—though few—who are not free from religious prejudices and superstitions. Regrettably, there are even cases where teachers perform religious rites in front of students.

It is hardly necessary to prove that anti-religious education requires more attention.

In bourgeois schools, religion was and remains a subject of instruction. Natural science is presented there in a falsified form. The American pragmatist educator Dewey strongly opposes natural science as a school subject and demands its maximum reduction. In his view, only materialists and anti-humanists advocate expanding natural science in school curricula. With what emotion he speaks of classical education, where the humanities were, in his view, the best means of overcoming barbarism! Obviously, even falsified natural science taught in American schools frightens reactionaries. What kind of natural science knowledge is presented to American students can be judged from the collection *"Foundations of American Philosophy of Education"*, intended for teachers. In this work, in the chapter *"Evolution, Man, Education"*, evolutionary teaching is bashfully replaced by the term *"transformism"*, asserting that it does not contradict theories of world creation. The dispute between transformism (evolutionary teaching) and fixism (belief in world

immutability) is presented merely as a dispute over creation methods. The main difference, we read in this book, between transformism and fixism is not in denying or admitting a supreme power, nor in who or what created species, but in the method used to create new species.

If theological theories on the origin of species are instilled in teachers, one can imagine what knowledge students receive. In US schools, teaching Darwin's evolutionary theory is essentially banned. Even the teaching of falsified natural science causes anxiety among reactionary educators.

The Great October Socialist Revolution ended the existence of an established state church in Russia and established full freedom of conscience. On January 22, 1918, a decree was issued separating church from state and school from church.

The clergy, closely linked to autocracy, met the October Revolution with hostility and entered open struggle against Soviet power. Naturally, the Soviet government was forced to take repressive measures against this most reactionary part of the clergy.

Decisive strengthening of Soviet power, popular support for its measures, and grand successes in socialist construction forced the clergy to reconsider their positions and adopt a loyal attitude toward the Soviet state. However, this does not mean the Soviet state reconsidered its attitude toward religion.

The Soviet state's attitude toward religion remains fundamentally unchanged, ensuring freedom of conscience for all citizens. This position is expressed in Article 124 of the USSR Constitution: *"In order to ensure freedom of conscience for citizens, the church in the USSR is separated from the state, and the school from the church. Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens."*

Our glorious Communist Party, leading the Soviet people to unprecedented victories, has always viewed religion as an alien ideology and fought against it. The social roots of religion and its role as a *"type of spiritual oppression"* (Lenin) were repeatedly exposed with scientific depth in the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

Fighting for freedom of conscience, the Party has always fought against religion. Comrade Stalin, back in 1913 in his work *"Marxism and the National Question"*, wrote:

> "In the social-democratic platform there is a point on freedom of religion. According to this point, any group of persons has the right to profess any religion: Catholicism, Orthodoxy, etc. Social-Democracy will fight against all religious persecutions... but at the same time, proceeding from correctly understood interests of the proletariat, it will conduct agitation against Catholicism, Protestantism, and Orthodoxy to ensure the triumph of the socialist worldview."[284]

The Party conducts its struggle against religion persistently and patiently, without offending believers' feelings. This struggle proceeds via scientific propaganda combined with deep, comprehensive propaganda of Marxist-Leninist ideas.

Currently, a very harmful idea circulates that the masses are indifferent to religion, so it is better not to remind children about religion and leave them ignorant of religious teachings and cults.

Such a viewpoint is wrong, as it disarms us in the fight against religion.

---

[284] *I. V. Stalin, Works, Vol. 2, p. 355.*

The error of neutrality toward religion was clearly pointed out by Comrade Stalin during a conversation with the first American labor delegation on September 9, 1927:

> "We conduct propaganda and will continue to conduct propaganda against religious prejudices. The country's legislation gives every citizen the right to profess any religion. This is a matter of conscience for everyone. That is precisely why we separated church from state. But having proclaimed freedom of worship, we preserved the right of every citizen to fight via persuasion, propaganda, and agitation against any religion.

The Party cannot be neutral toward religion; it conducts anti-religious propaganda against all religious prejudices, because it stands for science, whereas religious prejudices go against science, for any religion is something opposed to science... The Party cannot be neutral toward religious prejudices or toward reactionary clergy poisoning the minds of working masses."[285]

Church figures and sectarians attempt to influence our youth and children.

It is obvious that theories like "non-religious education" or "spontaneous elimination of religion" must be fought decisively as hostile theories hindering a child's scientific worldview.

At the same time, one must fight against offensive attacks on believers, replacing persistent, skillful, long-term anti-religious propaganda with administrative force.

Anti-religious work is a fight against religious worldviews and morality, and simultaneously a fight for a scientific worldview.

---

[285] *I. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 10th ed., pp. 192–193.*

In overcoming religious prejudices, science and enlightenment play a huge role. It would be utopian in a class-antagonistic society to think that science alone can eliminate religious prejudices, as they are rooted in the helplessness of exploited masses before organized exploiters.

It is a different matter for us in a socialist society, where working people own all material assets, social roots of religion are undermined, and culture serves the people. Under these conditions, enlightenment is the main tool against religious prejudices, giving the school a crucial role. Therefore, forming a scientific worldview in students must occur primarily in the process of instruction, carefully planning the entire system of educational activities.

Simultaneously, with students—especially older ones—it is necessary to regularly hold talks, lectures, and reports on natural-scientific and socio-political topics. Such systematic, well-thought-out work will exert a positive influence and foster elements of scientific thinking in students.

In all work on building a Marxist-Leninist worldview, special tact, persistence, and patience are required. Only persistent, systematic work yields positive results.

To build a student's worldview, the teacher himself must possess a scientific, Marxist-Leninist worldview. This requires serious independent effort from every teacher to raise their own ideological level.

***

Success in instilling a Marxist-Leninist worldview in students depends on school collaboration with parents. The Soviet teacher does not isolate themselves within the school; they are connected to the population by thousands of threads. The broader the school's work with parents, the more successful

educational efforts become. Raising the overall cultural level of the population allows the family to be utilized effectively for communist education. The teacher is a transmitter of communist ideas among both children and adults.

In working with parents, anti-religious education issues are sometimes timidly avoided. In lectures and talks, much attention is given to a child's daily routine, hygienic conditions, etc. Of course, these must be discussed.

However, it would be naive to think that without serious, skillful, and tactful scientific propaganda, religious prejudices in the family can be eliminated.

By expanding their work among the population, teachers thereby create more favorable opportunities for improving educational work in school.

The cultivation of the foundations of a Marxist-Leninist worldview in students is one of the most important aspects of communist education and is carried out not only through classroom work during lessons, but also through extracurricular and out-of-school activities, as well as through well-established and organized operations of Pioneer and Komsomol organizations.

Our Soviet teachers perform a noble and responsible task by educating the younger generation in the spirit of the most advanced and revolutionary worldview. The all-conquering power of the Marxist-Leninist worldview is confirmed by the experience of the struggle to build a communist society. It must be mastered by our growing generation—our replacement, our future.

"*Soviet Pedagogy," 1948, No. 11.*

E. I. MONOSZON

Senior Research Associate at the Institute of Teaching Methods, Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR

THE EDUCATION OF CONSCIOUS DISCIPLINE IN STUDENTS

Our socialist Motherland, under the leadership of the great party of Lenin–Stalin, is making a gradual transition from socialism to communism. The peoples of the USSR are heroically fighting for the early fulfillment of the Stalinist plans embodied in the post-war five-year plan, which marks a major step forward on the path of building a communist society.

The transition to the higher phase of communism presupposes the comprehensive development of Soviet people, their education in the spirit of communist ideology, and the elimination of the vestiges of capitalism in people's consciousness. The acceleration of our country's movement forward toward communism now depends on the level of communist consciousness among the working people.

Communist education of the Soviet people and, in particular, of the younger generation is one of the decisive political conditions for the transition from socialism to communism. In carrying out this task, an exceptional role is played role is played by the Soviet school, in which tens of millions of children, young men, and young women are taught and educated.

The Soviet socialist school is the most advanced school in the world. It bases all its work on the foundation of the Leninist-Stalinist teaching on communist education, which aims to provide comprehensive development to the country's young

generations, to prepare them to be educated and cultured people, active builders of communism.

Only the Soviet school arms students with genuinely scientific knowledge and, upon its granite foundation, forms the only scientific, Marxist-Leninist worldview in the younger generations, educates them in the spirit of life-giving Soviet patriotism, noble communist morality, and in the spirit of the great ideas and policies of the Bolshevik Party.

The Patriotic War of the Soviet Union against Hitlerite Germany and imperialist Japan, which served as a “great school of trial and testing of all forces of the people” (Stalin), was at the same time a responsible exam for the Soviet system of educating and training the growing generations.

The Soviet school passed this historic test with honor.

Millions of Soviet schoolchildren, overcoming the hardships of wartime, stubbornly mastered the fundamentals of science. They carried out immense, socially useful work on the home front. Pupils of the school performed heroic deeds in the fight against the enemy at the front.

The immortal deeds of Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya, Aleksandr Chekalin, the Young Guard members of Krasnodon, and many other representatives of our glorious youth will forever remain a bright page in the history of the liberating struggle of the world's peoples against the obscurantism of fascism.

In the years of peaceful construction, pupils of the Soviet school, replenishing the ranks of the working class, the collective farm peasantry, and the Soviet intelligentsia, demonstrate examples of selfless socialist labor in factories and plants, in collective farm fields, and in scientific laboratories.

Under new historical conditions, the Soviet school faces the task of further improving its educational and instructional work.

Decisions of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*, on the repertoire of drama theaters, and on the film *A Great Life*, as well as Comrade Zhdanov's report on the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*, and the decisions of the 11th Congress of the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League (VLKSM) on the work of the Komsomol in schools—are the most important political documents of our time, defining the pathways for educating Soviet youth in the spirit of Bolshevik ideology.

The Communist Party and the Soviet state set as their goal the education of a new generation that is cheerful, confident in its cause, and ready to overcome any obstacles for the victory of communism. One of the most important tasks of the school is the education of conscious discipline in students. It is inextricably linked with the entire system of educational work in the school.

Along with the overwhelming majority of disciplined children in our schools, there are students who violate established norms and rules of conduct. In some schools, the number of truancies and late arrivals to class is still high, and various violations of classroom discipline occur (noise, extraneous chatter during lessons, moving from place to place, prompting, copying others' work, etc.). Individual students do not carry out teachers' instructions, breaking and damaging school property. Quite often, students in our schools violate rules of conduct in public places.

The reasons for weak discipline in some schools lie in the deficiencies of educational and instructional work, low demand

placed on students, unskilled organization of the children's collective, and the still-weak connection between the school and parents.

Insufficient elaboration on the methods of cultivating conscious discipline hinders the teacher's work.

The duty of research workers in the field of pedagogy is to come to the aid of the school in successfully resolving its noble educational tasks.

I. THE ESSENCE OF DISCIPLINE IN THE SOVIET SCHOOL

Every social system creates its own discipline, which is one of the most important elements of social class morality.

In a class society based on oppression and exploitation, discipline is an instrument of the ruling classes, through which they consolidate their economic and political dominance over the working people. Coercion and violence are the most important means of establishing discipline in an exploitative society. In accordance with the nature of this coercion—which changes across different periods of social development depending on the mode of production and organization of labor—lies the character of discipline in that social system.

> "The serf organization of social labor rested on the discipline of the stick, amid extreme ignorance and degradation of the working people, who were robbed and mocked by a handful of landowners. The capitalist organization of social labor rested on the discipline of hunger, and the vast mass of working people, despite all the progress of bourgeois culture and bourgeois democracy, remained in the most advanced, civilized, and democratic republics an ignorant and degraded mass of hired slaves or crushed peasants, robbed and mocked by a handful of capitalists. The

> communist organization of social labor, towards which socialism is the first step, rests and will rest more and more as it advances on the free and conscious discipline of the working people themselves, who have overthrown the yoke of both the landowners and capitalists."[286]

The bourgeoisie and its ideologists attempt to mask the class, exploitative nature of labor discipline established in capitalist enterprises.

Traitors to the working class—right-wing socialists in the USA, England, and other countries of the modern imperialist camp—attempt to portray matters as if discipline in capitalist enterprises were established merely to maintain order required by the "technical conditions" of large-scale production, and that both entrepreneurs and workers are equally interested in maintaining this order.

In reality, compulsory labor discipline in bourgeois countries is directed at intensifying the exploitation of working people. Fines, the threat of unemployment, and political terror are the means by which capitalists "discipline".

Socialist discipline, as a manifestation of new social ties arising from the characteristics of socialist society and the socialist character of production relations, differs fundamentally and in principle from capitalist discipline.

As a result of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, a great historical transition took place: "...from discipline enforced by exploiters to conscious and voluntary discipline" (Lenin).

In the Leninist-Stalinist teaching on socialist social discipline, its character and basic laws are clearly formulated. In his

---

[286] *V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. XXIV, p. 336.*

speech at the 3rd Komsomol Congress, the great leader of the socialist revolution, V. I. Lenin, speaking about the discipline of the new social order, emphasized its consciousness, unity of will, and the cohesion of the collective of builders of socialism in the struggle against an exploitative society.

Lenin contrasts the conscious socialist discipline of workers and peasants with the discipline of bourgeois society—a discipline of oppression and enslavement of the working people.

Conscious discipline is "a discipline of trust and organization," "a discipline of comradeship, a discipline of utmost respect, a discipline of independence and initiative in struggle" (Lenin).

Socialist labor discipline is the *discipline of the working people themselves*. We have no exploitation of man by man. Socialist relations among people in labor are relations of comradely cooperation and mutual assistance among workers free from exploitation. Under the socialist system, the working people themselves—the masters of socialist production, the builders of communism—are interested in firm labor discipline. Socialist discipline ensures high labor productivity, contributes to strengthening the economic power of the Motherland, and, on this basis, drives the growth of the material well-being of the working people.

This is the source of the consciousness and voluntary nature of socialist discipline among the working people of our country.

Speaking about the *consciousness* of working people's discipline, V. I. Lenin at the same time emphasized another aspect of the new discipline—the *subordination* of each member of the collective to the will of the majority and to the requirements of the socialist state.

> "...The basis of unity lies in class discipline, in recognizing the will of the majority, in working harmoniously in the ranks and keeping step with this majority."[287]

The great teachers and leaders of humanity, Lenin and Stalin, repeatedly pointed out that socialist discipline is a labor discipline, an iron discipline. It "...does not exclude, but presupposes consciousness and voluntary subordination, for only conscious discipline can be truly iron discipline."[288]

By what means is conscious labor discipline achieved? The new social discipline, arising from the new social order, does not fall ready-made from the sky: it is created in a long and persistent struggle against all forces, traditions, and vestiges of the old world.

Proceeding from the fact that *consciousness* is the most important feature of working people's discipline, the Leninist-Stalinist teaching considers *persuasion as the main weapon in the fight for socialist discipline*. Agitation and propaganda, socialist emulation, and the entire system of ideological public education must be directed toward forming this new discipline in the working people.

Recognizing persuasion as the primary instrument for educating the new social discipline, Lenin and Stalin also point out the necessity of *coercion*.

Lenin, at the same time, emphasized the following condition for applying coercion:

---

287 *V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. XVII, p. 314.*

288 *J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 10th ed., p. 70.*

> "...we correctly and successfully applied coercion only when we were able first to lay under it a foundation of persuasion."[289]

Establishing conscious labor discipline presupposes the strict responsibility of every working person for the work performed and for their conduct.

In the article "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government," V. I. Lenin spoke of the need to "...learn to combine the stormy, overflowing from all shores, the meeting-democracy of the working masses with iron discipline during work, with unquestioning obedience to the will of a single person, the Soviet leader, during work."[290]

In accordance with the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on socialist discipline, Article 130 of the Constitution of the USSR states that "to obey the laws, to observe labor discipline, to honestly treat public duty, to respect the rules of socialist human intercourse"—is one of the most important duties of a Soviet citizen.

Disciplined behavior—fulfilling established norms and rules of conduct in labor and socialist society—is one of the most important traits of the communist morality of Soviet people. The conscious discipline of working people is nourished by life-giving Soviet patriotism and their devoted love for their socialist Motherland.

The Soviet school is an organic part of Soviet society, inextricably linked with the entire life of the people.

It organizes its educational work based on the state goals of education.

---

289 *V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. XXVI, p. 74.*

290 *V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. XXII, p. 464.*

Between the labor discipline of Soviet society and the discipline of Soviet school students, there is a definite connection: the discipline of the Soviet school reflects the nature of the socialist social discipline existing in our country.

Carrying out the task of preparing students to be future participants in socialist production, active and conscious builders of communist society, the school educates children in the spirit of the requirements of social labor discipline. The content of school discipline and the methods of its education are linked to the specific characteristics of children's activities and their age development during the learning process.

In contrast to the mindless drill of the old school and the mechanical conditioning of children to obedience, the Soviet school implements the principle of conscious socialist discipline.

The conscious discipline of Soviet school students is based not only on their understanding of the demands placed on their behavior in and outside school, which is absolutely necessary, but also on the *internal conviction of children* regarding the necessity of rules and norms of discipline and organized conduct. It is quite understandable that achieving conscious discipline in students requires extensive educational work from the school and teachers.

It must be pointed out that one of the guiding principles of school discipline—its conscious adoption and observance by students—is often misunderstood by individual educators.

Some school principals and teachers reduce the concept of *conscious discipline* to endless moralizing about the benefits of discipline, etc. They fear presenting students with firm, indisputable demands, assuming that children will arrive at the realization of the need for organized conduct on their own.

Such an understanding of students' conscious discipline and its opposition to firm discipline stems from an underestimation of the fact that the school deals with children, and that the degree of consciousness varies at different ages. This fails to account for the important factor of pedagogical influence on the child: the demands placed upon them shape their consciousness and assist them in mastering specific rules of conduct within the collective.

Mindful, however, that a child's development occurs in the process of their upbringing and education, the teacher should persistently form a conscious attitude in students toward discipline requirements. A teacher's knowledge of the laws of children's age development will help them correctly implement the principle of consciousness in cultivating discipline among students. *Conscious discipline is the result of versatile educational work.*

The discipline of the Soviet school must be firm, based on the unconditional obedience of students to the teacher and educator.

Unconditional obedience of the pupil to the will of the educator does not contradict the conscious character of school discipline. Just like Soviet social discipline, the discipline of students in our school must be *proactive*, meaning it should be expressed in the student's active desire to best fulfill requirements, orders, and instructions, and—most importantly—in striving striving toward organized work and performing one's duty through personal initiative.

The outstanding Soviet educator A. S. Makarenko wrote in his *Lectures on Child Education*:

> “Sometimes a disciplined person is defined as one who is distinguished by obedience. Of course, in the vast majority of cases, every person is required

> to execute the orders and instructions of higher bodies and individuals accurately and quickly; yet in Soviet society, so-called obedience is an entirely insufficient sign of a disciplined person—mere obedience cannot satisfy us, much less blind obedience, which was usually demanded in the old, pre-revolutionary school."[291]

A more complex, fundamentally different kind of discipline is required of a Soviet citizen. They must possess an *initiative-driven and creative will*, know how to select the correct behavior that is most useful to society under any conditions, and find the firmness within themselves to maintain such behavior to the end, despite any difficulties. Soviet discipline is a "discipline of struggle and overcoming".

Having defined the general character of school discipline, let us turn to revealing its *content*.

What constitutes the disciplined nature of a Soviet school student?

The conscious discipline of students is expressed, first of all, in their observance of the rules and requirements set by the school, and in the neat and conscientious performance of academic duties. At the same time, conscious discipline requires students to fulfill established rules of socialist conduct toward other forms of labor (socially useful work, physical labor in the family, age-appropriate labor during out-of-school hours in collective farm production, etc.).

One of the main manifestations of conscious discipline in Soviet school students is a socialist attitude toward public and personal property, in particular, a careful attitude toward school property.

---

[291] *A. S. Makarenko, Lectures on Child Education. Uchpedgiz, 1940, p. 40.*

Conscious discipline requires organized conduct from students both inside and outside the school.

The concept of students' conscious discipline includes the thoughtful and unconditional observance of essential rules and norms of socialist community life, such as respect and polite attitudes toward parents, elders, and peers.

An essential feature of a Soviet student's discipline is deep respect for the teacher and unconditional recognition of their authority.

The conscious discipline of a Soviet school student is characterized by the fact that even in the absence of constant external control, they conscientiously fulfill their assigned duties.

A disciplined student not only observes the requirements of school discipline themselves, but also decisively fights against non-discipline in their peers.

The basic rules of student discipline are formulated in the "Rules for Students," introduced by order of the People's Commissariat of Education of the RSFSR on August 5, 1943. They are the law of a student's life.

The ultimate goal of discipline education is to achieve a level of consciousness at which the student adopts the norms and rules of socialist community life as their own. Therefore, one of the key tasks of discipline education is forming specific views and convictions in children regarding discipline, which underpin their awareness of its norms and rules.

However, convictions and views must be constantly translated into action by students through disciplined conduct. For this, systematic training of students in organization and discipline is necessary. A. S. Makarenko emphasized that discipline grows not out of bare intellectual conviction alone, but also out of

conscious experience, from practical, comradely, collective action. Thus, the system of educating student discipline in the Soviet school includes the development of views and convictions regarding discipline, the gradual realization by children of disciplinary rules and norms, and the training of students through collective life and activity in discipline—that is, the cultivation of corresponding habits and skills of organized behavior.

II. BASIC CONDITIONS AND METHODS FOR EDUCATING CONSCIOUS DISCIPLINE IN STUDENTS

1. The Decisive Role of the Teacher

The success of educating conscious discipline, as well as of all educational and instructional work in the school, is determined primarily and mainly by the personality of the teacher and their activities.

The content and methods of cultivating conscious discipline, which stem from the goals and tasks of communist education for the younger generation, are *practically carried out by the teacher* through their multifaceted educational and instructional work. The final result of children's discipline education depends on them.

The personality and authority of the teacher are of great importance for cultivating discipline in the school.

How is the authority of an educator determined and built?

The authority of any individual is based primarily on their strength in ideological, moral, and intellectual terms. A teacher's authority depends on their moral and political character, intellectual superiority, and ability to win the love and respect of children.

High ideoloy, limitless devotion to the socialist Motherland and the great cause of Lenin–Stalin, Bolshevik adherence to

principle, active fulfillment of civic duties, and selfless service to one's people—these are necessary qualities of a Soviet teacher.

Not only older students, but to a certain extent younger ones as well, consider a teacher's moral qualities in their attitude toward them. If an educator causes children to doubt their moral virtues through their actions, they have already undermined their authority.

This is why all the best moral qualities of a Soviet person must be embodied in the teacher. Only in this case can they instill these qualities in their pupils.

The teacher, realizing the immense power of their personal example's educational influence on children, must serve as an exemplary model worthy of imitation through all their conduct. They must actively make use of children's natural desire to see in the teacher a "combination of all virtues" (N. A. Dobrolyubov).

A teacher's authority is also determined by their level of intellectual development, knowledge of the subject taught, general culture, and attitude toward their teaching labor.

In relations with the teacher, children should see an example of *love and respect for the human personality*. A heartless, bureaucratic attitude, constant distrust of students, fault-finding, rudeness, and a lack of sensitivity undermine the teacher's authority and alienate children from them.

The combination of demandingness and sensitivity contributes to strengthening the teacher's authority and increasing their educational influence on students.

Proper relationships between teacher and students, along with authority, also depend on how well the teacher knows the children's collective of their class and school, the individual

characteristics of the students, their character traits, interests, inclinations, views, and moods. Knowledge of students and an individual approach to them protect the teacher from mistakes. Observing students during lessons and recesses, in extracurricular activities, in public work, and holding conversations with students and their parents can give the teacher a comprehensive idea of the student's personality and traits.

The strength of a teacher's educational influence lies in pedagogical tact—that is, in the well-considered actions of the teacher regarding both individual misdeeds and the conduct of every student.

Authority, therefore, depends primarily on the teacher themselves, who must persistently and systematically cultivate in themselves the above-mentioned qualities of a respected educator.

2. Properly Organized Instruction—The Foundation of Educating Student Discipline

Learning, as Ushinsky said, is a powerful instrument of education. This premise applies all the more to the Soviet school, where knowledge taught is not falsified, as is the case in bourgeois schools, but is genuinely scientific. The lesson as the main form of organization of educational work is not only a tool for arming students with knowledge, but also an essential means of education. In the process of learning, students' views, convictions, and worldview are formed. Here, first and foremost, the collective creative activity of students is organized.

In the course of educational work, the active attitude of pupils toward labor, public property, and people is primarily determined. This attitude characterizes the quality of children's conscious discipline.

Successful learning requires establishing conscious discipline, and at the same time, learning itself creates necessary conditions for cultivating student discipline. It is called upon to foster in students a sense of responsibility for their schoolwork as a primary duty and a contribution to state affairs.

> "We view our work," writes order-bearing teacher A. M. Deryabina, "together with the students, as a small part of the nationwide plan for building communism—whether we read newspapers, prepare to pass norms for the BGSO badge, or care for the neatness of notebooks—in everything, we see the connection of our work with the great construction project of the Soviet people. When children begin to be guided in their actions by nationwide motives, our work acquires an elevated character."[292]

Every lesson, through all its content, organization, and methods, must ensure the education of students in the spirit of conscious discipline.

The task of the educator is to use the content of educational curricula, materials on socialist construction, and current events to foster in students an understanding of conscious discipline requirements and a drive toward active creative work. For example, a seven-year school teacher, using reading lessons, speech development, history lessons, and other subjects, as well as extracurricular activities, should convey to students key moral concepts related to discipline:

---

[292] "*Methods for Increasing Academic Achievement in School," Uchpedgiz, 1940, p. 69.*

In the USSR, labor is a matter of honor, glory, valor, and heroism—the first and most important duty of everyone. In our country, everyone must work.

For success in labor, for the growth of our Motherland's power, and for its success in the struggle against enemies, every citizen must work with full exertion of their strength and capabilities, strictly observing labor discipline.

In the USSR, studying "well" and "excellently" is a sacred patriotic duty of every student to the Motherland. Successful learning requires strict discipline and students' fulfillment of established rules of conduct.

A Soviet school student is a future active and conscious builder of communism. Within the school walls and in the Pioneer detachment, they must prepare themselves for labor and defense, educating themselves to be honest, truthful, persistent in achieving goals, brave, enduring, and courageous.

In their behavior, they must follow the example of the great leaders of the revolution, Lenin and Stalin, the courageous heroes of the Great Patriotic War, Heroes of the Soviet Union, and Stakhanovites—the best people of our Motherland.

Soviet people do not fear difficulties. A Soviet student knows how to persistently overcome difficulties in learning and labor.

Socialist public property is sacred and inviolable. Soviet children treat public, school, and personal property with care.

Our country is strong through the fraternal union of the peoples inhabiting it, through collectivism, cohesion, and the unity of working people in the common struggle for the victory of communism.

Friendship, comradeship, and mutual assistance unite Soviet children as well.

A Soviet student must set an example of cultured behavior both inside and outside the school.

The Party and the government highly value the teacher's labor. A Soviet student respects their teachers and conscientiously carries out their instructions, advice, and orders.

Explanatory reading, which serves as the basis of primary education, provides rich opportunities for educational work.

The material contained in reading books and textbooks, when skillfully used, allows the teacher to teacher to properly influence the feelings and consciousness of primary school students: "My Sister" (care for little ones), "Mother and Children," "The Plum Stone" (on the impermissibility of lying), "Know How to Wait," "A Piglet's Own Brother" (about an untidy boy), "Dirty Girl," "Who Punished Kolya?", "Finished the Job—Walk Boldly," etc. For example, the 1st-grade reading book provides a series of short stories related to discipline education: "Who Follows Whom?" (on the way to school), "Almost Late," "How to Sit in Class?", "What Mitya's Father Said" ("Might is not right," after Ushinsky).

However, the teacher must remember that a textbook cannot replace living speech or the direct influence of their educational word. Therefore, it is especially important to skillfully select material and expressive means for a teacher's story or conversation during the lesson.

Teacher M. I. Kuzmina of Moscow School No. 626 speaks on the moral influence of reading and discussions based on read materials:[293]

> "I read several articles from *Pionerskaya Pravda* to my 2nd-grade students describing children's attentive and thoughtful attitudes toward elders.

[293] *Journal "Primary School," 1944, No. 4.*

> Afterward, many children shared with me how they helped old or sick people. When a child reports, for instance, that they helped an old woman carry firewood in their building today, our children's collective learns of such actions and welcomes them."

A large number of examples could be cited showing how the best teachers use the content of educational work to develop proper views, convictions, and concepts of discipline in children.

All subjects in the secondary school curriculum contribute to varying degrees to forming correct views on discipline in students and building solid habits of organized conduct.

In grades V–VII, work on forming communist views in students regarding labor, public property, and interpersonal relations can be based on extensive historical material and classic examples of outstanding literary works of the peoples of the USSR studied in reading literature courses.

Teaching physical culture is of tremendous importance for educating conscious student discipline[294].

The foundations of student discipline are laid during lessons.

From this perspective, the teacher must precisely foresee what and how things will be explained and demonstrated to students in the lesson; they must skillfully combine various instructional methods and techniques: engaging all students in active work, making consistent and strict demands on student behavior during the lesson (observing behavior rules during questioning, raising hands, order at desks, rules for using learning aids and supplies, etc.).

---

[294] *This issue is covered in detail in Prof. P. A. Rudik's article "Issues of Physical Education in School," see "Soviet Pedagogy," No. 8–9, 1946.*

Pedagogical skill and clear lesson organization are the keys to student discipline.

Regrettably, one must observe instances where teachers begin a lesson without paying attention to whether students have settled down or prepared their workspace—textbooks, notebooks, diaries, writing utensils. It is clear that such teachers cannot maintain order in the lesson, and consequently, the necessary effectiveness of instruction and education is lost. Students must know that upon hearing the bell, they enter the classroom, quickly check the order on their desks, and with the teacher's appearance, work begins immediately. The teacher must relentlessly demand unconditional compliance with this rule from students.

It is very important to properly organize homework checks and student questioning. It sometimes happens that while the teacher checks homework or questions individual students, the rest of the class, disengaged from specific tasks, loses its working mood—leading to disorder.

Some teachers complain that students do not complete homework. To a significant extent, this results from insufficient demandingness and poor organization of this aspect of academic work.

Frequently, teachers assign homework "under the bell," when there is no time left to explain its content or procedure to the children. The teacher, however having assigned homework and skillfully guided students' independent work, is entitled to demand the execution of assigned work at home and relentlessly achieve success in this endeavor.

The school exerts an educational influence on students not only during academic sessions, but also during out-of-school hours.

Extracurricular and out-of-school activities organized with children contribute, in particular, to educating them in the spirit of conscious discipline.

The importance of extracurricular and out-of-school work for educating conscious discipline lies in the fact that:

a) through its content, it promotes students' adoption of disciplinary norms and requirements;

b) it accustomed them to organized and socially useful labor;

c) through clear organization of out-of-school activities, it develops a specific set of habits and behaviors within the collective;

d) it reasonably directs children's interests, organizing their leisure and rest without leaving room for aimless time-wasting.

The Role of the Children's Collective in Strengthening Conscious Discipline

A children's collective in school is not a randomly gathered group of children, but their unification under the leadership of a teacher for joint labor.

The organization of children based on their shared activity is one of the main conditions ensuring successful discipline education.

The children's collective is not only an object, but also a subject of education.

As N. K. Krupskaya pointed out, "a valuable quality of the new person—a sense of responsibility of each for the work and conduct of the entire collective, as well as the responsibility of the collective for each of its members—is cultivated within the collective." In the class collective, Pioneer detachment, or unit, the child learns to live by the rule: "One for all, and all for one."

A children's collective, skillfully directed by a teacher, serves as a powerful factor in educating conscious discipline. A. S. Makarenko believed that in the process of communist education of children and adolescents, it is necessary to build a collective. "The art of the educator consists in combining leadership with the rights of the collective itself. The educator must know how to direct the collective so that the will of the educator and that of the collective are unified. Education in the collective and through the collective is one of the main principles of Soviet pedagogy."

In the Soviet Union, Makarenko stated, there can be no personality outside the collective, and therefore there can be no personal path or happiness opposed to the path and happiness of the collective. Therefore, influencing an individual through the collective is the strongest method. "In this lies the new logic of the Soviet system of education." It does not exclude the teacher's individual influence on individual students, while taking their individual differences into account.

The guiding role of the teacher in collective education increases. Where the educator relies on the activity, initiative, and independence of the children's collective, public opinion and a sense of responsibility for one's collective are fostered and supported. Under these conditions, it is easier to achieve a new discipline.

A crucial condition for creating a united collective is the diverse joint activity of pupils, in the process of which essential traits of the new human are developed: respect for common labor, readiness to fulfill duties out of duty and responsibility to the collective, etc.

A cohesive children's collective is formed primarily through instruction, as learning labor is their main activity. In daily activities with children, by organizing their studies, the teacher

forms the children's collective, establishes correct relationships within it, and uses the collective's influence on students.

However, creating a united children's collective capable of disciplining every member requires special, purposeful efforts of the teacher and the entire pedagogical collective. As experience shows, this work should proceed in two interconnected directions: 1) bringing to children's consciousness the significance of the collective in common work and the necessity of subordinating to its will; 2) instilling habits of collective work and discipline.

In primary grades, the main emphasis is placed on *accustoming* children to fulfilling the collective's requirements as directed by the teacher. Yet even here, it is important to explain to children in an accessible manner the meaning of the collective and the need to follow established rules of collective life, friendship, and comradeship.

In uniting the primary class collective, it is exceptionally important to rely on the most disciplined and active children.

Teacher Arkhipova of Chertovishchenskaya Primary School in Ivanovo Region practices assigning individual duties to children as early as 1st grade through the collective. The children themselves nominate organizers for board games, classroom library managers, nature corner monitors, etc. These assignments accustom children to working for the benefit of the collective.

Class meetings play a large role in uniting the children's collective. The "Regulations on Student Organizations in School" provides, starting in 3rd grade, for systematic class meetings on improving the work of the class and individual students. When properly organized, class meetings bring children together, arm them with an awareness of the collective's strength, unite them around common tasks, instill

skills for jointly solving life issues within the collective, and foster a sense of responsibility to and for the collective.

Class meetings are of particular importance in upper grades, as organized influence of the children's collective is vital for adolescents. The power of any collective lies in the unity of its parts. One must not limit oneself to a narrow collective; therefore, the task of uniting the children's collective cannot be restricted to the class collective alone—this would narrow the foundation for cultivating collectivism in children as future full-fledged citizens of our country. The fight for the honor of one's class must expand into a fight for the honor of the school, and responsibility for the studies and discipline of individual students in one's class must expand into responsibility for the academic achievement and discipline of all students in the school.

Creating school traditions and educating all children upon these positive traditions is an important task for the school's pedagogical staff.

Pioneer and Komsomol organizations in the school are the primary helpers of the teacher and class supervisor in educational work, organization, and cohesion of the children's collective.

Caring for the vibrant activity of Pioneer and Komsomol organizations is a key duty of the pedagogical staff and school leadership. The decisions of the 11th Congress of the VLKSM on Komsomol work in schools serve as a combat program for Soviet teachers.

The school's pedagogical collective is obligated to provide daily assistance to Pioneer troop leaders and, above all, ensure that school Pioneers set an example in study and conduct, leading all students forward.

When work is properly organized, Pioneers themselves closely monitor the academic performance and discipline of their comrades, organizing mutual aid where needed, condemning violators of order, and initiating useful undertakings aimed at creating a vibrant life in the children's collective.

Teacher N. Kostareva from a Moscow school shares an interesting experience in this regard:

> "We managed to gain a good friend in Kharitina Grigorievna Parkhomenko. Having invited her to a gathering dedicated to the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, I prepared the children beforehand. I told them that Aleksandr Yakovlevich Parkhomenko was a friend of Voroshilov, that he died early in battle for the Motherland and was posthumously awarded two Orders of the Red Banner. I showed the children V. Ivanov's book *Parkhomenko* and read several vivid episodes from it. The ground was prepared, and Kharitina Grigorievna's simple, moving story about the hero-husband's life was heard with bated breath. And suddenly, everyone had the same thought—to name our detachment after Parkhomenko. But that was not so simple..."

The name of Parkhomenko had to be earned. "It is impossible to disgrace the name of Parkhomenko," class supervisor N. Kostareva told the children. "Yet we have students with poor academic standing and discipline violations. We must struggle for the right to bear the name of Parkhomenko. I cannot promise that all of us will study without failing marks in the second quarter, but we will hang the portrait of Parkhomenko in the classroom only when we earn the right to call ourselves the Parkhomenko Detachment. To call ourselves the

Parkhomenko Detachment and misbehave at school is something no one would think to do."

Comrade Kostareva recounts how the children tried to justify this trust.

It seems that anyone can monitor order in the classroom; every class monitor takes turns on duty. But here, monitoring duty was always performed with enthusiasm and pride. The children asked to be on duty for two days in a row, even though only one day was expected.

How was such a mood created? By entrusting order monitoring to the class, great trust was shown. This trust had to be justified, for "we are the Parkhomenko Detachment." It was agreed that every Friday after classes, the unit would sum up the results: someone suggested keeping a special notebook where the monitor would record all observations. This raised the sense of responsibility even further.

"On Saturday, I passed along the director's gratitude to the class for their conscientious work in helping the school. The children's collective, it would seem, rallied and united even more."

School-wide events contribute significantly to uniting the children's collective: assemblies, matinees, excursions, interest clubs, sports competitions, creative evenings, and collective socially useful labor.

The experience of the best schools and teachers shows that where the pedagogical staff, school principal, and study director daily lead the children's collective and systematically assist Pioneer troops and Komsomol organizations, the responsibility of the children's collective for each student increases significantly, discipline in the school improves, and students' academic success rises.

School and family in educating student discipline. "Unity of school requirements for students and harmonious work between teachers and parents ensures the success of cultivating conscious student discipline." In this partnership, the leading role belongs to the school and the teacher. The school must know the conditions of family upbringing for its pupils and strive for a unified approach toward children. The school's task is to properly organize its interaction with parents, in which child education in the family is treated as a responsible duty.

Under socialist conditions, the joint work of school and family is ensured by the unity of educational tasks set by the state and the people. However, this real opportunity for educational unity between family and school can only be realized through active utilization by both teachers and parents.

In school practice, there are still many facts testifying to a lack of contact between school and family in child upbringing. Sometimes individual teachers undervalue the importance of joint efforts between school and family in disciplining students. Often parents do not consult with teachers and do not utilize advice in raising their children. Many parents do not know how to approach the specific resolution of key educational tasks. Nothing, for instance, negatively affects the formation of a child's will, character, and discipline like a lack of unified demands, consistency, and systematic influence from both school and parents. Lacking firm convictions and clear concepts, the child often cannot navigate what requirements are necessary and correct, or how they should act. As a result, various violations of conduct arise.

In what direction should joint work between school and family proceed regarding the education of conscious discipline in students?

The school must, above all, explain to parents the requirements for children's conduct in and outside of school, as formulated in the government-approved "Rules for Students." Without parents knowing these rules, there can be no talk of unified requirements for schoolchildren.

However, the school cannot limit its influence on parents merely to explaining requirements; it must help the child's father and mother master the methods of communist upbringing and, in particular, issues of discipline. Various forms of pedagogical propaganda can serve this purpose: lectures, discussions, individual and collective consultations, parent universities, seminars, study groups, print media, etc.

In working with parents of undisciplined students, the teacher must know how to spare the parents' self-esteem and their love for their child. Hence, it is important not so much to complain to parents about the child's behavior, but rather to advise and consult with them, and in necessary cases, demand compliance with the school's directives. It is necessary to build parents' trust, making them realize that the teacher is no less concerned about their child's fate than they are themselves, and showing them that the teacher sees not only the negative sides and shortcomings of the child, but also their virtues and positive traits.

The educational influence of the school on children becomes stronger as the parental community is more broadly and actively drawn in to help the school (participation in parent committee work, school library support, etc.).

Active parent participation in school operations brings them even closer to its interests and demands, raises the authority of the school and teachers in the eyes of parents—and consequently in the eyes of children—thereby significantly facilitating the task of educating conscious discipline.

5. Application of Individual Methods and Techniques for Educating Conscious Discipline in Students

The scope of concepts formed in students regarding discipline and the degree of their effectiveness depend on the children's age, their general education, and cultural level and life experience.

If the requirements of school discipline are initially perceived by primary school students primarily as indisputable demands of the school and teacher, then gradually, at higher stages of education and upbringing, these same requirements will be reframed in students' consciousness as specific moral concepts.

One of the methods to achieve this goal is *explanation*. First and foremost, the subject of explanation should be the norms of conduct and discipline requirements formulated in the "Rules for Students."

It is self-evident that identical concepts of discipline expressed in the "Rules for Students" do not arise in children all at once, but require repeated explanations.

Concreteness and vividness in explaining the "Rules" are the most important pedagogical requirements.

Comrade Rogasinskaya, head of the Alexandrovsk (Sakhalin) Pedagogical Cabinet, reports several examples of skillful rule explanation to students in the newspaper *Sovetsky Sakhalin*:

> “At Primary School No. 1 in Alexandrovsk, a Pioneer gathering was held on the theme 'For the Honor of the School.' By evening, an exhibition was prepared: 'How We Fight for the Honor of Our Detachment.' In the exhibition section 'How We Study,' student notebooks, diaries, and class journals were displayed. Beneath a poster reading 'Let's Protect Textbooks' lay textbooks covered and

repaired by students, alongside notebooks tracking textbook conditions, etc. Teacher of Class X conducted a vivid discussion with Pioneers, sharing positive traditions of the school and its best students."

In Alexandrovsk schools for grades IV–VII, extracurricular discussions are systematically held on rule content: "How an Educated Person Benefits the Motherland," "How Great People of Our Country Studied," "The Value of Books in Human Life," "A Schoolchild's Daily Routine," "Organizing Your Workspace in Class and Home," "Cleanliness—The Key to Health," "Public Duty," "Politeness," etc. Naturally, these discussions across different grades are built on material accessible to students' understanding.

Teacher Comrade Uvarova, aiming for vivid explanations of discipline requirements and behavior norms, compiled a whole collection of newspaper clippings for herself articles on Pioneer deeds, contrasting negative and positive examples.

Some teachers use a method of *explanation* through individual and class discussions based on real cases from school life. Analyzing positive and negative student actions, the teacher suggests that children reflect on their own behavior and actions, training them to analyze and evaluate their personal qualities.

Individual conversations carry great weight for explaining discipline requirements to students. The results of a conversation depend primarily on how well the teacher manages to concretely and vividly convey specific norms of discipline.

The teacher should use concrete facts from school life to explain discipline demands.

Teacher Comrade Slobodskoy (Rostov Region) showed students magazine illustrations and told them about the immense human effort embedded in making a desk: logging timber, processing wood at sawmills, and crafting desks at the factory. The children listened to this story with great interest, realizing the need to care for school property. Then the children asked to be shown how to keep notebooks and pencils properly. As a result of the teacher's educational work, students learned to care for school desks, textbooks, and equipment.

To build convictions in students, educators also use a method of explanation such as *admonition*. Here is an example of skillful guidance:

Teacher of Seven-Year School No. 10 (Shakhty) encountered such a case: "I noticed a student running down the corridor. Stopping him, I asked: 'Who is on duty today?' The student named the monitor. 'When a senior speaks to you, you must stop, listen to the question, and answer calmly,' I said.

This form of influence is quite common in primary school age, where children learn behavior rules through practical experience.

In explaining rules of conduct in and outside school, the teacher must show necessary firmness and persistence in their requirements.

Proceeding from the principles of socialist humanism, A. S. Makarenko formulated one of the key tenets of Soviet pedagogy: "As many demands as possible on a person, but as much respect for them as possible."[295] Respect for human dignity lies at the core of Bolshevik demandingness. Relying on his pedagogical experience, Makarenko developed the theory and methods of presenting demands to pupils.

---

[295] *A. S. Makarenko, Works, vol. V, p. 102.*

In his lecture "Discipline, Rewards, and Punishments," Makarenko outlined the following stages in applying demandingness:

The *first stage*—when the educator presents demands to an unorganized collective, unaccompanied by moralizing speeches.

The *second stage* of demandingness development occurs when a active group of students forms around the teacher, supporting the educator's demands with their own opinion. At this stage, the educator gains the opportunity to apply moral theory.

The *third stage* of demandingness development occurs when the collective itself demands discipline. In this case, the educator receives wide scope for unfolding moral theories before the collective. "This path from the dictator's demand of an organizer to the free demand of each individual upon themselves against the background of the collective's demands —this path," says A. S. Makarenko, "is the main path in developing a Soviet children's collective."[296]

An educator's demand toward a children's collective and individual students can be expressed in various forms: an order, prohibition, admonition, reminder, wish, advice, or even a request. Selecting one form of demand over another depends on the goal and specific conditions under which it is applied.

A teacher's demand expressed in a categorical, imperative form is an *order*.

When a categorical demand is expressed in a negative form ("not allowed...", etc.), it is usually called a *prohibition*.

---

[296] *A. S. Makarenko, Selected Pedagogical Works, Uchpedgiz, 1946, p. 102.*

Based on analyzing school experience, the following main rules for issuing orders can be formulated:

An order must be categorical in character and aimed at the pupil's unconditional fulfillment of the educator's demand. Explaining the motive of an order is not mandatory, though it may be allowed to the extent that it is understandable to the child and does not diminish unreserved execution.

An order must be clear, definite, and precise. The student must clearly understand what is required of them and what type of action is obligatory. Otherwise, the order will go unfulfilled, be executed imprecisely, or even incorrectly. Unclarity in an order can cause the student to doubt the necessity of its execution.

An order must be brief. Brevity contributes to its definiteness and prevents conflicting interpretations. Furthermore, a brief order is better remembered by a child and, consequently, executed faster.

An order must be within the child's capacity, without requiring excessive strain. An unmanageable order undermines the "foundation of foundations"—unconditional execution—which is entirely unacceptable in educational terms, as it breeds a practice of disobedience.

An order must be characterized by consistency, meaning it should not contradict a previously given order by the same teacher or other teachers and school leaders.

An order cannot be given in anger, with shouting, in an irritated state, or in a joking, mocking tone. An order must be firm and serious. This achieves the necessary authority for the command.

Excessive lavishness in handing out orders and prohibitions is unacceptable—this weakens their force and effectiveness.

Once an order is given, its execution by the student must be achieved.

An order serves not only as a means to direct a pupil's behavior, but also as an important tool for shaping their consciousness and convictions, which dictate all their behavior.

Admonition, as a method of educational influence, is characterized by the educator's desire to convince the pupil of the advisability of acting a certain way based on specific motives. The success of admonition depends primarily on the educator's authority and their ability to approach the child. Admonition has nothing in common with begging a child. Admonition is a demand expressed in a gentler form, appealing to feelings of honor and duty. Admonition can be delivered in class, in the presence of peers, or in private. Setting selection is determined by pedagogical advisability (taking into account individual child characteristics, age, nature of the action, etc.).

Admonition within a collective evokes a feeling of shame in children, but it should not turn into mocking the student or aimless moralizing.

Reminder is a repetition of an admonition, often with reference to what was previously said to the student.

In Seven-Year School No. 2 (Shakhty), the following case occurred: "Student Marusya V. was rude to a teacher in class. In a private conversation with this teacher, Marusya apologized and promised to improve. However, the next day, Marusya broke her promise and tore up a notebook with a bad mark. The teacher told her: 'Marusya, when a person breaks their word, they are no longer trusted as an honorable person.' This remark affected Marusya deeply. A week later, on the way home, she caught up with the teacher and asked: 'Do you really not believe me now?' The teacher replied: 'Now I see that you

know how to keep your word.' The girl's behavior improved markedly."

Sometimes a teacher may express a demand in the form of a *wish*: "I would like you not to interfere with your neighbor's work."[297]

A demand can also be expressed in the form of *advice*, when the teacher recommends a specific line of conduct to the student.

A teacher's demand can also be expressed in the form of a *request* addressed to the child. This gives the student an opportunity to choose a course of action. A child perceives a demand in request form as advice; a request should be resorted to when there is confidence in its execution. However, one cannot allow a situation where a demand turned request becomes an occasion for bargaining between teacher and student. Resorting to requests too often inevitably leads to a loss of teacher authority and possible breakdowns in student discipline.

In all cases, the teacher must express demands with dignity.

Teacher cannot educate a disciplined person through mere explanations of discipline. Practice shows that students often know the rules of discipline well, but do not know how to carry them out. *Training in disciplined behavior is required.*

It is appropriate to cite Dobrolyubov's words: "Reasonable training consists of making useful rules habits in children... When instructing children, one must train them to perform actions, requiring from them that what is desired be retained in their soul; one must make children act so constantly and repeatedly that doing so becomes their nature."[298]

---

[297] *From materials of the Rostov Institute for Advanced Teacher Training.*

Training in organized behavior begins from a child's first days in school and must continue throughout all schooling. Naturally, in primary classes, children are trained in elementary habits of discipline; as they grow older, these habits are deepened and perfected.

Applying a well-thought-out system of training in discipline habits, the teacher: a) brings the necessity of acquiring a given habit to the child's consciousness; b) shows how it should be performed (for example, shows how to sit at a desk, how to stand up during questioning, etc.); c) systematically exercises students in specific habits; d) daily monitors students' execution of established rules of conduct in and outside school.

An essential condition for educating conscious discipline is a clear routine for all life and activity of children both in school and at home.

If a school strives to instill the best qualities in a child, to educate discipline and organization, and to accustom them to order and culture, it must naturally first care that the child sees positive examples in their surrounding environment, routine, and school order.

Principals and teachers of leading schools have mastered this rule and, paying great attention to external order and routine, achieve good results in discipline education.

In such schools, every detail of equipment and decoration in the school building and classrooms is well-thought-out; academic labor and rest routines for children are clearly regulated, with planned and systematic organization across all student life.

---

[298] *N. A. Dobrolyubov, Selected Pedagogical Writings, Uchpedgiz, 1939, pp. 134–135.*

Very interesting and instructive is the experience in training primary grade students in discipline conducted by Teacher A. E. Adrianova of a Leningrad school, detailed in her book *Educational Work in Class 1* (Leningrad, 1940) and the collection *Educating Conscious Discipline in Students* (Uchpedgiz, 1941).

In the first days of students' school attendance, Comrade Adrianova explains the meaning of school bells, how to greet the teacher, how to quietly stand up and sit down at one's seat, the advisability of raising hands during lessons, basic rules of conduct during recess, etc. For every habit taught, the educator strives to bring it to the child's consciousness, justifying the necessity of its acquisition for successful work at school and home.

At first, Adrianova focused on cultivating students' external behavior and movement coordination. She taught them to quietly stand up, sit down, leave desks, approach the blackboard without bumping into desks or making noise, and without shuffling feet; during answers and conversations with adults, to stand straight, keep hands at their sides, without leaning on the board or wall, or swaying to their own words.

Training in all these habits proceeded on the basis of all academic work throughout the school year.

Cultivating politeness in details, Adrianova taught children to greet and say goodbye to adults and peers, and when called by a teacher, not to sit down until invited to do so, and to apologize if accidentally bumping or pushing someone. She taught children to offer chairs to adults, pick up fallen objects, listen to speeches of adults and peers without interrupting. As a result of a well-thought-out system of training in discipline habits, teacher Adrianova achieves strong results.

Solid foundations of organized behavior laid at a primary age successfully develop in upper school grades. Here, training students in discipline relies on their greater level of consciousness.

Habits developed in upper grades carry a more complex character. For instance, while in primary school (especially grades I–II) main attention is centered on instilling primary habits like entering/exacting the classroom, addressing the teacher with questions, behavior during questioning, etc., in upper grades greater importance is attached to habits of organized independent work, self-control, etc.

In cultivating positive habits and discipline skills in students, teachers cannot fail to fight against bad habits that contradict requirements of conscious socialist discipline. The struggle against bad habits—*unlearning*—must proceed in the following directions: cultivating self-control (especially in older ages), replacing bad habits with necessary and useful ones, systematic monitoring of student behavior by school and family, and involving public opinion from the children's collective to fight against bad habits in individual students.

Exceptionally important instructions on ways to eradicate bad habits in children are found in K. D. Ushinsky's works.

> “By its very nature,” says Ushinsky, “a habit is eradicated either from a lack of nourishment—i.e., stopping actions that led to the habit—or by another, opposing habit. Taking into account children's innate need for constant activity, one must employ both means at once when eradicating habits: as far as possible, remove every occasion for actions stemming from a harmful habit, while simultaneously directing the child's activity in another direction. If, while eradicating a habit, we

do not give activity to the child at the same time, the child will involuntarily act the old way."[299]

Further, Ushinsky points out that when eradicating a habit, one should look into why it arose and act primarily against the cause, not against the consequence.

Numerous facts of eradicating indiscipline in students observed in pedagogical practice show that success is always determined by careful study of the causes of indiscipline and an individual approach in selecting methods of influence. In doing so, it is important to rely on the positive qualities present in the pupil.

Encouragement and Punishment

In the Soviet school, encouragement and punishment have a fundamentally different meaning than in a bourgeois school.

Encouragement and awards in bourgeois schools are infused with individualism. They stem from a desire to pit individual students against the collective and are based on mutual competition and rivalry among students.

Punishments in bourgeois schools bear the stamp of the ruling ideology. They are designed mainly to cultivate blind obedience in the spirit of bourgeois legality and order.

Encouragements and punishments in the Soviet school are based on respect for the child's personality and are directed at cultivating human dignity within them. This motivates the combination of care and demandingness toward the child expressed in A. S. Makarenko's remarkable words: "As many demands as possible on a person, but as much respect for them as possible."

---

[299] *K. D. Ushinsky, Collection: "On Educational and Instructional Work," Uchpedgiz, 1939, p. 33.*

Encouragement and punishment in our school are an integral element of the entire system of communist child education.

Encouragement enhances the feeling of satisfaction from a correct action and good behavior, strengthens the child's faith in their own strength, and stimulates good actions. Encouragement reinforces children's desire to behave in a disciplined manner.

By order of the People's Commissariat of Education of the RSFSR No. 205 of March 21, 1944, the following measures of student encouragement were established: "Teacher's praise, reward, and certificate of commendation issued by the school director." The primary form of encouragement is approval of a student's strong progress and good behavior.

Approval can be expressed in various forms: an approving gesture by the teacher, a smile reflecting satisfaction with the student's or class's behavior, a positive review of the student's work and conduct before the class or parents, etc.

Sometimes it is important to *encourage* a student who has not yet achieved full success in study and discipline, but strives toward it and makes a definite effort in this direction. Expressing trust in a student (an assignment, a teacher's statement that a given student cannot act poorly, etc.) is a valuable form of encouragement.

Recognition from a teacher or class supervisor regarding improved behavior, especially in front of the children's collective, often stimulates the correction of indiscipline in students.

An important and widespread form of encouragement is *praise*. Its value is enhanced when the teacher's praiseful review of a student's behavior is delivered in the presence of the whole class or at a school assembly.

Praise accompanied by a award (a book, a trip on a distant excursion, etc.) constitutes a *reward*.

The highest form of encouragement in school is a *commendation certificate* for excellent achievements and conduct, and upon graduating secondary school—*gold and silver medals*.

Encouragements can be applied not only to individual students, but also to a student collective (a class, study circle, or student group fulfilling an assignment). Encouragement of a collective can be expressed in the form of: a) approval from the teacher, class supervisor, head of academic affairs, director, or school manager; b) a positive mark from the pedagogical council or student committee; c) gratitude from the director or pedagogical council; d) rewarding the class.

Encouragement is a very sharp tool of educational influence on students.

When encouraging students for good behavior, the following principles must be followed:

Encouragement must be deserved, i.e., correspond to the actual behavior of the person rewarded.

Undeserved encouragement indiscredits the teacher and turns praise or an award from a positive into a negative educational factor, sowing distrust in the teacher's actions and discord within the children's collective.

The form and degree of encouragement must correspond to the achievement level of the student or collective, taking individual child characteristics into account.

Encouragement, while evoking a sense of self-dignity in a student, should stimulate a drive to raise the honor of the class and school collective through their successes.

Underestimating the role of encouragement is just as harmful as excessive over-praising of children.

Students must know that success, diligence, and high discipline are rewarded by the school and teacher.

Considering conviction and training as primary methods for educating conscious discipline, the school and teacher can and must compel a student to fulfill behavior rules and norms in necessary cases.

Under Soviet school conditions, where there is no and cannot be hostility between students and teachers, where children are surrounded by care and their interests are protected by law, the teacher's right to punish an irresponsible student and the skillful use of this pedagogical measure serves as an important factor in discipline education. Knowing that a negative act will be punished restrains the student from violating school requirements, rules, and behavioral norms. Emotional experiences associated with punishment protect both the offender and other students from similar actions. Since punishment in Soviet schools derives its force from its educational role, there can naturally be no talk of a rigid scale or code of punishments automatically taking effect for a given infraction.

By order of the People's Commissar of Education of the RSFSR, to which we have already referred, the following measures of student punishment were established: a teacher's remark, a reprimand before the class, ordering the offender to stand (at their desk, at the blackboard, or at the teacher's table, near the door), removal from the classroom, detention after classes to complete unprepared lessons, lowering the conduct mark, a summons for admonition before the pedagogical council, and expulsion from school—temporary (for no more

than two weeks) or for a term of one to three years with referral to a special-regime school.

Punishment in itself, isolated from the entire system of educational measures, cannot force an offender to realize they acted poorly. Punishment carries educational significance only when based on a certain level of moral qualities, moral concepts, and views in the punished individual, as well as the teacher's authority and the strength of the children's collective. This explains why the exact same measure of punishment in the hands of an authoritative teacher achieves its goal, while with another teacher it turns into its opposite; in one class with formed public opinion, the punished student deeply feels the slightest remark from a teacher, while in another class the punished student feels like a "hero," bragging about the number of deserved punishments.

Punishment achieves its educational goal only when it represents a link in a general chain, within a harmonious system of educational work of both the individual teacher and the entire pedagogical staff of the school.

In applying punishments, M. I. Kalinin's directive should be remembered: "A teacher needs naturalness and honesty in resolving all matters, especially in resolving various children's affairs, punishment issues, etc. Suppose a boy broke a window pane or offended a girl, or a girl offended a boy. Here one must proceed not merely from the fact as such, but consider how a given resolution to the issue will affect child psychology. This is absolutely necessary."[300]

Let us state the *basic rules for applying punishments*:

Punishment must be fair and recognized by the student as deserved.

---

[300] *M. I. Kalinin, On Communist Education, "Molodaya Gvardiya," 1945, p. 39.*

The degree and measure of punishment must correspond to the committed offense.

Punishment must stem from the teacher's desire to correct the student's behavior.

Consistency and gradualness in applying punishment are necessary. The degree and measure depend on the offense, but it is unwise to resort to harsher measures immediately.

Punishment should follow the offense as soon as possible, but after all circumstances causing it have been clarified.

Pedagogical tact of the teacher is a key condition for successful punishment.

In school practice, a number of measures not provided for by official instructions are used, as instructions cannot regulate all instances of school life.

Here, one should point out punishments that stem directly from the character of the committed offense: if a student damaged school property, they are made to repair it or compensate for the material damage; if they violated order during an excursion, they are temporarily deprived of the right to participate in excursions, etc.

***

In conclusion, let us emphasize once more that the decisive role in educating conscious discipline in school belongs to the teacher.

Mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory, tireless work on improving one's qualifications and pedagogical mastery, and selfless, honest service to one's people are the key to a teacher's successful resolution of tasks facing them in the communist education of the younger generation.

"*Soviet Pedagogy," 1946, No. 10–11.*

Prof. I. A. KAIROV

Full Member of the APN RSFSR

SOME ISSUES REGARDING THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHILDREN'S COLLECTIVE

Soviet pedagogy pays great attention to questions regarding the educational role and importance of the children's collective, the content of its activities, the methodology of organizing the collective and raising children within it, friendship and comradeship in the children's environment, and the pedagogical, educational essence of children's and youth organizations in school: Komsomol, Pioneer, and student organizations.

From the History of Children's Self-Government

The question of organizing the children's collective has been repeatedly examined by pedagogy and has found its practical resolution in school.

Views on the organization and purpose of children's self-government in bourgeois schools lacked unity. Some saw in children's self-government the best means for maintaining discipline, for better "curbing" the students' vivacity. Representatives of this direction believed that children's self-government should provide the opportunity to transfer onto children part of the teachers' duties regarding the supervision of student behavior, making them accomplices in maintaining school order and routine. In these cases, the teacher appointed "exemplary" students as peculiar "overseers" over the behavior of the rest. Sometimes these "overseers" joined together to coordinate actions into a single organization.

Others attempted to view children's self-government as a certain condition for civic education. It goes without saying that the concept of "citizenship" stemmed from general concepts of bourgeois law and state structure. According to these views, children's self-government could be used as a sure means for raising children in the spirit of the ideology of the ruling classes of bourgeois society. To this category belong attempts to copy forms of state structure in the organization of children's self-government in the form of "school-cities," "school-republics," etc.

One of the most prominent proponents of this type of children's self-government was the American educator of the late 19th century, Wilson Gill. He recommended creating children's self-government along the lines of an American republic with all its organizational institutions—president, parliament, prosecutor's office, police, and even prison. In such a "republic," students in practice became acquainted with the state structure of their country, and most importantly, were raised in the spirit of respect for bourgeois order, in the spirit of blind obedience to laws. Such self-government was calculated to protect students from contagion by anti-state, anti-government ideas and to raise them in the spirit of American imperialism.

In her article "On School Self-Government," N. K. Krupskaya subjects to scathing criticism bourgeois educators who tried to use children's self-government to shift the burden of boring and unpleasant supervision over the execution of the teacher's directives onto the students themselves.

N. K. Krupskaya also exposes the reactionary character of German pedagogy and its representatives, behind whose words about the need to respect the personality of the child, to develop their activity and independence, lay essentially Prussian drill.

In the pre-revolutionary Russian school, children's self-government was absent. The policy of tsarist autocracy was directed toward suppressing the social activity of students.

The very possibility for a student to organize and defend their interests was excluded. Unquestioning obedience to school regulations and the teacher was demanded of the student. The latter was expected to ensure the upbringing of youth in the spirit of unconditional devotion to the throne. Usually, students were drawn into school to perform certain auxiliary classroom functions. On-duty students were required to meet the teacher at the door after the bell, ensure the teacher's podium was in order, the blackboard clean, maps and other visual aids brought to class, and all students in their places. The student on duty reported to the teacher about absent students in class and was required to inform the class tutor of undisciplined student behavior in class and during recess.

In the pre-revolutionary school, there were two forces: teacher and student, and between them existed a peculiar, sometimes hidden, sometimes breaking out into the open, hostility. The activity of the most progressive section of students sought an outlet in creating underground student organizations, circles, publishing manuscript journals, etc. The struggle for children's self-government in the pre-revolutionary Russian school was included as one of the demands of the revolutionary struggle with tsarist autocracy.

The revolutionary struggle of 1905 was reflected in the school in a mass student movement for self-government as an organ for protecting student rights. Progressive, forward-thinking Russian teachers understood the incorrectness of tsarist autocracy policies and, seeing its reactionary essence, contrary to orders from above, drew students into discussing a number of questions of school and class life, cultivated creative mutual

aid, organized circles, social evenings, and other types of student independent activity.

In classical Russian pedagogy, in V. G. Belinsky, K. D. Ushinsky, N. I. Pirogov, N. A. Dobrolyubov, N. G. Chernyshevsky, we find statements indicating the great importance of an organized children's collective in the educational work of the school, organizing and educating through the power of student public opinion.

Of significant interest is the experience of organizing a children's collective by the famous Russian educator S. T. Shatsky in his colony "Vigorous Life" near Maloyaroslavets.

The Great October Socialist Revolution resolved the issue of *children's self-government* in the Soviet school as an organization that helps teachers raise youth to be principled, initiative-driven, and comprehensively developed builders of a new society. The organization of children's self-government became a necessary, integral part of all educational work in the school. In the Soviet school, contradictions between teacher and student disappeared. In the Soviet school, the authority and leading role of the teacher are combined into one with the initiative and activity, the self-reliance of the children's collective.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution, the first years passed under the banner of searching for new forms and content in the work of children's self-government in the Soviet school. One should note the positive role played by children's self-government in school in the early years of the revolution in the fight against old, reactionary school traditions, its rigid routine, and the conservative attitudes of a section of teachers. Revolutionary youth played a big role in dismantling the old and creating the new Soviet school.

In subsequent years, teachers, research workers, and organs of the people's commissariats of education of the republics focused their efforts on a more precise definition of the tasks, organizational structure, and content of the activities of children's self-government in the Soviet school. The task was to enhance the leading role of the teacher, determine the proper place for the children's organization, and find a combination in the teacher's work with the task of activating children, increasing their self-reliance and responsibility to themselves and the school.

The Resolution of the CC of the AUCP(b) of September 5, 1931, "On the Primary and Secondary School," gave the main direction for the activities of children's self-government in school: "To organize the work of children's self-government bodies in school in such a way that it is primarily directed toward improving the quality of studies and strengthening conscious discipline in school." In accordance with this resolution, at the beginning of 1933, the "Regulations on Children's Self-Government in Polytechnical School" were approved.

In these regulations, the tasks of children's self-government were defined as follows: "The main task of children's self-government is the education and strengthening of conscious discipline, the ability to work and study collectively, jointly discuss issues important to school life, jointly make decisions, steadfastly carry them out, and monitor their execution."

Children's self-government helps cultivate the public opinion of schoolchildren, educate the habit of consciously relating to one's behavior, cultivate a sense of responsibility, and thereby strengthen and increase conscious discipline, develop

necessary organizational skills of public life, and skills of personal communist behavior[301].

The governing body of children's self-government becomes the student committee, elected by the students. Further development and strengthening of the school's work required a new solution to the question of children's self-government.

Pedagogical science and practice, in accordance with the task of improving the quality of educational work in school, increasing the authority and responsibility of the teacher, and strengthening student discipline, strove to find the best forms and content for organizing children's self-government. The very name "children's self-government" contains a certain contradiction: children in school are not self-governing future citizens of the Soviet country. They cannot govern their lives independently. The Soviet school is a state school, the management of whose work is carried out by state bodies in the person of teachers and educators. The school and teachers must organize proper Soviet education and instruction for students. It was necessary to combine the authority and leading role of the teacher in school with the duty of children to consciously fulfill all school requirements, while showing activity, initiative, and rendering help to the school in solving the tasks before it. The solution to this complex problem could not fit within the framework of old children's self-government. It became obvious that a way out must be found in terms of organizing the children's collective in school as a most crucial pedagogical task.

---

[301] "Regulations on Children's Self-Government in Polytechnical School." L., 1933, p. 1.

The Role and Characteristics of the Children's Collective in the Soviet School

The role and importance of the collective in raising children have been repeatedly noted by progressive Soviet teachers and scientists. Thus, N. K. Krupskaya spoke on this issue:

"It is necessary for children to experience everything collectively, and thanks to these collective experiences, learn to feel collectively. It is necessary to organize children's lives so that they learn to live collectively without offending one another, showing consideration for the peace, convenience, and desires of comrades, knowing how to help each other in everything. It is necessary to give free play to the creative forces of children, create a working atmosphere, teach kids to work, of course in their children's sense—to work creatively, teach them to organize their work and organize around this work."[302]

The role and significance of the collective in youth upbringing are revealed with particular persuasiveness in the experience and works of A. S. Makarenko.

We view the children's collective not only as an educational tool, but also as a result of education, for in a cohesive collective, children develop feelings of friendship and comradeship, collectivism, responsibility, and the ability to subordinate personal interests to the general interest.

It can be considered established that when a child is in a collective, aspects of children's individuality manifest that under other conditions would not have manifested or been discovered. In the collective, the child finds the best conditions for revealing and flourishing their diverse sides.

---

[302] N. K. Krupskaya, *In Search of New Ways*. Collection of articles. "Rabotnik prosveshcheniya". M., 1924, p. 239.

The individual and the collective exist in very complex dependencies. In an organized collective having specific goals and tasks, these dependencies are highly complex. An individual person must align their personal desires with the desires of others. The necessity of aligning personal aspirations with the entire collective so that personal goals are not opposed to the goals of the whole collective. Common goals must determine personal goals as well. This unity of personal and common goals is a characteristic feature of an organized children's collective in Soviet school.

The moods and experiences of the collective as a whole exert an influence on an individual member of that collective, as if integrating them into the general frame of mind and feelings of the whole collective.

The intensity and depth of an individual's experiences depend to a certain extent on the intensity and depth of the experiences of the entire collective. At the same time, the intensity and versatility of the collective's experiences depend on the depth and versatility of the experiences of individual members, their initiative and place in the collective; and finally, in the collective, such personality traits emerge and reach great strength that the person himself did not even suspect.

An enormous role in children's behavior is played by the moment of imitation. In a collective, this feature increases. The effect of an example in a collective is enhanced because a single example is presented in the plural; the receptivity and impressionability of the collective are sharper, faster, and more versatile.

A child who enters school remains in it for 10–11 years. Throughout all this time, students in school under the guidance and influence of the teacher carry out a series of duties and tasks assigned to them.

For a long time, the rule existed: "The teacher teaches—the student learns." This rule viewed the student as a peculiar object upon which the educational efforts of the pedagogue were directed. In this setup, the educator was active, while the student was passive. The student, however, rightfully considered himself not just an object of upbringing, but a living, actively functioning creature with his own inclinations, abilities, and interests, which frequently came into contradiction with the educational aspirations of the pedagogue, engendering opposition and protest, causing the educator considerable distress.

The student collective represents a tremendous pedagogical force, and the teacher's task consists of organizing the children's life so that this educational force acts to the full extent and in a specific ideological direction.

The experience of Soviet educators, especially the long-term experience of A. S. Makarenko, shows that the process of education is a complex process of organizing the life of the student. This process ensures the development and formation of the versatile abilities of children, the child's personality, under the influence of the educator, the children's collective, and their life. The teacher not only gives lessons in the classroom, but organizes the life of children in the classroom and outside the classroom, and helps the family raise children.

The task of the educator consists of pedagogically skillfully and subtly organizing and directing the life of children in accordance with the goals and tasks of the communist upbringing of Soviet youth. In the process of activity, students also acquire skills in organizing their own lives.

A child's activity in school requires them to master organizational skills that would ensure their implementation of the tasks set before them.

Activity will be fruitful and successful if it is organizationally supported, if there is an organization corresponding to the tasks of the children's collective. An active children's collective must be properly organized and guided. It must have clear tasks and interesting activity content. If this content is lacking, then an outwardly, structurally very good form will turn out to be empty and lacking substance.

A strong children's collective is an effective organization that designates an executive governing body possessing the necessary authority for resolving issues concerning the activities of both individual members of the collective and the collective as a whole. These bodies plan and direct the work of the collective and are responsible for it. At the same time, general guidance and assistance in the work of the collective are provided by the class teacher, the educator.

Organized is a children's collective in which children live as a close, cohesive family, where everyone holds dear the interests of the whole collective, where all successes and failures concern everyone.

A strong children's collective possesses certain qualities. Let us name the main ones: adherence to principles, political sharpness in framing and resolving issues, quick reaction to unfolding events, criticism and self-criticism, and healthy public opinion.

Further—the presence of versatile interests, activity, searching for the new, goal-directedness, forward movement, optimism, and cheerfulness, the ability to overcome difficulties. In an organized children's collective, we find a strongly developed sense of self-dignity and respect of members of the collective for one another, a striving for mutual assistance, and intolerance toward injustice, lies, and dishonesty.

And, finally, the presence of a strong active core (*aktiv*) that enjoys the respect and general sympathy of the entire collective.

It goes without saying that all these features of a children's collective in each given age group bear their own specific coloring, and their formation must occur in accordance with consideration of the students' age.

In a children's collective, highly complex dependencies are created between members of the collective, between the individual and the collective. This exerts a great influence on shaping the ethical views, convictions, and behavior of students.

If in an organized collective comrades fulfill identical duties, they are bound not only by simple friendship, but by shared responsibility. The most interesting relationships in a collective are the relationships of such comrades who walk not side-by-side in the same rank, but when dependency is unequal, when one comrade is subordinate to another. In this case, one comrade must know how to submit to the order of another; one must command another and demand execution from him. This is possible only when both the one issuing commands and the one executing them understand that the command is the execution of the collective's will. In such a collective, comradeship relationships acquire a principled, responsible character; each member of the collective is responsible for the behavior of another; comradeship bonds are not a personal matter, but concern one way or another the whole collective.

A person can test their friendly and comradeship feelings only in actions. At the same time, especially when friends experience some major joyful or sad events in life and when it is necessary to express one's attitude toward them.

The ethics of a collective in terms of content, ideological direction, moral judgments, and assessments do not fundamentally differ from the ethics of an individual Soviet person.

However, collective morality is qualitatively unique. The moral consciousness of a person in a collective is clearer, deeper, and more versatile; experiences are sharper, finer, and brighter; actions are more considered, consistent, and responsible. Personal feelings and experiences grow more complex and deepen with the consciousness of responsibility not only for oneself, but for the entire collective, with a sense of joy or grief for the entire collective, and concern and anxiety for the assigned task.

The uniqueness of collective ethics, therefore, consists in heightened responsibility for one's behavior before the collective, for observing moral norms followed by the entire collective. In a collective, individual aspects of the human personality develop more intensively and deeply: love for the Motherland and hatred for its enemies, love for one's collective, and dislike for those who attempt to disrupt collective life.

In a collective, the ability of a student to come to the aid of a comrade, stand up in their defense, not betray a comrade if they are right, and at the same time, know how to correct a comrade's erroneous actions by telling them the whole truth to their face if they act wrongly, is cultivated and manifested with special force.

In the collective as a whole and in each of its members, the ability to overcome difficulties, willpower, great faith in one's strength, faith in the strength of the collective, and the courage to admit one's wrongness before the collective are developed.

A sense of justice is of exceptional importance in a collective; personal honor is the honor of the entire collective.

In a collective, it is significantly harder for a person to show their egoistic inclinations, ill will toward people, or evasion of labor duties assigned to the entire collective.

The collective is intolerant of violators of its decisions, its will, and norms of behavior accepted by voluntary agreement of all members of the collective.

In a collective, a person develops the ability to voluntarily submit to accepted decisions. In a collective, it is easier for a person to get rid of remnants in their consciousness.

The student collective of a school represents an organization in which everyone performs specific work. They are provided full opportunity to show their initiative, develop, improve, and grow.

It is necessary to remember that the characteristic feature of a children's collective in a Soviet school is that it is, as it were, a small part of the collective of the Soviet country, and builds all its work in accordance with the task of preparing and educating citizens of the Soviet state from among the students. From this comes the ideological orientation of the children's collective and the connection of its activities with the policy of the Soviet state.

The experience of the best Soviet educators, in particular the experience of S. T. Shatsky and A. S. Makarenko, shows what a huge role the aesthetics of the collective play in the upbringing, organization, and strengthening of the collective. A. S. Makarenko rightly emphasized two sides of collective aesthetics—internal and external, organically linked with each other. According to A. S. Makarenko's idea, the internal aesthetics of a collective consist in the collective living a

beautiful ideological life, where actions, behavior, and relationships within the collective are morally beautiful. Inside the collective, life bustles, healthy criticism and self-criticism are developed, but there are no grudges or desires to complain about one another. In the collective, there are no individuals who feel lonely or unhappy. The idea of the protectiveness of each individual collective member against unseemly actions by other members decorates its style and is its pride. In such a collective, every student feels protected from bullying, injustice, humiliation of personal dignity, or offense to self-love. Younger students consider themselves younger, but equal members of the collective, and feel the protection and guidance of older students.

The aesthetics of the collective from its internal side are connected with constant enthusiasm, cheerfulness, optimism, the ability to move and act, and along with this, the ability to restrain oneself. This should become a habit; a child from childhood is accustomed in their relationships in a collective to be guided by the norms of communist morality.

The aesthetics of a collective are expressed in serious internal composure and discipline of each member. A student in a collective must strictly observe rules of conduct for students, requiring this of other members of the collective as well, creating mutual demanding control and responsibility for one another.

Another aspect of collective aesthetics is the external side. An established form of politeness in relationships within a collective has very great significance. It mobilizes the will, forces a person to feel composed, and teaches how to distinguish the character of relationships toward one another in a collective—younger toward one another, younger toward older, older toward younger, pupil toward educator. External politeness, therefore, is an expression of internal convictions

and internal composure, as opposed to bourgeois politeness, where behind external polish hides internal poverty and the reactionary orientation of bourgeois aesthetics. Norms of external behavior for a Soviet school student lose meaning if the general style of the collective is not cultivated. This style creates the form of external politeness. It decorates the collective, and in decorating it, produces a secondary, reverse effect, making the collective attractive, interesting, and aesthetically pleasing.

The student collective from an external standpoint must be beautiful. Clothes must be clean, neat, and well-fitted. Cleanliness in classrooms, study rooms, corridors, school staircases, and the decoration of the entire school play a major role in organizing the children's collective. This determines to some extent the behavior of collective members themselves. Experience shows that if you want students to be neat, disciplined, and composed, keep the beautifully furnished school building clean, warm, and orderly.

In class, one must strive to create a cultured environment and comfort. Serious demands must be made regarding every little detail that plays a significant role in education—the textbook, pen, pencil—everything must be in its place, in order, clean, and neat.

These requirements for neatness must be made not only of students, but also of teachers. A teacher should not come to school carelessly dressed; by their appearance, as well as by their internal world, they can serve as a positive example or reproach to students.

From what has been said, it follows that collective aesthetics play a major role in the organization and activities of the school.

Let us move on to considering the question of governing bodies for the children's collective.

The collective designates from its composition governing bodies that ensure its active, planned activity. In an organized children's collective, we distinguish one form or another of children's activity and, in accordance with this, the structure of the organization. The latter is determined, consequently, by the content and direction of children's activity, greater or lesser activity, the complexity of the assigned tasks, and conditions for their fulfillment.

Leadership of a collective can be:

a) **Individual**—when the collective designates from its midst individual authorized persons responsible to the collective, to whom it entrusts the leadership of work. This includes: class organizer, leader of a link or detachment, leader of a circle, brigadier of a group or brigade, etc.;

b) **Collective**—when the collective creates an elected body consisting of several persons for leadership. This includes student committees, detachment headquarters, the Komsomol organization committee, etc.

Leaders of a collective can be **elected** or **appointed**. Some governing bodies of a collective are only elected according to the regulations or charter of the organization (Komsomol, Pioneer organization, student committee, etc.). In a number of cases, the leader of a collective is appointed by the school director (for example, the brigadier of a student brigade performing a specific assignment). The director, considering the degree and complexity of tasks set before the collective and its composition, appoints a leader from among the students whose personal qualities best ensure successful completion of the assigned work.

In organizing a children's collective, a big role is played by creating an active core (*aktiv*). The *aktiv* as it were organizes around itself all remaining students and guides them.

Many teachers sometimes begin organizing a children's collective by identifying and organizing an *aktiv*, relying on which further work is conducted. Younger and middle school-aged students love fulfilling assignments. Knowing the inclinations and interests of students, they are given appropriate assignments. Thus, one is entrusted with decorating the Red Corner or wall newspaper, others with helping a classmate who missed lessons due to illness with homework, a third with distributing purchased tickets to the cinema or theater, a fourth with gathering and transferring toys for a kindergarten, and a fifth with caring for flowers. Students usually consult with one another, feel responsibility for the assigned work, and report on execution. Thus, an *aktiv* is soon formed from among the students. Subsequently, leaders emerge from the *aktiv*, to whom children present very strict requirements.

According to VII-grade students of a Moscow school, a leader must satisfy the following requirements: above all, treat the collective that elected them well, respect everyone, be a good comrade, and behave so that everyone respects them. For this, they should never boss around, act arrogant, or give orders, but when giving assignments, ask politely like a comrade for their completion. An elected leader must treat everyone equally, single no one out, act simple, exemplary, study well, behave well, be disciplined in class, at home, and in public places, and be neat and polite in everything.

It should be borne in mind that all work cannot be built solely on the *aktiv*. It is necessary to involve the entire collective. The *aktiv* is merely the organizing, leading force, an example for

others. All members of the collective must participate in its work.

One of the most important moments in organization is the skillful preservation of an organized collective. For this, it is necessary first of all to preserve the core, to maintain continuity in activities, so that one composition is always replaced by another, prepared in advance and gradually within the collective. On the other hand, established traditions and rules must be cherished.

Student behavior in a collective is supported by established, sometimes unwritten traditions and rules. One must act this way because it is accepted in the collective, and older members do so. Respect for the experience of older members, respect for the rights of the collective and its authorized representatives give the collective unity, organization, pride, and dignity, preserving the style in the collective's work.

Methodology of Organizing the Children's Collective

The process of organizing a children's collective is a complex and lengthy process. It encompasses small individual groups of students as well as more complex associations. It is necessary to organize the life and work of circles, classes, Pioneer detachments, units, Komsomol groups, and school students as a whole. The ideological direction and content of a children's collective's work are determined by the goals and tasks of the communist upbringing of students; the pedagogical approach—by the laws and rules of communist upbringing established by Soviet pedagogy and psychology.

The experience of Soviet teachers shows that they carry out the organization of a children's collective taking into account children's age characteristics and usually start with a preliminary acquaintance with students based on characterizations from past years, conversations with parents,

and with the students themselves in order to clarify interests, inclinations, character traits of students, and their organizational capacities. Further, the teacher usually sets a series of tasks before the collective that rotate and grow more complex, but are always interesting and captivating. In the process of fulfilling tasks, the teacher identifies an *aktiv* upon which they rely in work, gradually involving the rest. In resolving tasks, the teacher—in accordance with the strength and age of students—shows and teaches some how to do things, while providing others greater opportunity to demonstrate independence.

The experience of teacher A. I. Voskresenskaya from School No. 175 in Moscow shows that normal work of a collective can proceed well when the entire collective understands and fulfills the school routine provided for by the "Rules for Students." In School No. 175, the school day in all classes begins with physical exercise. Exercises are done by all links in turn, and each link leader is responsible to the teacher, class leader, and whole class for conducting exercises. On the eve, they appoint who should conduct exercises, test their ability to conduct them, and show new exercises. The link leaders themselves receive consultations approximately once a month from the physical education teacher or senior Pioneer leader of the school. All girls in the class must know how to conduct exercises, and they do.

From Grade 1, the teacher tries to instill in children an understanding of how necessary and pleasant it is to do something for the collective. During the war years, various collections of books, toys, and stationery were held at the school for shipment to areas devastated by the Germans. By Soviet Army Day, they prepared gifts for the front—sewed, embroidered, drew, etc. If they prepared a small stage performance, they invited parents and neighboring classes. The

New Year holiday and year-end report evening were designed to be events in which all children participated, serving as a *review of the collective's growth* in mental, physical, and moral terms. Both from the preparation process and from holding the evening itself, children derived great satisfaction. After every performance by children, the teacher held a conversation summarizing work results, noting positive aspects and carefully, cautiously pointing out failures and their causes.

Five girls organized a sanitation group, devised a work plan and forms for accounting. They reported this plan to the whole class. A school doctor came to the meeting. The girls asked for help in this work. The doctor held several special talks with the children and then periodically checked the work of the sanitation group and the sanitary condition of the classroom.

The work of the sanitation monitors consists of the following:

1. Daily, they appoint class monitors on duty and check their work;
2. Weekly, they inspect all girls, noting irregularities in attire, hairstyle, etc.;
3. They ensure order throughout the class setup;
4. They organize breakfasts and ensure everyone eats properly;
5. They monitor the cleanliness of school supplies.

The sanitation monitors keep a diary where they record observations. In the class, there is a list of duty monitors where they note who is on duty and how they perform.

Sanitation monitors organized a first-aid kit and provided female students first aid (cuts, bruises, splinters). They received necessary consultation from the school doctor.

At class meetings, reports from this group of girls were heard.

In spring, a group was organized that joined the school's general work under the slogan "Green Our School." The girls obtained many good plants, gathered a large number of flower pots, and seeds. This interesting, captivating work brought great liveliness to the collective's activities. The girls became convinced in practice of the power of collective work directed toward a single concrete goal. They enthusiastically tended planted seeds and greeted every green sprout with excitement[303].

The experience of teacher Comrade Tobenskiy from School No. 636 in Moscow shows that bringing children closer together by organizing them into a collective can proceed based on the experience of relationships formed in a family. In a harmonious family, members draw closer based on participation in shared labor and interest in a shared household. The teacher decided to start uniting students through collective constructive labor. It was decided that work needed to be chosen that was directed toward something necessary for the class, so the class would realize its necessity. The classroom space was uncomfortable and unwelcoming. It had to be changed with their own hands. The teacher suggested students participate in decorating the class. Everyone responded to the call. Students were invited to choose themes and decorate the class with posters. In the teacher's view, the school had the capability to set up a bookbinding workshop, bind tattered textbooks and other books, organize a library, and outline other types of labor that could foster collective cohesion. Then, students had to be accustomed to managing their classroom setup, electing a class committee, and identifying individuals responsible for various areas, so that a larger number of students took part. In class, it was necessary to have someone responsible for chalk and rags, breakfasts, attendance records,

[303] Journal *Primary School*, 1947, No. 7, pp. 26–29.

and the newspaper editor. Civic duties teach students to be useful collective members. Through personal participation in collective labor, everyone felt solidarity, achieved without any admonitions.

Further, chess and checkers tournaments, game evenings, trips out of town, and collective visits to cinema and theater were organized in this school. All this ensured gradual cohesion of the children's collective.

In roughly the same way, teacher N. N. Kovaleva organized a children's collective in Grade V of Women's School No. 36 in Sverdlovsk.

Teacher L. G. Shuvalova of School No. 635 in Moscow conducted work organizing a class collective over three years from Grade V to VII. Taking on Grade V, the teacher painted a picture of the future and their ultimate goal in a form accessible to children—to leave school as full-fledged Soviet people capable of finding their place in the life of the Soviet state. To be useful to the Motherland, one must learn this within school walls, in the life of one's Pioneer detachment. The subject taught by the teacher—Russian language and literature—allowed her during lessons on literary works to begin educational work in the spirit of patriotism and continue this work outside class during extracurricular reading. The task of extracurricular reading was determining the scope of requirements for a Soviet person. The whole school worked on this task. The theme of extracurricular work was "People of Strong Will." Work across all classes culminated in a general conference with presentations on heroes of Russian history (from the Patriotic War of 1812 to the Great Patriotic War). In Grade V, this teacher chose Civil War heroes for deeper study: the biographies of Shchors, Chapayev, and Kotovsky.

The second stage in this struggle was reading Nikolai Ostrovsky's book *How the Steel Was Tempered*. Pavel Korchagin's life path, faith in his idea, active struggle for it—through labor, rifle, blade, and writer's pen—will unbroken by mortal illness—all this showed children what a real Soviet person—a communist—must be. An excursion to the N. Ostrovsky Museum and a conversation with the writer's wife made his image vivid and concrete, while high ideality combined with active work and struggle served as a model for children.

High ideality in everyday activities for the benefit of the Soviet Motherland—that is what the Pioneer detachment organization of the Grade V collective began building its work upon under the teacher's guidance.

Students of the class conducted major socially useful work, helping liberated regions with books and school supplies, collecting toys for children of frontline soldiers, taking patronage over a kindergarten, eagerly helping the school unload coal and firewood, and helping clean the classroom.

Alongside socially useful deeds, other interests were not forgotten: children engaged in needlework, artistic embroidery, etc.

The most difficult and yet primary task was working on students' mastery of solid knowledge. Comradely assistance to struggling students was organized among the class, and a special staff of consultants for individual subjects was introduced.

From what has been said, it follows that depending on age, conditions, concrete goals, and tasks, the approach to organizing a children's collective can be highly varied: in some cases, it is the resolution of a single common task around

which children group; in other cases—initial groupings of a few people, joined later by many others.

The organization of a children's collective usually should not begin with talk about the collective, but with practical organizational work. At the foundation of collective organization must lie activity and labor. At the same time, every collective, like an individual person, must always have a clear perspective and joy of moving forward. Students must see the results of their labor.

Social work can be directed toward helping the school itself. This includes participating in creating equipment for the school, improving school grounds and premises, creating conditions for timely completion of academic tasks by students, and applying healthy forms of mutual assistance that aid the growth of student self-reliance.

Soviet schoolchildren must carry out manageable practical work related to restoring the economy of cultural institutions, ancient monuments, improving towns and collective farms, and participating in cultural-educational work among the population providing assistance to village reading rooms, clubs, libraries, and other educational institutions. Through such work, a habit of participating in public life will be cultivated in students. This public activity must be tied to the educational work of the students, subordinated to educational-instructional goals, and must lead to the reinforcement of knowledge by applying it in practice.

Everyone carries out their assigned task, and the better they do, the greater authority they enjoy in the collective.

The organization of a children's collective assumes a duration of joint activity for a specific group of children, a known degree of organization, and the greatest room for self-activity.

The experience of the Soviet school shows that the main requirements that the process of organizing a children's collective and its activities in school must satisfy are the following:

1. **Unity of common and personal goals.** The goals and tasks of the collective's activities, depending on the type of collective and the age of the students, must be ideologically and politically grounded. In achieving goals and solving tasks within an organized children's collective, personal interests are determined by common ones and combined as one.

2. **Unity of joint activity.** Having a common goal, tasks, and interests, an organized children's collective strives to achieve them. The unification and organization of forces occur not in discussions about tasks, but in lively, engaging joint activity.

3. **Searching for the new.** A children's collective lives a full life and represents a complex, organized whole if it has a clear goal and perspectives in its activity; it always strives forward, does not settle down, and does not stop at what has been achieved.

   The experience of A. S. Makarenko teaches that the strength of a collective and its vitality lie in searching for the new and in movement; standing still threatens the disintegration of the collective.

4. **Respect and mutual responsibility.** An organized children's collective is possible under the condition that every member of the collective is responsible for all, and all for one—if every member of the collective tries to help one another mutually in achieving the set goal, and if there is friendship and comradeship in the collective.

Students of the Soviet school are united by a number of children’s and youth organizations, namely: Komsomol, Pioneer, and student organizations.

Illuminating the topic of the content, organization, and methodology of these organizations' work is not part of our task and is the subject of a separate article or, more precisely, a series of articles on this topic.

"Soviet Pedagogy", 1947, No. 10.

A. S. SOLOMAKHA

Director of School No. 349, Moscow

NURTURING THE COLLECTIVE IN SCHOOL

(From work experience)

The task of the Soviet school is not only to equip students with necessary knowledge, but also to nurture active and conscious builders of a communist society—people who know how to live and work in a collective, devoted to the Motherland and the great cause of Lenin and Stalin, people of strong will, persistent, unafraid of difficulties, and capable of overcoming them.

To successfully educate children, educators must know them well, know the family from which the children come, and the environment in which they live. It is necessary to know every child in order to find their place in the collective and direct their strengths toward the benefit of the collective.

The study of children in our school begins from the earliest primary grades and continues throughout their entire stay at school. Young teacher B. N. Melnik writes: "*I met with a children's collective for the first time this year. The first meeting made me very anxious. Therefore, I began preparations for the upcoming school year in mid-August. By September 1st, I visited almost all of my future female pupils at home, got acquainted with their families, and learned about the children's interests. Thus, from the very first day of classes, I already had an idea about the children in my class.*"

Experienced masters of pedagogical labor K. S. Aristidova and V. P. Savitskaya do not stop studying the children of their classes for a single day. They carefully observe their students,

record these observations in a diary, and based on them, outline concrete plans for educational work for the near future, both with the class as a whole and with individual children.

They study their children both in lessons during the learning process and outside of lessons when children interact with each other and with elders, as well as in collective conversations where children express their opinions about the heroes of books they've read, about the actions of their comrades and relatives, reveal their attitudes toward ongoing events, and during the process of performing public work.

All aspects of school life provide an observant teacher with rich material for studying children.

Let us refer to the diary of K. S. Aristidova. On October 21st, she wrote: "*We wrote a control dictation. A pupil asked to repeat a sentence but did not say the word 'please'. I made a remark to her.*"

In the same diary, it is recorded: "*During a meeting of the teachers' association, Ira N. entered the classroom without knocking and immediately addressed me in a loud voice. I pointed out her impolite behavior to her.*"

In the entries from November 2nd, the educator returns again to the question of children's behavior in the collective: "*Today I had to hold a conversation with the children about how they speak very loudly, trying to shout over each other, how they don't know how to listen to the end of what their friends or elders are saying, and how they try to interrupt the speaker. Children speak loudly everywhere, without regard for place or time. This creates an unpleasant impression...*"

Rich material for studying children is provided by collective conversations, which are frequently practiced by educators. In K. S. Aristidova's diary from November 25th, we read: "*Today*

I read to the children from 'Pionerskaya Pravda' dated November 15, 1946. Very good material is given in the article 'Please, Be Kind, Excuse Me, and Thank You'. We also read a short article, 'Can They Be Forgiven?'. The children listened with great attention and took an active part in discussing what was read. The actions of sisters, brothers, friends, and their own actions were analyzed."

During the conversation, some children, with the spontaneity inherent to them, spoke about how their parents raise them.

The candid admissions of the children forced the school administration once again to place a report on joint home-school child education on the agenda of the next parent-teacher meeting.

To study the mood of the students, our teachers use children's essays. For instance, V. P. Savitskaya was already able in the 4th grade to conduct an essay with the children on the topic *"Our Class"*. Together with the children, they outlined an essay plan: 1) Positive aspects of class life; 2) What is bad in the collective; 3) What flaws individual members of the collective have.

The majority of the girls took the work seriously. *"This work,"* says V. P. Savitskaya, *"revealed a number of shortcomings in individual children that I hadn't even suspected."* Individual issues raised in the essays were discussed at a class meeting, after which a series of measures was planned to eliminate the shortcomings in our class.

Thus, 4th-grade students are already consciously approaching their collective and seeing its flaws.

Labor undoubtedly plays a paramount organizing role in creating a children's collective. The main type of labor in school is academic study. From the very first days children

arrive at school, educators strive to foster in them an honest and serious attitude toward their duties. This does not come all at once and is not easy. It takes great patience, willpower, and persistence to instill these qualities in children. Great explanatory work, teacher assistance, and, of course, systematic control are needed here.

In this regard, our staff considers exemplary the work of Honored Teacher of the RSFSR O. M. Platonova. Her class amazes visitors with its exceptional organization in labor, not only during lessons, but also after lessons when the little ones help each other. O. M. Platonova achieves such results because, in her pedagogical work, she is demanding first and foremost of herself. Despite her 38 years of experience, she thoroughly prepares for all lessons every day. Each of her lessons represents a fully complete stage of academic study.

Checking children's homework and classwork daily, Olga Mikhailovna places strict demands on the quality of any assignment, which obliges children to work seriously. Each of her lessons is strictly thought through from an organizational standpoint as well. She does not waste a single minute of instructional time preparing the board, handing out notebooks, teaching aids, etc. This work is performed in the classroom by the children's active group, with duties among the children being strictly delimited.

The same can be said about such masters of pedagogical labor as K. S. Aristidova, V. D. Nikolskaya, V. P. Savitskaya, N. I. Kartasheva, V. F. Demina, F. R. Dubrovskaya, V. P. Gorskaya, N. N. Nikolaeva, and V. D. Vadkovskaya.

All these educators organize their work so that every student in the lesson feels responsible not only for their own work, but also for the work of the class as a whole. When questioning one student, everyone prepares to answer. The class does not

fall out of the teachers' sight for even a minute. Accustoming children to joint work in the lesson, educators work persistently to unite the children's collective.

To deliver good lessons, one must prepare for them seriously. "Preparing for a lesson, I think through every detail: whom and on which section I will question; what forms of assessment I will apply; what the class will do during the questioning; what types of drill exercises for developing and consolidating skills in reading, translation, oral speech, and writing I will use. I question students often. Thus, students get used to a specific style of lesson and to constant requirements. This develops in them a conscious and conscientious attitude toward the subject being studied and toward work in general," says Z. V. Znamenskaya in her report.

Head of Instruction B. M. Geiber tirelessly ensures that every teacher's lesson is not only methodologically correct, but also educational in content and organization.

Students have also acquired a taste for lessons that are well thought out by the teacher and rich in content, and they are very critical of educators who unproductively waste time in lessons on chatter, do not work densely, although they give grades generously.

However, children in school learn not only to work, but also to live harmoniously, with common interests, to share common joys and failures, not to set themselves against the collective, and to place the interests of the collective above their own. Organization of public work inside and outside the classroom helps the teacher solve these tasks.

To foster a sense of friendship and its proper understanding, besides conversations, educators make maximum use of fictional literature. Studying the biographies of our leaders and revolutionary figures teaches children how to live and work.

Books like Ulyanova's "*Stories about Volodya Ulyanov"*, Kononov's "*Childhood and School Years of Volodya Ulyanov"*, Stepanova's "*Childhood Years"*, and Herman's "*Iron Felix"* awaken in children the best feelings, love, and respect for our leaders, a desire to imitate their actions, to be good comrades, truthful, and honest, and not to fear difficulties. Reading books is accompanied by discussions of what was read and appropriate conclusions.

An interesting and meaningful activity with the 6th grade was conducted by B. M. Geiber in connection with preparations for a Pioneer gathering dedicated to N. E. Bauman.

They began by studying Bauman's biography. Collectively, they read Mstislavsky's book "*Rook — Spring Bird"*, characterized the personages, and wrote book reviews. Then the whole class went to the theater and watched the play "*Rook — Spring Bird"*, and after watching it, held a session dedicated to analyzing the play they saw, and finally, held a gathering dedicated to Bauman. In the process of preparing for this gathering, questions of friendship, comradeship, and self-sacrifice in the name of society's interests were raised and discussed more than once.

Judging by the children's reviews, the preparation for the gathering and the gathering itself left a deep mark on their consciousness. This is evidenced by their further independent, similar work on Fadeyev's book "*The Young Guard"*.

Starting from the 3rd grade, educators habituate children to writing reviews of books read and analyzing the actions of characters. This forces children to reflect on the content of what they have read, draw necessary conclusions, and evaluate their own actions.

In 4th-grade classes, V. P. Savitskaya held a conversation on the topic *"We Will Be Like This"*. For this conversation,

materials were used from the book *"Native Speech"* (articles: *"Friendship"*, *"The Stone Boy"*, *"On the Ice Floe"*, *"The Bicycle"*, etc.), as well as books read: Chukovsky's *"Sea Hunter"* and Ilyina's *"The Fourth Height"*. Fifth-grade classes, under the leadership of teacher V. F. Demina, collectively read and discussed Kassil's book *"My Dear Boys"* and Ilyina's *"The Fourth Height"*. Ilyina's book particularly captivated the students. How much talk there was about Gula Koroleva! What enthusiastic reviews the students wrote; and all reviews ended with the words: *"I want to be like Gula!"*

Questions of friendship and comradeship concern older students even more. The study of fictional literature, which depicts the friendship of great people, helps students understand these issues.

Thus, in the 9th-grade literature circle (teacher F. R. Dubrovskaya), at a session dedicated to Ogarev, one pupil spoke about Ogarev's life and his friendship with Herzen; another about Ogarev's poetic activity; a third presented interesting materials about the friendship of K. Marx and F. Engels; a fourth spoke about the friendship of V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin; a fifth shared memories of A. M. Gorky about V. I. Lenin. Summarizing everything said about the friendship of great people, they turned the conversation to friendship in our time: they spoke about the Young Guards of Krasnodon, the play *"Old Friends"*, and friendship in their own class. On one of the following days, on the initiative of circle members, they organized a class evening, which was very successful and contributed to bringing the female pupils even closer together.

One of the important factors in uniting a children's collective is well-organized public work. Its beginning is laid as early as the 1st grade. O. M. Platonova tried to give every girl in the 1st grade some public work for which she was responsible. Four girls took care of flowers, one watched the blackboard, two

were in charge of the class cabinet, squad leaders distributed notebooks to their comrades, sanitary monitors checked whether ears, necks, and hands were clean, and the senior sanitary monitor noted the results on an account sheet. It was explained to the children that this was their public work. Each girl carried out her assignment with great diligence. The work was strictly controlled. If any child performed the work poorly, the class helped them. There was an instance when Nora Sh. failed to complete an assignment, citing that she forgot.

The class decided to temporarily deprive Nora of the right to carry out public work, emphasizing thereby that one cannot treat public duties in this manner. Such a measure had a positive effect on both Nora and others.

From the second half of the year, in the process of carrying out assigned tasks, class activists began to emerge. They carried out responsible duties monitoring the class and hallway, led the class to the cafeteria and cloakroom. Knowing these activist girls, Olga Mikhailovna could calmly leave the class, aware that everything would be in order.

Skillful organization of children for academic and public work leads to the creation of a friendly, goal-oriented children's collective. Summarizing the results of 4 years of work with the class, V. P. Savitskaya writes: “Now, regarding the collective, one can say that it possesses good qualities. Comradely cohesion grows stronger; interests and aspirations are directed toward achieving a single goal—not to lower the honor of the school, to study well, and to be worthy of the title of Pioneer. Children's initiative has grown: at meetings, they make useful suggestions to improve work in the class... On their own initiative, girls stayed after lessons and helped weaker ones. Often, one could hear their conversations with the girls: 'Why didn't you, Lena, learn the lesson?' — 'You were inattentive, and then you won't know the material', etc.”

If anyone committed a bad deed, the whole class reacted to it. When Mila allowed a lie, the girls were deeply upset by her bad behavior and urged her not to do so anymore.

In the essay *"My Joys and My Sorrows"*, pupil B. writes: “I am happy when our detachment is praised at the squad council, when our detachment diary is taken to the City Department of Public Education, and when the class writes a control test well. I am upset when there are 'twos' and 'threes' [failing/poor grades]. That is bad for the whole class.”

Public work in secondary school often goes beyond the class and even the school. The teaching staff of our school was concerned that among older students, some stood aside from public work. They tried to find the cause of this phenomenon and came to the conclusion: we organize children poorly for work. To raise the collective sense of responsibility for assigned public work, the school began practicing assignments for the whole collective—the class—headed by the class organizer. The assignments were of the most diverse nature: organizing school evenings, working at a polling station, issuing a wall newspaper, checking universal education compliance, cleaning classrooms, etc. Various objects of work were distributed in advance between classes. Each class knew what it was assigned, knew the scope of the task, and the deadline for completion. Already at the beginning of the year, public work was distributed among the classes.

Thus, the 9th grade was assigned the organization of an evening dedicated to the Great October Socialist Revolution. The 10th classes were responsible for organizing and holding New Year's ball, the 8th grade was assigned the organization of an evening dedicated to the Soviet Army, etc.

Classes handled their assigned tasks well.

School life raised issues not foreseen by the plan at the beginning of the school year; for example, in the middle of the year, a thorough check of universal education compliance was required: it was necessary to compare the actual state of universal education in the district with statements provided by housing managements. The work was assigned to the 9th grade. The homeroom teacher, V. F. Demina, together with the class active group, distributed houses among the students, and in 3 days this major task was completed.

In connection with elections to the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR, work at the polling station was distributed among classes in advance, and planned participation of the school in the election campaign was organized.

Work completed by a class is checked and accepted by the school director. This increases the responsibility of the performers. At first, while students were not yet used to doing every task with high quality, they had to be made to redo poorly executed work more than once.

In our school's practice, public work is distributed evenly among upper classes, taking into account the age and development of students; all class students participate in completing assigned work.

One of the means stimulating active participation of students in public work is accounting for the performance of public assignments by individual members of the collective. Every student in the class has a personal account sheet where assignments given to them by the class, Komsomol organization, school leadership, and teachers are recorded. An evaluation of the assignment's completion is also entered here. Students know that their work is seen and evaluated accordingly. This increases responsibility for assigned work

and also helps involve all members of the collective in public work.

Such organization of public work among older students freed the principal from many petty details, increased the role of the homeroom teacher, and raised the initiative of the students themselves.

Great is the role of skillfully organized class meetings in nurturing a sense of responsibility to the collective. They make it possible to create public opinion within the collective and exert an educational influence through it on individual students. Class meetings give the children's collective an organized structure. The best educators understand this and, in their practice, highly value class meetings, prepare for them seriously, and prepare the children.

The content of class meetings, with the exception of summarizing quarterly or weekly results, can be extremely diverse and determined by the requests of the students themselves, current events, and finally, the homeroom teacher's work plan.

In primary grades, children report at meetings on their assigned public work and discuss issues related to the actions of individual students. Some educators hold educational conversations with students, using examples taken from the life of the children's collective to explain the given topic. V. P. Savitskaya, while noting children's positive qualities at class meetings, carefully points out their existing shortcomings and gives advice on how to eliminate them. Comrade Savitskaya writes: “Children love such meetings and wait to hear what new things I will say about them, whom I will praise for correcting flaws that were noticed earlier, and whom I will point out regarding what needs to be fixed. At one such meeting, I brought the girls a lot of joy when I spoke about

their successes: Lyusia B. achieved beautiful handwriting, though she came to our class with terrible calligraphy; Olya Sh. became thoughtful and works seriously; Ira S. became a good comrade, etc. I remained silent about some girls, and this upset them. They realized that they had not yet eliminated their shortcomings."

In the 3rd and 4th grades, V. P. Savitskaya skillfully handed over the initiative at meetings into the hands of the children. On the board before the class meeting, the topic was written: *"What is good with us and what is bad with us"*. The children spoke themselves; the teacher only guided them. In the children's statements, good and bad sides in the work and life of the class were noted the best comrades were highlighted, and advice was given to others on how and in what to improve. This childhood truthfulness and bold statements were received without offense; directions were taken as proper comradely advice. Class activists pointed out flaws to their friends in a comradely manner: *"You, Lena, seem lazy to me—I don't believe you can't learn geography,"* says Lyusia B. "Veta has changed a lot, but sometimes sharp tones break through in her voice. Once, addressing Ira, she said: 'Irka, hold my briefcase', and Veta's tone was very rude," Natasha V. expressed. A good student in the class, Mila M., deceived the teacher. At the meeting, the girls advised Mila not to ruin the opinion of her, which was quite high. Mila said she would never act that way again.

At such meetings, children spoke about themselves and their actions with captivating sincerity. Questions were also discussed in formulations such as: *"What I like in people"*, etc. For such meetings, the teacher drew material from *"Pionerskaya Pravda"*, fictional literature, and the lives of remarkable people. Thus, the profile of a Soviet student is gradually formed.

In secondary school, the agenda for the (weekly) class meeting is often outlined by the students themselves, and the teacher helps them resolve the questions raised. What do current, i.e., weekly, meetings represent? At these meetings, work results for the week are summarized, and various issues brought up by class life are discussed—for example, mutual aid, daily routine, comradeship, developing willpower, attitudes toward younger brothers and sisters, parents, etc. Bringing these issues up for discussion comes from the students themselves; the teacher only supports their initiative.

Here is an example. In the 5th grade, there is a girl who studies poorly and is insufficiently organized; she often has to be spoken to in class. Each time she promises to improve, but it remains just words. The squad leader approached the homeroom teacher, S. I. Pats, and said: "Rimma seems to genuinely want to improve, but she can't manage. How can we help her?" Thus arose the question of willpower. S. I. Pats assigned this squad to select suitable material from the *"Pionerskaya Pravda"* newspaper, and then this issue became the topic of a class meeting. At the meeting they read and discussed the following articles from *"Pionerskaya Pravda"*: *"What Strong Will Means"*, *"A Firm Word"* (Dec 18, 1945), and *"Iron Law"* (Sept 11, 1945 — article by Academician Chudakov).

In the articles read, it was explained in popular terms what should be understood by willpower and how to cultivate it; that a weak-willed person will achieve nothing in life and cannot be useful to their Motherland.

Academician Chudakov suggests Pioneers establish an iron law in their life: *"Whatever you undertake, carry it through to the end."* The children read the articles with great interest and very actively discussed the issue raised, bringing examples from personal experience. In conclusion, they read the article *"On*

Willpower"—an excerpt from B. Polevoy's *"The Story of a Real Man"*, which made an exceptionally strong impression on the children. The children understood that persistence in achieving a goal makes possible what seems impossible. The question of willpower raised at the class meeting arose repeatedly during extracurricular activities when children discussed books like Ilyina's *"The Fourth Height"*, N. Ostrovsky's *"How the Steel Was Tempered"*, M. Aliger's poem *"Zoya"*, and others.

Along the same lines, a class meeting was held where the issue of comradeship was brought up. This question arose in connection with the task of combating cheating and prompting.

Children love such meetings, and we consider them extremely useful.

In older classes (8th–10th), the class meeting agenda is preliminary discussed in the Komsomol group with class activists and the homeroom teacher. A seriously prepared class meeting gives far more in terms of impact on individual students than the most convincing lectures from a homeroom teacher. Meetings also discuss public work assignments that the class receives from the principal or Komsomol committee; duties among collective members to carry out the assignment are distributed right here.

In every collective, there are children whose behavior does not fit into the norms: stubborn, self-absorbed, very shy, or excessively loose, etc. Such children undoubtedly need an individual approach. A skillfully selected key to such a student will facilitate the teacher's educational work. Homeroom teacher of the 6th grade N. I. Konina, upon her first acquaintance with the class, paid attention to Natasha P., who acted defiantly at the first class meeting. Comrade Konina visited her home and discovered very difficult home

conditions: discord in the family, arguments, and fights. In the 5th grade, the girl was viewed as undisciplined, and she developed a reaction—to contradict everything. Meanwhile, Natasha is a capable girl, draws well, and is a good organizer. She was elected to the Pioneer active group of the squad, entrusted with responsible public work, and this had a beneficial effect on her. Natasha began to behave well and study well.

In the same class, Nina L. amazed all teachers with her stubbornness. Upon closer acquaintance with the girl, it turned out that she was ill, and having a physical defect, was very suspicious of people. They managed to break her stubbornness and persistence only with a gentle approach toward her. At the beginning of the year, Nina did poorly in history. But when she saw an attentive, gentle attitude from the teacher, she became unrecognizable: she began studying very well and worked actively in the history circle.

Ninth-grade pupil Nina K.—stubborn, self-absorbed, and persistent—interfered with teachers during lessons. Neither "reprimands" from the homeroom teacher, nor a quarterly grade of "4" [out of 5] in conduct, nor anything else had any effect on her. After another "stunt", she ended up in the principal's office, prepared to hear another lecture and continue playing the "heroine". The principal treated her appearance in the office completely calmly and, instead of a lecture, began asking how her school affairs were going, how work in class was proceeding, and what caused her strange behavior. Together, they began analyzing her actions, her attitude toward comrades, teachers, and parents. The conversation turned to comradeship and helping peers, and in this peaceful conversation, the student herself evaluated her actions. She did not apologize, nor did they demand an apology from her. It ended with the principal suggesting she think over the entire

conversation once more and act as her conscience told her. The results of the conversation exceeded all expectations. During the second half of the year, Nina K. stopped disrupting class with prompting, worked with weak students in the class, and saved some from failing grades, changed her behavior at school and at home. At the end of the 3rd quarter, the pedagogical council noted K.'s great work in helping struggling students and resolved to express gratitude to her. The mother also came to school with joyful news: the girl became much better at home.

A major role in organizing and uniting a children's collective is played by well-established Pioneer work in the school.

The moment of joining the Pioneer organization is a very important event for children, for which they prepare thoroughly. Skillful teacher help and major explanatory work are needed here as to why one must cherish the title of Pioneer and wear the neckerchief with honor, and why a Pioneer must be an example for other children. During the October holidays, the best children in terms of study and conduct were admitted into the Pioneers. This served as an incentive for more diligent work for the remaining children as well. In K. S. Aristidova's diary from October 30th, we read: “At the class meeting, we discussed who is worthy of being a Pioneer. The children correctly noted some girls who are not yet worthy of the high title of Pioneer. One such girl, Masha G., came up to me and asked: 'What does she need to do to become a Pioneer?' I gave her advice on this matter.”

As a rule, Pioneers summarize the results of their work at squad and brigade gatherings. This obliges school leadership and educators to help children prepare gatherings and make them interesting and meaningful.

In Pioneer work, we are guided by the rule: not to chase a large number of gatherings, but to strive to ensure that gathering topics are interesting and preparation for them is conducted thoroughly.

We pay special attention to preparing brigade gatherings. A brigade gathering is an important event in the life of a large children's collective, and preparation for it must be conducted in all squads. We instill in children the idea that a brigade gathering is not just a meeting of Pioneers, but the final stage of some major work conducted by all members of the collective. Over the year, we held only 4 brigade gatherings.

Of special interest was the brigade gathering dedicated to Ukraine.

It was held during the days of the Stalin Constitution. All squads took part in preparing for this gathering: some rehearsed songs, others prepared models and albums, published wall newspapers, and others rehearsed dances. All squads designated their best reciters to participate in the montage performance. The brigade arrived at the gathering in Ukrainian costumes. The sight was amazing. In the hall, they "lit a campfire". Near the campfire sat a storyteller (history teacher N. I. Konina) and participants of the literary montage. This was not a report, but an extraordinarily interesting narrative presented in an engaging form about the distant past of the Ukrainian people, their struggle for independence, socialist Ukraine, the struggle of the Ukrainian people against German fascists, and finally, Ukraine today. This narrative was illustrated by gathering participants reading excerpts from fictional literature, accompanied by vocal and musical performances. The gathering ended with Ukrainian dances.

Children still remember that evening to this day.

A gathering dedicated to "The Book" had a different character. The idea for the gathering originated during "Book Week". The gathering topic was discussed at the brigade council, and then in squads. The topic interested the Pioneers. They set to work on preparation enthusiastically. Each squad had to report at the gathering on which books squad members had read and present material with reviews of the books read. Reading books was accompanied by discussions. Each unit created reviews of books read. Preparation for the gathering continued for about three months. During this time, a number of interesting books were reread, and many exciting questions were discussed. For the gathering, Pioneers prepared reports: 1) How and when the alphabet originated; 2) From stone books to the books of our days. The fourth squad visited a printing house and learned how books are printed now. A detailed and interesting report on this excursion was presented at the gathering in report form. Pioneers of the first squad visited the Lenin Library and learned how every printed work enters the library, visited the book repository, inspected unique books and manuscripts, visited reading rooms, and learned about the library's history and current operations. The squad also spoke about its excursion at the brigade gathering. They collected and wrote on large sheets of paper statements about books by ancient sages, scientists, writers, and political figures, selected proverbs and riddles, and decorated the gathering site with this material.

After opening the gathering, the floor was given to the school principal, who in a brief speech focused on the role of books in the life of humans and human society, and on the purpose of this gathering.

Reports by students were listened to with great interest and attention, and in conclusion, poems by Marshak and Gorodetsky about books were beautifully performed.

Writer E. Kalma spoke at the gathering, sharing how she worked on the book about Mayakovsky, *"Great Steps"*, and read excerpts from her works. Not only the gathering itself, but mainly the preparation for it left a deep mark on the children's consciousness. When an outsider asked the children on the day of the gathering why they were dressed so smartly, the children replied: *"We have a holiday today—a brigade gathering."* Indeed, by the children's mood and their faultless behavior at the gathering, one could feel that this was no ordinary day for them.

Such brigade gatherings undoubtedly contribute to organizing the children's collective. Thus, children's understanding of the collective gradually expands, and they realize themselves as members of a large family—a Pioneer brigade that has common interests, goals, and creates its own traditions.

Of special interest, from the viewpoint of collective education tasks, is the work of homeroom teachers in 8th–10th grades. As a rule, in the 8th grade, the student collective is partially renewed. New students enter the class with their own habits, skills in work, and behavior.

The homeroom teacher must, on the one hand, reinforce good skills that students acquired in previous years and take a firm course toward thwarting attempts by some students to introduce their own rules in class and school; on the other hand, encourage valuable initiative and independence in students in every way, uniting an even stronger, healthy, goal-oriented children's collective.

I want to show the features of an upper-grade homeroom teacher's work through the example of work with the 8th class by V. D. Vadkovskaya, for whom this class was new.

At the very first organizational meeting, internal regulations of the class and school were discussed, and duties were

distributed among collective members. To accustom students to order and strict observance of student rules, V. D. Vadkovskaya, from the very first days, organized careful accounting of student attendance and checking of every public assignment's completion. All instances of class absences were checked either by class activists or the homeroom teacher. An absence due to illness, confirmed by a doctor's note, was considered valid. At first, V. D. Vadkovskaya had to wage a struggle even with some parents who allowed their children to miss classes and gave them an "excuse document" written by themselves on the second day. Persistent struggle by the homeroom teacher for school attendance led to the cessation of absences due to "family circumstances", and this, in turn, positively affected academic progress.

To build an organized, goal-oriented collective out of the class, V. D. Vadkovskaya systematically worked with the Komsomol group from the beginning of the year. At the very first class meeting, besides academic progress and attendance, Komsomol members raised an interesting question: comradely mutual aid and combating cheating. The Komsomol group brought this issue up for discussion not only in their class, but onto the pages of the school newspaper.

In connection with performing public work (issuing a school newspaper), a question arose regarding the sense of responsibility for assigned work. Irresponsibility shown by one pupil, who undertook to design the wall newspaper, kept the paper sheet for a long time without doing anything, leading to the newspaper issue having to be written and designed in a hurry. So that this would not happen again, the published wall newspaper issue was discussed both in the Komsomol group and in class; shortcomings of the newspaper were noted, their causes clarified, the work of each editorial board member

evaluated, and the topic and content of the new newspaper outlined right then and there.

This helped ensure that students began taking a serious attitude not only toward publishing wall newspapers, but toward carrying out any assignment.

V. D. Vadkovskaya, in working with the class and Komsomol members, tries to develop initiative and independence in performing assigned work. For example, her class was assigned by the school principal to organize an evening dedicated to the Soviet Army. This assignment was discussed at a class meeting. They agreed on the content of the work, elected a committee, distributed duties among members, and right there V. D. Vadkovskaya emphasized to the students the great responsibility placed by the school administration on their class, and specifically on the created committee. Committee members handled the task wonderfully; V. D. Vadkovskaya only consulted students and checked the timely completion of each stage of work. The class also treated the polling station assignment seriously.

In connection with preparations for celebrating Moscow's 800th anniversary, the whole class, together with the homeroom teacher, took a bus tour around Moscow. They gathered extensive material on the Kremlin and created a beautiful album.

At a group Komsomol meeting before the end of the school year, the question of organizing a summer excursion was raised. Organizational work was assigned to Komsomol member R. The class finished the school year with a collective trip along the Moscow Canal.

From V. D. Vadkovskaya's work experience, it follows that the leading role in organizing a collective of older students belongs to Komsomol members. One must not forget, however, that

student Komsomol members still have little experience in Komsomol work and need help from adults. The success of Komsomol organization work depends not only on a well-chosen committee, but also on how well its individual units work—Komsomol groups in classes. Systematic work by the homeroom teacher with the Komsomol group and timely assistance provided in resolving various issues will ensure success in working with the entire class, since Komsomol members are the best, leading part of the class and school, leading the entire children's collective. Our best educators have understood this, and in their daily work organizing the children's collective, they rely on Komsomol members.

"Soviet Pedagogy", 1948, No. 2.

L. N. LEONCHUKOVA

Honored Teacher of the RSFSR

FOSTERING A SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY IN SENIOR CLASS STUDENTS[304]

(From Practical Experience)

A sense of responsibility is a necessary condition for a conscious attitude toward labor and disciplined behavior in students. This article is dedicated to the upbringing of this feeling in students, based on the experience of our work in the upper classes of Boys' School No. 367 in the Moskovsky District of Leningrad.

Studying the Students

The work on fostering a sense of responsibility was conducted by me as a homeroom teacher with the same group of students over the course of three years. I began it with the fact that during the first two days of classes at the start of the school year (by agreement with the administration), I attended all lessons of the 8th grade and observed my pupils. The impression from these observations was discouraging: students were late for class, distracted by unrelated matters during lessons, passively followed the progress of the lesson, raised commotions during breaks, and handled visual aids carelessly (the class was located in the natural science room). Newly enrolled students from other schools kept to themselves.

The first quarter of the school year, which I dedicated to studying the students and bringing the collective together,

---

[304] *Abbreviated and edited report submitted to the "Pedagogical Readings" at the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR in 1947.*

showed me that before me were young men of varying levels of development and different interests. Some of them were still reading exclusively Jules Verne and Mayne Reid, while others read indiscriminately whatever fell into their hands. Some attentively followed current events, regularly read newspapers, and could at any moment provide comprehensive information on where and what was happening; others were not interested in current events and did not understand them at all. The interests of the students were narrow. They behaved noisily and rudely; some did not observe elementary rules of politeness—for example, when greeting a teacher, they did not remove their hats, spoke to them without standing up, while remaining seated, etc. Remarks from teachers were poorly received. The situation was further complicated by the psychological characteristics of young men—not yet fully formed, but already adult. I had to overcome their secretiveness and reserve, while taking their youthful self-esteem into account. Under an outward cheekiness, they often hid insecurity, shyness, and embarrassment. Moreover, some students were ashamed to show that they were trying to fulfill requirements placed upon them and, despite repeated remarks, continued greeting me and other teachers without stopping, while on the move.

Thus, through observations, the shortcomings of individual students became clear to me, as well as their main defect: knowing what ought to be done and how to behave, yet at the same time failing to do it. This led me to think that they lacked a developed, conscious sense of responsibility for their actions.

In connection with this, I decided in the third quarter to make issues of fostering a sense of responsibility the main backbone of my educational work, structuring this work around exercises in dutifulness/execution and the educational effect of organized activities.

To this end, building on the results of the second quarter, I focused in an educational conversation on the importance of discipline and a sense of responsibility for every action, illustrating my arguments with real-life examples. I pointed out that a sense of responsibility, like any other human character trait, can be cultivated through exercise and practice. Furthermore, I announced that in the third academic quarter I would introduce a system of educational tasks—small, uncomplicated ones that would not overburden the students, but would allow them to develop skills of dutifulness and a sense of responsibility in each of them. The execution of these tasks would be recorded and reflected in an overall chart of dutifulness indicators for each student and the entire class as a whole.

Tasks for Fostering Dutifulness

The first task was to hand in signed report cards—no earlier and no later than January 19. I drew the students' attention to the meaning of this task, pointing out that fulfilling it would essentially demonstrate a desire to be dutiful and work on oneself. The next day (which was the eve of the deadline), student Shura R. ran to my apartment. Apologizing for the disturbance, he asked me to complete his report card, which he had not bothered to hand in during the second quarter, so that he would have the opportunity to fulfill the first task on time.

The second task was to return, within one week, books borrowed from me personally. Everyone completed this task. The students also felt another significance of it—returning books they had kept for various lengths of time from the library, overdue.

Of course, I could not limit myself to such elementary tasks. I linked tasks on dutifulness with general educational goals. Once, I hung a poster in the classroom showing photographs of

10 outstanding architectural buildings and suggested writing down: which of these buildings could be attributed to a single style, as well as indicating who among the students had seen similar architectural buildings in Leningrad or in drawings (examples of Baroque, Gothic, Classical styles, and medieval residential houses were provided).

The content of the assignment greatly interested the students. For the first time, they paid attention to the features and differences of architectural styles. The boys brought postcards and books related to the task, analyzed the architectural samples presented there, discussed them, and argued. Two students failed to submit their entries: "Everyone already knows which building belongs where anyway," they justified themselves; interest in the content of the assignment displaced their interest in completing it.

For the next meeting, I suggested completing the following task: select from the books they were currently reading the thought they found most interesting, reflect on it, and explain what made them choose it. This task confused the students; they did not know which thoughts to consider interesting. Then, using a newspaper I had in my hands, I gave an example with words from Roosevelt's speech: "The only way to have a friend is to be one." I had to explain the task with other examples as well. Many students submitted several notes; some became so interested in this work that they continued handing in notes to me later on. One student, Mark U., even started a notebook for further work in this direction.

The entries showed me what the students were reading and where their attention focused. Some were interested in connecting the author's expressed thought with the modern situation, for example: *"You are Russian, strengthen your heart with courage. Sacrifices are inevitable—without them, there is no honor, no glory, no salvation"* (*"Bagration"* by Golubev).

An excerpt from Tikhonov's book *"War"* spoke of an irreconcilable hatred toward Fascist Germany. The choice of thoughts also reflected personal experiences—thoughts on human dignity, on the feeling of love. At the same time, I noticed how the students developed a desire not only to complete the task on time, but to complete it neatly and tastefully. Initially, completed assignments were submitted on scraps of paper, carelessly written, unsigned; now, these entries took on a tidier appearance. One could feel that the students were striving to fulfill the tasks flawlessly in every respect.

The next two tasks—1) write down foreign terms in context from current newspapers and provide an explanation for them, and 2) submit a list of the last 5–6 books read—were completed by all students, which, of course, gave me satisfaction. From the explanations of foreign terms, I learned that the term "communication" was understood by the students as "a place where warehouses or military units are concentrated," that "The Headless Horseman" was already off the stage, and that "classical literature is hardly read." The students mainly read Jack London and H.G. Wells. Some lists included Hugo, Stendhal, Balzac, Dreiser, Sinclair, and Feuchtwanger. Having analyzed what the students read, I gave a presentation at an open Komsomol meeting on the topic "What and How to Read." Many of the books I recommended were in my personal library, and I was able to pass them to the students to read. It should be noted that the students made a point of reading the books I recommended.

The next task was to write a letter by Soviet Army Day to Bora Ch., a classmate drafted into the Soviet Army. In his letters to me, he complained that his comrades were not writing to him, and asked me to influence "his pupils." I wanted the boys to feel a sense of moral obligation toward their comrade—to bring joy to a Soviet Army soldier. Knowing how difficult

writing letters was for my young men, I gave them a number of topics touching upon school life and Leningrad news, and suggested using these topics. For emotional inspiration, I read them several excerpts from letters written by my former students at the front line, which spoke of the joy that letters bring to front-line soldiers, how they wait for them, and how they re-read them. Letters to Bora Ch. started coming to me. Only three students who had joined the 8th grade and did not know Bora Ch. did not write letters.

At the end of the year, I had the opportunity to check whether a trace of the sense of moral duty imposed on a person by friendship remained in the boys' consciousness. Upon completing their studies, the 8th grade took a photograph. At first, I decided to send the photo to Bora Ch. myself. Then I thought it would be better if the students thought of doing this on their own. Once, I said to my pupils: "Boys, you're collecting money for photos—doesn't any thought or wish cross your mind?" The students looked at each other in confusion. Only Mark U. understood my hint: "Send a picture to Bora Ch." I nodded and held out my hand to him. You had to see the satisfaction expressed on his face, and the disappointment and annoyance at their own lack of insight on the faces of the rest. They felt that they should have thought of this themselves.

One of the final tasks was: write what qualities a Soviet young man should possess. This task captivated the boys, and they decided, having requested my consent, to fulfill it right there in the classroom after the "educational hour." In outlining the image of a Soviet youth, there were differences in formulations, but in general, opinions converged on the fact that a Soviet youth must be honest, direct, brave, with a firm character and willpower, and broadly developed.

All the tasks I provided, while fostering dutifulness, broadened the moral horizon of the students. They directed their attention to questions of duty, linking behavior with general moral and cultural foundations. Tasks were given and discussed at special meetings, which we called "educational hours."

Fostering dutifulness bore fruit: students became accustomed to carrying out assigned tasks; they developed an awareness that this fulfillment in some measure reflects the internal character of the student, his positive trait—an awareness of responsibility for his actions.

Content of Educational Conversations

For educational conversations, in addition to those prompted by questions that arose during the week in connection with reading newspapers and books, I selected topics that could in one way or another influence the development of a sense of responsibility in students through their content, painting vivid portraits of people with a clear sense of responsibility and awareness of their duty. In Yakovlev's book *"Stories from Life"*, the students noted passages where he talks about his anxieties while working on a new aircraft design, about his responsibility to the Party, the government, and Comrade Stalin, who provided him with great support. I also focused on how high self-exactingness and standards for the quality of one's work are closely tied to high achievements. I emphasized that demandingness toward oneself is a higher stage in the development of a sense of responsibility than dutifulness alone. To be demanding toward oneself, one must understand the general tasks facing the state, be able to analyze phenomena in surrounding life, and evaluate one's own behavior.

A series of educational conversations was devoted to reading various essays and short stories: on the one hand, to cultivate the habit of listening attentively/disciplinedly, and on the other

hand, to accustom students to reflect on what they read, learn to identify the main idea, and understand its educational significance.

We read Simonov's stories *"A Proud Man"* and reports on Egor Agarkov's method (work on the home front is no less important and responsible than fighting at the front), an excerpt from Maysky's book *"Before the Storm"* (the childhood and youth of T. Maysky, the formation of a sense of responsibility and duty to the people, which subsequently led him to revolutionary activity), and a story about the restoration of the Admiralty (a sense of love for one's native city and its cultural values gives courage to defend them, disregarding the instinct for self-preservation). We discussed the feature film *"Zoya"*, exploring the motives that compelled Zoya to sacrifice her young life in order to fulfill her duty to the Motherland.

Students easily highlighted the main ideas of the works read. They quickly learned to understand why I had chosen a particular material and what guided me in asking a given question.

After reading excerpts from Bek's essays *"Panfilov's Men on the First Line"*, I posed the question: the cultivation of which qualities in soldiers makes the Soviet Army the strongest and best in the world? The students noted discipline, devotion to duty, awareness of the tasks assigned to the soldiers, their fortitude, etc. To my question—what words of Commander Mamysh-Uly addressed to the soldiers do I often want to remind you of?—the answer was unanimous: *"Everything I require of them is needed not by me, but by them."* The students began to realize that the educational work we carry out leaves a mark on them, helps develop character traits necessary in life, and positively influences the formation of their personality.

Work in the 9th Grade

In the 9th grade, the composition of the students changed slightly: two students left, and three new students, who returned from evacuation, arrived. After the summer, many skills that had seemed firmly established were lost. At the first organizational meeting, I had to pay attention to the issue of classroom duty. I said that there was no need to explain to 9th-grade students the importance of cleanliness, order, and organization in the classroom; this should be clear to everyone as it is. The question was posed differently: how to ensure that every student demonstrates a sense of responsibility for the duties they carry out, in accordance with the rules established by the school. The students suggested that when signing the weekly log, alongside the general discipline mark for the week, a mark for classroom duty should also be recorded. This suggestion was accepted by me. Every day during one of the breaks and at the end of the school day, as I entered the classroom, I silently scanned it with a glance. The duty student's reaction to this was two-fold: either his voice would sound, *"Everything is in order with me, L. N."*; or he would rush to the un-erased chalkboard, to a piece of paper or rag lying on the floor, and restore order. The duty performance of most students was evaluated with a top grade ("5"). The classroom had a satisfactory appearance, and I did not have to remind students about duty at all—the class organizer regularly posted lists of duty students.

Thus, the expression of a sense of responsibility for classroom duty could be observed and recorded for each student. It must be said that while the awareness of needing to be answerable for one's work was present in everyone, not everyone showed sufficient attention to their duty. Furthermore, a sense of personal, rather than collective, interest in maintaining cleanliness and order in the classroom prevailed.

Tasks of various kinds (at the beginning of the school year there were many—moving school furniture, decorating the Pioneer room, etc.) were carried out willingly by 9th-grade students, but they paid little attention to the careful handling of items or the manner of execution: when moving a cabinet, say, the doors would swing loose, glass would occasionally break, something would get broken through carelessness, etc. I had to talk about how work should be performed: understanding the meaning of the task, knowing how to break work down into separate operations, distributing forces properly, conducting it neatly/properly, completing it within the established timeframe, and reporting back. I contrasted these requirements for students with the requirements placed on commanders at the front and workers in various sectors of labor.

Soon after conducting this conversation, I had the opportunity to test what effect it had on the students. All property from the natural science classroom needed to be moved to the methodics cabinet one floor down. Before starting the work, I suggested that the students appoint a responsible leader and plan the work. Vanya K. volunteered to be the responsible leader. In my presence, he outlined his plan: clear the tables and cabinets, stack the visual aids on the floor in a specific order, move the cabinets, then the visual aids, and arrange them in their places in the new room. I approved the plan and asked if I needed to monitor the progress of the work or if I could leave. Receiving assurances that the students could manage without me, I allowed them to act independently, indicating only the placement spots for cabinets and tables. The move was carried out quickly, harmoniously, and without incidents. However, since the visual aids were not moved in the order in which they had been arranged, difficulties arose when organizing them in the new location. Later, I had to carry out some rearrangement. The students complied with the orders and directions of Vanya K. without objection. Upon finishing the work, he came to me

and reported that everything was done, asking me to see how the work was performed. Noting the shortcoming mentioned above, I approved the work as a whole.

Much more slowly did a sense of responsibility develop in other directions. Keeping student diaries in proper order and submitting them on time were accompanied by constant failures. Every week, when collecting them, 5–6 diaries were missing—"forgot it at home," "didn't fill it out," etc. I pointed out that filling out the diary was not a mere formality, that the diary was a means of communication between the school and parents, and that the boys were obligated to report to their parents on their academic work. The responses were mostly of the same type: "my mother (or father) knows I got a bad grade," or "why do they need to know, I know myself that I need to correct such-and-such grade." I saw that the boys did not recognize their moral responsibility to their parents, and that work was needed on cultivating it.

On the day of the elections to the Supreme Soviet and the days preceding it, there were severe frosts. Students in grades 1–7 were excused from classes; in our school, only grades 8 and 9 were supposed to study (grade 10 did not exist yet)—a total of 35 people. And so, on February 8, when I was freed from teaching and spent the whole day at the polling station, the ninth-graders showed up at school, gathered in the classroom, and after the bell rang for class, left the school as an entire class. Only one person remained—the secretary of the Komsomol organization, "despite the protests of his comrades"—and then one more student who was late for the start of classes. Lessons were conducted with them.

I returned to school on February 12 and was stunned to learn what had happened from the head of studies and the principal. I went into the classroom for my lesson. Tense silence reigned in the room; the students did not dare to move. Only at the end of

the lesson did I say: "Do not leave after the 6th lesson; I need you." When I came back to the classroom, the students met me just as silently. I already knew that the principal had spoken to them and that for all students in the class, with the exception of those who stayed for lessons and those who were sick on February 8, the quarterly mark for discipline would be lowered. Therefore, without repeating myself, I only asked: how and with what could they explain the class's unworthy behavior? The whole country welcomed Election Day to the Supreme Soviet with high production indicators, yet my pupils allowed themselves such an act on the eve of this momentous day. The question posed deeply touched the whole class. Everyone wanted to speak. I managed to restore silence and order with some effort. It turned out that none of the boys had intended their action to carry a political tone. Leaving happened spontaneously—it was cold, the surrounding classrooms were empty, someone among the boys (no one even remembers who) said: "There's no one around, why should we study? Let's go home." This thought occurred to many, and everyone readily picked it up without thinking any further. However, as soon as they walked out of the school gates and began dispersing home, they felt that they had done wrong. But returning to school was awkward, and going home felt uncomfortable. Therefore, they all decided to go together to Igor T.'s house; from there, they called the school to try to find out if lessons were ongoing in the 9th grade.

On behalf of the class (the question had evidently been discussed earlier), the Komsomol secretary asked me to believe that the act was not pre-planned or demonstrative in nature. They understood the total inadmissibility of their action, admitted their guilt, and considered the lowering of discipline marks to be a harsh but deserved punishment. They understood how poorly they had acted toward me as well, and asked for forgiveness. I saw the genuine distress and upset of the class

and declared that I believed them and believed that nothing similar would ever happen again. Later on, whenever I mentioned this incident for any reason, the students pleaded: "L. N., please don't bring it up, don't." Throughout the entire quarter, the class tried so hard to make up for their offense through their behavior that the pedagogical council deemed it possible not to lower their behavior marks.

What was the reason for such an irresponsible act? Evidently, simply that an awareness of responsibility had not yet become the regulator of all actions for these 9th-grade students. Consequently, it was necessary to make them think about this question as often as possible. Persistent work was required.

Reasonable behavior in a person develops gradually, requiring practice until it becomes a habit and enters one's flesh and blood.

In the 8th grade, there were many tasks aimed at developing dutifulness, but dutifulness is only a stepping stone to developing a sense of responsibility.

In the 9th grade, I used school duty/monitoring assignments for exercises in dutifulness and for cultivating a sense of responsibility.

At one of the school assemblies, it was decided that students with a lowered discipline mark or remarks at the end of the quarter should not be allowed to hold responsible duty roles. Regarding the 9th grade, I was given the opportunity to act at my own discretion. In turn, I gave the class itself the chance to decide this question. When I posed the question of whether Igor T. and Pasha K.—who stood out for their lack of discipline—could be included in the list of responsible duty students, the class made a fuss, with exclamations sounding out: "They'll let us down and disgrace us," "They'll start a fight themselves," etc. Igor T., not a bad boy, but very nervous and

easily excitable, declared with tears in his eyes, red all over, that he wanted to carry out duty just like everyone else. Pasha K., who was very stubborn and tended to do everything out of spite, answered without a second of hesitation: "Of course I won't, I don't really care to." I said that I expected precisely such an answer from Igor T., that I approved of his decision, and was confident he would rise to the occasion as a responsible duty student. As for Pasha K., I could only warn that the duty schedule would be drawn up tomorrow, and he still had time to think over his decision.

To foster a sense of responsibility, it is very important to develop a student's sense of self-respect and elevate him in his own eyes. This always yields favorable results. In cases of stubbornness, such as that shown by Pasha K., I tried not to escalate his outbursts, but to express confidence that, after thinking it over, he would do the right thing. Quite often, that is exactly how it turned out.

The list of responsible duty students was drawn up. The first on duty were members of the Komsomol committee, followed by 9th-grade students in alphabetical order, followed by 8th-grade students. All of this emphasized the significance of duty service and special trust in the students—members of the VLKSM committee and the senior 9th grade—which contributed to an increased sense of responsibility. The 9th-grade students (4 of whom were members of the committee) approached duty with great attention and diligence, striving to have it evaluated as "excellent" by the supervising teacher in the notebook.

I could consider that the students possessed an awareness of a sense of responsibility and the will to demonstrate it; they already possessed dutifulness skills. At the same time, I was not calm or confident that my pupils possessed a fully developed sense of responsibility. Responsibility to the class

for carrying out a public assignment was felt (it was considered awkward and disgraceful to evade work or shift it onto a comrade's shoulders); responsibility to the title of a Komsomol member was also felt; responsibility to parents, perhaps, lay hidden somewhere deep in their souls, but was not consciously realized; responsibility to the educator and teachers was not manifested always or in everything. Along with all this, individual differences among students became increasingly clear. One more trait could be noted: the less mandatory a requirement was presented as being, the more willingly and diligently it was fulfilled. An element of voluntariness served as a stimulus for responsible behavior.

What methods should be used moving forward? The nature of educational work must correspond to the overall level of student development and rely on achievements already gained. Reflections on this topic brought me to the conclusion that senior students could take a manageable part in the educator's work and assist in clarifying certain aspects of youth psychology and the motives behind their behavior. In connection with this, at a regular class meeting, I stated that I wanted to talk with the students on a topic related to educational work, and asked those interested in listening to stay on Monday after classes.

On the appointed day, after the fifth lesson, a student entered the teachers' room and informed me that those gathered were waiting for me in the classroom. Arriving in the classroom, I began the conversation by pointing out that they had probably noticed the importance I attach to fostering a sense of responsibility and their behavior in various situations of classroom and extracurricular life. Now, when the pace of liquidating the consequences of the war and the further development of all branches of our country's national economy depend on everyone's responsible attitude toward their work,

fostering a spirit of responsibility for actions in the younger generation—who will take direct part in constructive labor—acquires immense importance. The exchange of opinions that took place on this issue showed that the students fully understood me.

At the next meeting, I asked the students to briefly answer the following question: how do they understand what a sense of responsibility is? The answers varied:

> *"Responsibility is the feeling when a person is answerable for his actions to himself."*
>
> *"This feeling (a sense of responsibility — L. L.) guides a person who commits a particular act. A person knows why and for what purpose he commits it, understands the consequences of the act—not only for himself, but for other people directly or indirectly affected by it."*
>
> *"By a sense of responsibility, I understand the feeling a person experiences when committing an act for which he must answer to someone: the state, the collective, a friend, a leader, the Motherland; or consider something: his honor, his conscience, his sense of duty, etc."*
>
> *"...A person with a cultivated sense of responsibility does not commit bad acts out of fear of punishment, but out of the realization that he might let people down."*
>
> *"...A person who commits an act solely out of dutifulness does not think about what this act yields in general..."*
>
> *"...Responsibility is consciousness and conscientiousness..."*

The students asked to read aloud the answers they had given. Everything written raised no objections, with the exception of

one: *"a responsible attitude is when a person knows that sooner or later someone will pay attention to his action."* The boys protested against such a definition and pointed out to its author the contradiction: *"a person acting responsibly acts without any selfish motive or calculation for reward and praise."*

Upon concluding the discussion of the answers, I suggested that for the next meeting, the students write an answer to the question: what action in their life do they consider the most responsible and the most irresponsible? A day later, the students declared to me that this assignment was very difficult to fulfill, as there were very many examples of irresponsible actions, but none of responsible ones. They asked me to tell them what actions in my own life I personally consider the most responsible. The examples I provided did little to ease the students' difficulty.

In the students' responses submitted by the set deadline, several examples of irresponsible actions were given (characteristically, not a single one cited leaving class early on February 8th as an example), but there were few examples of responsible actions. Here are the most interesting answers: Mark U.

> "I believe that in my life so far there have been no responsible actions corresponding to the definition I gave to a responsible action. However, with a degree of leniency, I can point to some actions that seem responsible to me. Thus, for example, I remained in the column of demonstrators on May 1st, despite the fact that most of my comrades left it... I have no small share of irresponsible actions. Once, for example, I took on an essay for the literature olympiad without weighing my strength

and capabilities beforehand. This led to a lamentable result."

R. (secretary of the Komsomol organization) writes that he considers his most irresponsible action to be "shortcomings in work with young Komsomol members," and his most responsible — "the decision to remain in class on February 8th," although his act was not brought to completion, as he failed to prevent the departure from school of the rest of the students.

In my future work, I was faced with continuing to develop the students' skill of execution and conscious evaluation of their actions, but from specially selected assignments to transition gradually to assignments prompted by school life itself, to instill in the students' consciousness that responsibility must manifest itself, above all, in their attitude toward academic work and in their behavior.

At the end of the term, I conducted a regular parent-teacher meeting. I intentionally did not write written invitations to the parents, but told the students that I was very interested in the presence of all parents at the meeting. I explained how important it was for parents to be informed about the regimen of the final term, and about exams. I asked — could I rely on them and not send out written invitations? The response was affirmative. Some right then and there wrote the date of the meeting in their student diaries. Only Igor T. forgot to inform his parents about the meeting. A suspicion arose in me whether there was intent here (not everything was smooth with Igor's discipline), but his mother came to the school 2–3 days later.

At the parent-teacher meeting, I outlined the general picture of the class's work across all areas. I also talked about work on fostering a sense of responsibility. The parents were very interested in this. They cited examples of irresponsible

behavior in their sons, but some also spoke of another matter — about raising the sense of responsibility for academic work. The mother of Rena K. said: "Now I understand the change in him; previously he wouldn't recognize anything, now it feels like he's somehow governing himself." Rena K. is a difficult student in terms of upbringing. He has tuberculosis of the spine. He spent most of his life in the hospital lying in a cast. He studied in school for only one year — in the 8th grade in Sverdlovsk. He came to us in the 9th grade. Rena K. is a smart, developed boy, but an extreme individualist. He submits only to what he himself deems necessary; off everything else he brushes: "nonsense, rubbish."

Conversing with the parents, I was once again convinced that the majority of students share everything that happens at school with them, but do so not as a result of a conscious sense of responsibility to their parents for academic progress and behavior.

The parents showed great interest not only in the studies and behavior of their own children, but also in the class collective as a whole. This gave me the idea to conduct a parent-teacher meeting at the end of the academic year in the form of an account presentation by the students, which was also intended to serve the goal of developing a sense of responsibility in them.

The academic year ended, and examinations began. I can note that the ninth-graders prepared all necessary materials for the examinations on time, that in the 4th term each of them tried to eliminate existing gaps; the students strictly adhered to the recommended schedule, demonstrated good will in re-allocating textbooks, and themselves proposed uniting for examination prep so that everyone had the opportunity to use textbooks. The results of the class examinations were good.

Through two days after the completion of exams, a parent-teacher meeting was scheduled. At the class meeting, I told the students by what motives I was guided when choosing such an unusual form of parent meeting. In my view, the students were to familiarize their parents with the work in each subject. To show the syllabus content of the subject, teaching methods, general educational significance of the given subject, its connection to practice. The speeches were to be accompanied by a demonstration of physics experiments, an exhibition of read works in literature (57 works), an exhibition of drawings, essays, and written works in mathematics. Two speeches were to reflect the content of extracurricular work and extracurricular reading. I distributed the topics, taking into account the inclinations, strengths, and abilities of each student.

The matter was not without difficulties. First, the students met the very idea of speaking before their parents very negatively — it embarrassed them and seemed superfluous. When passions settled and in principle my idea was accepted (i.e., the right of parents to know and see the work of the school and the 9th-grade students was recognized), I moved on to distributing the topics. A new outburst of protests. Without objections, my decision was accepted only by Mark U. and Yura T. Some asked to change the topic. Rena K., whom I assigned to give a report on geography, declared: "I will not do it and I will not come." I looked at him, said nothing, and moved on to the next topics, and at the end turned to him with the words: "Now I want to say a few words about what you need to emphasize in your presentation. I respect you and therefore, of course, I cannot entertain the thought that out of petty pride you will ruin our whole collective effort and not show up." I once again dwelled on what importance I attached to the report before the parents, and emphasized that the students' presentations would serve as a showcase of the class's work class and asked the

students not to forget about "small details" that could testify to non-compliance with point 5 of the student rules (neatness in appearance).

The next day, an hour before the start of the meeting, the young men were already at school and prepared both the exhibition and apparatus for the experiments. I brought the written work and gave the students the opportunity to satisfy their completely natural interest in it. Then I arranged the notebooks on the table. All the students were assembled, looking smart and neat. Only Pasha K. did not show up, having sent me a written report on the teaching of the German language assigned to him. The meeting began. Volodya A.'s mother was very anxious — he was late, and she wanted to go after him. Everything went smoothly and well. The boys succeeded one another at the table and in the same tone as during exams (which I wanted to show the parents) — delivered their reports thoroughly and in literary language. The parents listened with tense attention. The students were anxious, but outwardly kept calm — just as during exams. After their presentations, I gave a general report on the annual results of the class's work, cited reviews from those present at the exams testifying to the readiness of the students to transition to the graduating class, and congratulated the parents and students on the successful completion of the school year. The parents remained very pleased with the meeting.

They had not imagined until now how 9th-grade students can speak, or what demands are placed upon them. They saw how the highest-achieving students stood out. Every mother or father, evidently, determined their son's standing in the class. Everything that parents knew from their sons' stories about school took on tangible forms. Then parents confessed to me that they were very anxious when their children were speaking. The mother of Leva K., the youngest student in the 9th grade,

said that she almost ran away from the meeting when he gave his report on extracurricular reading. With great interest, parents examined the written work of the students. With a tinge of sadness, they spoke of how their sons were outgrowing them in knowledge, general awareness, cultural, and political development.

This meeting was a kind of test of my students' consciousness, their responsibility for executing a complex task — for each individually and for the class as a whole. For this, it was necessary to overcome a sense of awkwardness before the parents' assembly, a sense of anxiety about the quality of one's speech.

Work in the 10th Grade

Continuing work in the 10th grade, I already knew well both the characteristics of individual students and the general profile of the entire class as a whole.

From the beginning of the school year, a specific orientation was adopted at class meetings: final examinations for the certificate of secondary education are the culmination of school academic work and a test of readiness for entering a university, but the school's role in educating the student is not limited to this; therefore, everyone graduating from school must pass a test of maturity in the field of political and cultural development, in moral development, and in possessing various skills of a labor and industrial nature, as well as skills of cultural behavior.

In connection with this, educational work had to bear a dual character: testing and characterizing students in various areas of their non-academic life, and remedying existing gaps and shortcomings in their upbringing.

After the very first class meeting and conversation on the importance of active work in class and conscientious

preparation of homework, I introduced tracking of student homework preparation. This was done in the following manner: on a slip of paper, students wrote the lesson schedule for the coming day, and opposite each academic subject made a conventional mark: a well-prepared lesson was marked with a straight plus ($\bf +$), reviewing material for a lesson was marked with a diagonal plus ($\boldsymbol{\times}$), and a completely unprepared lesson was marked with a minus ($ \mathbf{-}$). If there was no assignment for a given subject, a circle ($\mathbf{O}$) was placed. Such a slip, dated and signed by the student, was dropped into a large envelope pinned to the classroom board. I made two retrievals from the envelope: one — precisely at 9 a.m., with the bell for class, the other — after classes. The first retrieval I marked with a straight plus in my notebook.

Such registration was kept throughout the entire first term. Reviewing and taking into account the submission of such daily information, I was kept informed about the work of every student. It turned out that when preparing at home, students take into account the likelihood of being called on in a particular subject, and spend time preparing accordingly. On days preceding test works or literature essay submissions, usually all time was devoted to these assignments, while remaining lessons were only skimmed or not prepared at all. I could not doubt the truthfulness of the information given to me by the students: it was clearly not in favor of the students. I selectively cross-checked the marks given to called-on students with their written slips, and several times, after reviewing a specific student's entry, asked the teacher to call on him to answer. Furthermore, by introducing this assignment, I wanted to establish the degree of a student's dutifulness and their ability for prolonged perseverance and persistence in completing a task.

The result turned out to be positive: part of the class — more than half — showed a strongly expressed desire to flawlessly fulfill the assignment; a few people stumbled — missed a day or two, but then again continued to neatly drop their slip into the envelope; two students neatly submitted slips during the first month, but after the summary results I drew up, relaxed with the achieved result and ceased further participation in the assignment; two submitted slips a few times and limited themselves to that. One student clearly did not want to reveal the picture of his homework (in the term he received two failing grades), while another took up the task several times, but could not sustain it and dropped it.

After the first term, a special meeting was held with the 10th-grade students who had failing and satisfactory grades, at which we analyzed the causes of weak academic performance and outlined a plan of work to eliminate gaps.

At class meetings, the question of reading was frequently raised. Free time for extracurricular reading remained very little, the habit of regular reading was far from universal, and the tastes of the majority were already formed, though quite randomly. Therefore, our exchange of impressions about a particular book read made up for deficiencies in students' extracurricular reading and helped them stay abreast of literary news.

When organizing group visits to lectures or the theater, I assigned tasks to individual students. The first assignment — to organize a visit to the Pushkin Academic Theater for the play *Uncle Vanya* in connection with studying Chekhov's drama — was given to Mark U. He did everything — found out the repertoire, agreed with the literature teacher on a date, got tickets, and distributed them among the students. Yura T. obtained tickets to the Pioneers Palace for a lecture by Academician Tarle. Shura R. got several tickets for a lecture by

Tarle on the Nuremberg Trials. Volodya A. organized a visit to the Theater for Young Spectators for Gozzi's fairytale *The Raven*. The students did not want to go to this play, but I convinced them that it was impossible not to become acquainted with the Theater for Young Spectators, told them its history, spoke about mask theater and Gozzi's creative work, and expressed hope that they would appreciate the idea of the fairytale and its staging.

The performance made various impressions on the students — it captivated some, interested others, left a third group untouched, and so on. The exchange of opinions on the viewed play was so lively that we didn't notice how the hall emptied. We left the theater in a very orderly fashion, receiving the approval of the ushers.

Evening events at the girls' school and at ours on November 5th and December 4th were well prepared and conducted.

The most responsible, from my point of view, was holding an evening event after the end of the first term. This event was timed to coincide with a parent-teacher meeting, and in view of the concern expressed by mothers regarding meetings between male students and female students of the girls' school, I decided to stage a small performance through the efforts of the 10th grade of both schools. Protests from the students were substantial — "no mothers allowed." I don't know whether we succeeded in convincing the students that mothers have the right to be interested in and know with whom their sons spend time, or something else, but in any case we achieved that the students took part in the collective preparation for the evening. Even those who usually did not attend evenings came. Both the young men and the young women liked the evening very much, social interaction flowed naturally, they played merrily, and danced a little.

The majority of students believe that the development of a sense of responsibility is closely tied to the development of consciousness. Mikhail K. even asserts that every conscious act — that is, a thought-out and weighed action — is a responsible action. Igor T. notes that a sense of responsibility develops in a person throughout their entire life, starting with the manifestation of responsibility for small matters: "Naturally, a person who has never before thought about responsibility for small matters will not think about it in a series of important life matters," he says.

Yura T. notes that "the sense of responsibility develops gradually, as a result of practice," and "that internal analysis must accompany every action."

A number of statements emphasize the importance of will in developing a sense of responsibility.

Yura T. writes: "The whole crux lies in willpower; without it, a person is clay that will inevitably become mud." "A sense of responsibility can be developed by combining consciousness with willpower," says Volodya K.

This analysis of their actions and their motives shows that the young man, relying, it is true, only on his own example, understands the sense of responsibility as a deep moral problem, searches for ways to resolve it, places high demands on himself, and gives a strict evaluation to his actions.

Examples from life and literature exert a great influence on the development of a sense of responsibility — discussing a given act, analyzing the causes that prompted it, analyzing character traits, or the cultivation of a particular feeling. This accustoms students to analyzing their own actions, forces them to compare their actions with the actions of other people who serve as models of the positive, evokes dissatisfaction with their own actions, and a desire to change them for the better.

Summing up the work conducted, I can say that the students have risen to an awareness of the tasks that our Motherland sets before them as future practical workers and representatives of the Soviet intelligentsia. They hold themselves accountable for their shortcomings and try to eradicate them. I hope through coordinated work with the students to help them complete their moral formation and leave school as full-fledged and conscious builders of a new life.

"Soviet Pedagogy", 1948, No. 8.

N. I. BRAZHNIK

ON THE QUESTION OF EDUCATING AND SELF-EDUCATING STUDENTS

(From the experience of educational work in secondary school)

I

The longer one engages in educational work and the deeper one delves into it, the more interesting and at the same time complex it appears, and the more intensely one searches for the most effective methods and techniques for it. One must ponder these during lesson preparation, when assigning essay topics, when planning extracurricular club work, and during conversations outside of class.

In the present article, I wish to dwell on only one of the methods — on the organization of self-education of students in the upper grades of secondary school.

The practical application of this method was preceded by many years of observations of the behavior of students in grades VII–X, studying their motives, and in general the characteristics of the psychology of schoolchildren aged 14–18.

II

When the picture of the internal "life" of senior schoolchildren became clear to me with a certain degree of clarity, along with its strong and weak sides (naturally, individually in several different combinations) and its contradictions, it became understandable to me why in educational work we took a step forward and half a step, or even two steps back. Our encouraging influence, when the students' valuable impulse toward a given activity weakened, often invoked resistance as violence against the personality; critical evaluation of behavior was in many cases perceived as injustice. Advice and

directions during particular internal crises sometimes weighed heavily as an uninvited intrusion into internal life and were often interpreted as a lack of understanding of the demands of youth, which in their development were outpacing the older generation.

The situation was further complicated by the fact that the influence of the out-of-school environment was not always in harmony with the tasks of our school's educational work. All of this sharply reduced the results of educational efforts.

Pondering all these pressing issues, I came to the conclusion that while keeping in effect tested and proven types of educational influence, it was necessary at the same time to advance a set of techniques that would facilitate the organization of the consciousness and will of school youth for the purpose of self-education. My pedagogical practice suggested a series of measures to me in this direction, which will be discussed below. But this work is still very far from completion and can be placed on a fully solid foundation only by utilizing the experience of a large collective of teachers.

By means of purely external influence alone, a person can be educated mainly externally — broken in, so to speak; internally, however, one must help them educate themselves. I remember once having to visit a boys' school where the boys had a very well-mannered appearance and order reigned everywhere. But when the students rushed out of the school after class — which was apparently something like a rein to them — they shouted, shoved each other and passersby, yelled out rudeness, and even indecencies. In this school, drill had evidently replaced education.

Students themselves perfectly understand the difference between the one and the other, and such purely external order is not recognized by them as discipline. Characteristic in this

respect was a conversation I had with Grade VIII students at another school. "Do you have good discipline?" — "Bad," one of the pupils answered with conviction. "Perhaps only with the principal is it good," added another. "What kind of discipline is that?" objected a third. "We're simply afraid of him."

It is necessary to create, or if they already exist, to strengthen internal stimuli for moving forward, and to raise high standards for oneself.

At the same time, it is necessary to strengthen the teenager's and young man's faith in himself, in his own abilities, without which that important and complex internal work, which can be called self-education, is impossible. The first condition for this is the teacher's faith in their students. This seemingly subjective factor is of exceptional importance.

Once, a teacher with whom pedagogical work was not going well said to me: "You idealize them. They are sly. They know you have a high opinion of them and try to be good with you. But in my classes, they are completely different." Soon we received a clear demonstration of the truth of his words. Once, annoyed by something, he interrupted the lesson and left the classroom. Seeing the teacher in the corridor, I immediately entered the classroom he had left, as I was its homeroom teacher. The boys sat in silence and were apparently so stunned by what had happened that they didn't even rise from their seats upon my appearance. The teacher entered right behind me and began to complain loudly. "Who was disrupting discipline?" I asked him. — "Who! As if they'll tell! In their opinion, they were all behaving well." — "Who disrupted discipline?" I addressed the class directly. And the boys did not want to deceive my faith in their truthfulness and the courage required (they understood this well) to openly admit their fault: 8 people silently but decisively rose from their seats. "After the lesson, come to me, but for now study as you should," I said. And

turning to the teacher: "Excuse me, please, that the lesson was interrupted. I ask you — please continue." I immediately left the classroom; the lesson successfully "reached" its end, and after the bell, without any reminders whatsoever, all 8 people were standing near the staffroom, having first apologized to the teacher. They were in a hurry to offer explanations regarding what had happened.

No less convincing proof of the necessity of trusting those being educated was another episode for me. In the summer of that year, I happened to converse with one of my former students from the graduating class of 1941, a tall Guards officer who had a number of awards for combat exploits — consequently, a man not of the timid dozen. Recalling his school years, he told me how he and his comrades were afraid to receive a reprimand from those teachers who treated them with trust and respect. Such an attitude obliged them to stand at a certain height, and losing it seemed terrifying.

However, one should avoid the other extreme — an uncritical attitude and overpraising. Respect and trust toward students can and must be combined with well-thought-out, fair criticism and high standards. I emphasize: precisely with well-thought-out criticism coming not only from the characteristics of an adult's mindset (which tedious and useless lectures usually suffer from), but taking into account the age characteristics of the teenager and youth.

Since individual character and behavior traits of a student are interconnected, the entire system of educational influence on him must keep them in mind as a whole. Gathering together individual elements of my pedagogical experience, thinking through and generalizing, sometimes guided by intuition, I gradually outlined and carried out over a number of years several measures that to a certain extent contributed to the organization of self-education among senior students.

Our youth dream of useful activity for the good of the Motherland, lighting up at the thought of lofty exploits. But youthful and earlier ideas about the heroic do not differ in concreteness or reality, and often do not coincide with the conditions and requirements of surrounding life. Therefore, it seemed necessary to me, first and foremost, to draw the students' attention precisely to everyday phenomena, to strengthen their interest in our reality and everyday life, and to teach them to reflect upon it. On the other hand, in the process of rapid intellectual development, young men do not always think their own thoughts through to the end, often fail to deeply comprehend the thoughts of others, and therefore it is important to foster in them greater thoughtfulness and depth of study and reflection.

Proceeding from all this, I recommended that Grade VIII students keep diaries in which quotes from liked books, interesting remarks of surrounding people, their own thoughts, and observations of human life and nature would be recorded. I summarized my most concrete talk on this matter in the following way: keeping a diary 1) develops powers of observation and promotes a better understanding of people and nature; 2) elevates reasoning abilities; 3) helps accumulate life and literary materials for essays and other academic and non-academic work.

Once, in response to my explanations, Grade VIII student M. bitterly complained: "Here I kept a diary, and mother found it and gave me a thrashing." — "You need to hide it," came someone's sympathetic voice. — "Under the wardrobe," with a tinge of mystery, added another. — "You can put it under the wardrobe too," I agreed. — "And you can do it differently. Any person can have good and bad thoughts. Bad ones, of course, should be driven away, not fixed by writing them down in a diary. Then, perhaps, mother won't thrash you either. And the

point here isn't mother at all, but that later, when you grow wiser (I intentionally used this word to discredit what mother thrashed him for), it will be disgusting to read such a diary. After all, you don't gather into your pockets all sorts of dirt and trash that catches your eye. You put only the most necessary and valuable things there. And a diary is a kind of treasure chest."

Diaries were started by, let it not be 100% of the eighth-graders, but still very many. From these diaries, original descriptions for essays, well-thought-out thoughts, and vivid epigraphs were subsequently drawn. Upon graduating school, they were carefully kept as memories of wonderful school years and continued under different life conditions. Very telling in this regard were two letters from the front in 1943 to me. Here is an excerpt from the first:

> "I spent a month in the hospital. The head wound was minor, and I am again heading to my unit. But in connection with my injury, a great misfortune occurred: the diary I had been keeping since the VIII grade disappeared along with my belongings. For me, this is a huge loss."

The next letter was written in a jubilant tone: the diary was found, saved by his comrades. The question of the remaining belongings, apparently, was not worth attention and was not covered at all.

Undoubtedly, not everyone follows advice, but if even a portion of the students does so, it is easier to organize the rest. The content of creative essays revealing the internal life of the writers, and outside-of-class conversations in the VIII, IX, and X grades showed that keeping diaries was extremely effective in an educational sense, developing a thoughtful and active

attitude toward the surrounding life and a critical attitude toward oneself, promoting intellectual growth.

The next set of measures put forward by me in the plan of student self-organization (mainly in connection with age-related instability of decisions, short duration of their active implementation in life), had as its task the introduction of a planned element into their life and activity. I had to advocate for the implementation of this habit from two positions. The first of them was the ideal of a strong-willed person, so dear to our youth. More than one conversation was conducted on the topic that a strong will is a quality whose development, just like others, depends to a significant degree on the person himself, and that the main method in this matter is the precise and steadfast execution of a planned schedule of work, no matter what great external and internal difficulties had to be overcome for it. It is precisely in overcoming these difficulties that the will develops and character strengthens.

The second starting point was the students' complaints about a lack of time to complete everything required by the school. In this, as in the first case, explanations bore both the character of general instruction and individual conversations. I will cite one of the latter.

I had a capable, moreover gifted, but completely incapable of organizing his time student, K. Satisfactory grades alternated with failing ones, although he spent all his out-of-school time at home in a splendid apartment, under the supervision of a mother and grandmother who had only one job in life — raising their only son and grandson.

"How do you spend your time at home?" I asked K.

— "I come home, eat lunch, sleep, then they broadcast something interesting on the radio... And so I don't manage to study my lessons... Somehow I can't."

— "And what is that called?"

— "How... Well... I have no willpower."

— "Well, and are you waiting for this willpower to come from somewhere? Sometime a ring will sound in the hallway, willpower will enter and say: 'Hello, Vanya, I've arrived. Now I will serve you faithfully.' Why don't you develop your willpower? Or do you want to be a barren flower, like Onegin, Manilov, Oblomov? But they were served by serfs, and how do you intend to live?"

— "But I don't know what to do with myself."

— "You know perfectly well. Make a plan with a firm daily routine for yourself and, moreover, for the whole term. Include in it lesson preparation, reading, rest, theater, football, and so forth. A set hour arrives — take up the planned task, whether you want to or not. Thus you will gradually accustom yourself to being master, and not a toy of your desires and moods; you will easily and freely control yourself, just as a person with developed, regularly exercised muscles controls their body..."

Three or four weeks after this conversation, I obtained several theater tickets for the class and offered one of them to K... He made to eagerly reach out his hand, but immediately lowered it and, blushing, said while turning slightly away: "I cannot go: this will break my schedule." Subsequent observations showed that K. still slipped up at times, but nevertheless noticeably gained strength.

I tried to introduce planning skills into the distribution of homework as well. The Russian language lesson in these classes occurred once a week, but all homework was evenly

distributed by me over 6 days (10–15 minutes daily), and its execution was checked several times a week. Home essays were given 3–4 weeks in advance, and work on them was checked across three monitoring stages: 1) thinking through the topic, selecting material, drawing up an expanded outline — one week; 2) working on the essay in first draft (rough copy) — 10–12 days; 3) final refinement and copying out neatly — another week. The same planning was recommended when completing other assignments (reading fictional and critical literature, learning by heart, etc.).

Sometimes students contribute their own wishes to the plan of major work — for example, home essays, preparation of a literary evening, a readers' conference, etc. — and if these wishes are expedient (which is most often the case), they are accepted, and if rejected, it is done with obligatory justification by the teacher. To instill planning skills into the everyday routine of our students, it is necessary that the requirements for these skills be perceived consciously and actively, though, of course, without any rally-style grandstanding, since it concerns an assignment from a teacher or other school work.

The task of strengthening one's willpower appeals to the overwhelming majority of students. Here is how they express themselves. Grade IX student A. writes:

> "My ideal is an energetic, mighty person with enormous willpower, possessing great knowledge, direct and modest. And I will achieve this, because starting this year I have begun working on myself, educating my will. I cultivate will in myself in every small detail. Here, for example, if I feel like going to the cinema or somewhere else, but lessons aren't learned, then I don't go to the cinema, but study my lessons. At wake-up time I really don't want to get up, but I overcome sleep and get up

> without delay. If an example or problem doesn't work out for me, I will never leave it like that, I work on it until I solve it. I never go to sleep until I've learned my lessons."

This was written at the beginning of the school year in Grade IX. Over the year, the boy noticeably gained strength, studied significantly more evenly and better, and spent a lot of time practicing music. His words: "I want not a single day to be wasted in vain," were apparently said by him thoughtfully and seriously. But in Grade X, after the summer break, disruptions were felt again; however, he began entering his necessary working norm significantly faster than before.

Grade IX student G. expressed himself in the following manner:

> "A lightminded attitude toward my school studies is the main source of my misfortunes. For me, school is my life, and if everything is in order with me at school, there will be order in everything. With all my strength I will try to eliminate my shortcomings. And I will eliminate them. I have firmly decided this."

This young man had to endure a particularly difficult internal struggle. Sometimes he walked from school with me right up to my home, frankly confessing that he was looking in my advice for the fulcrum he lacked. He rose and rolled down again (academic work in this regard is a splendid indicator), and yet the result of his great internal struggle showed itself in Grade X: at present, G. is a composed, very capable of work, cheerful and, at the same time, modest young man.

Grade IX student D. comes to the thought:

> "To learn to value one's time, to keep one's word — these are also difficulties that you won't overcome right away."

Generally, a person needs a strong will, honesty, and courage. But these do not come by inheritance; one must cultivate them oneself through persistent work on oneself, strengthening them like muscles with daily gymnastic exercises.

Subsequent events showed that these were not empty words: despite a prolonged illness, student D. successfully finished the IX grade; now, in the X grade, through his persistent work he has achieved great success and is considered one of the candidates for receiving an honors diploma.

Student Ch. writes in his home essay:

> "The main goal of my future consists in having my life bring benefit to the Soviet state. In my opinion, a person can always achieve their goal if they have sufficient willpower. When I sit down to learn lessons, I often have an excited state. It prevents me from concentrating on the given lesson, but I force myself to concentrate and learn the lesson. In the summer I read *Dead Souls*; I didn't like it, but I read the book to the end. Once I returned from the theater at 12 o'clock at night. I really wanted to sleep, but I overcame my drowsiness and prepared all the lessons. However, one does not always succeed in overcoming oneself. During wake-up time there are cases when you strain all your forces, but cannot get up right away."

An attempt to develop persistent will in himself showed in Ch.'s academic life as well, but less vividly than in a number of other students — perhaps because he often had a heavy mood (his father was at the front, and his mother — at home — was

killed by the Germans). But this mood softened, and the boy's thoughts were diverted by the struggle for his set goal.

An exceptional example of consistency and planned organization in everything, especially in his labor activity, is presented by student Ts. Reflecting on his future and present, he comes to the following conclusions:

> "I have less than two years left to be within the walls of the school, but during this interval of time I need to do a lot. I want to master the secondary school program excellently, achieve complete literacy, supplement my knowledge through reading, actively participate in school evenings, and engage in sports. I plan to spend the holidays according to the following plan: Before camp, visit Ukraine or Kazakhstan to rest and get new impressions, visiting new places I haven't been to. In camp I will read intensively, engage in sports, and participate in all military exercises. Of sports activities I will dedicate attention to swimming, practicing on parallel bars and horizontal bar, playing football and volleyball. After camp I will go to the countryside; there I will rest before classes and grow physically stronger while participating in collective farm harvest work."

Thus, a whole large segment of a schoolchild's life — holidays — is planned here from the viewpoint of two tasks: 1) supplementing one's knowledge and 2) developing physical agility, the lack of which forces the boy to experience many agonizing minutes.

Ts. strives to bring the same planned organization into his daily distribution of activities. Here not everything is smooth, and Ts. explains it like this:

> "I don't have a strong enough will. The rudiments of will exist in me, but they need to be developed. For this purpose I, as far as possible, precisely fulfill tasks set before myself, promises given to a comrade even if he doesn't fulfill his own, and never arrive late for duty. All these and many other sincere confessions, sometimes marked by semi-childish naivety, speak of one thing: "It is hard for us to fight for the planned organization of our activities, for accuracy of execution, for strong-willed behavior; we have slip-ups, but we know that it is necessary to fight, and we do not back down."

However, an educator must never forget that in this difficult struggle of the student with his own weakness and all kinds of temptations from the outside — such as cinema, an ill-timed book in hand, ice skating, football, merry comrade banter, etc. — his constant help and support are needed. This help can proceed along three lines: 1) strengthening the sense of duty, 2) building interest in work, and 3) maintaining faith in one's own strength. To illustrate, I will cite one characteristic conversation in this respect during the period of Grade IX work on a difficult topic.

Quite late in the evening, I walked into the classroom where students were preparing their homework. The majority of them were writing a literature essay. Seeing me, one of the boys said: “Izmail can only be taken once. Don't give us topics like that anymore”.

“I won't give you a topic like that anymore... The next one will be harder”.

A murmur of protest and indignation ran through the class.

“How else could it be? You took this fortress with great difficulty, and that is precisely why you became significantly stronger than you were before this. The topic has already stopped being difficult for you. Why should I give you anything similar? We need to erect a new difficulty requiring a new exertion of strength to overcome it. Only in this way will you grow. And now you will be able to solve an even more difficult task”.

During my short speech, all traces of protest vanished from my interlocutors. Some of them laughed cheerfully, others firmly declared: “We will write it!” And we parted ways on very friendly terms.

Often very stormily and, in individual cases, painfully, the process of personality formation, the search for a life purpose, and the definition of one's relationships with the surrounding social sphere take place in early youth. In all these complex questions of youth life, the teacher-educator must naturally come to the rescue.

In order for the process of self-education to make sense, one must have a clearly understood, broad life goal before them. This goal—its obligatoriness—must be revealed completely visually, for in education, visual clarity is even more important than in teaching. While studying imaginative literature, we dwelt on the question of why active Korobochka was so petty, so despicable? Why does thrifty owner Sobakevich produce such a repulsive impression? An answer suggested itself: primarily because the sole driver of their actions was personal, selfish goals. What set Andrei Bolkonsky and Pierre Bezukhov apart from their gentry environment, ennobling them? Their desire to be useful to their people.

In subsequent conversations, we continued the discussion of this topic. Why are Nikolai Ostrovsky, Oleg Koshevoy, and

Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya so wonderful? Because the good of our Soviet Motherland is higher and dearer to them than personal happiness, dearer than life itself.

But, while helping our youth form their worldview, we must first and foremost fight for the development of the habit to translate words into action, ideas into deeds. And for this, it is necessary that a person from a young age consciously prepares for the tasks of practical activity facing them. For the purpose of such "self-determination" and "self-mobilization," ninth-grade students were given a home essay on the topic: "My Life Ideals". At first, everything was unclear to the students: both the meaning of the word "ideal," its place in the life of a 16-year-old youth, and the paths to its realization. There were many conversations and arguments, and the further the work on the topic progressed, the stronger grew the interest in it, and activity increased. For me, it was obvious that the work contributed greatly to the inner growth of the students.

With great and joyful excitement, I read these essays. Probably because they were written with vivid interest, their literary qualities were higher than usual. But the most valuable thing in all the works was the clear and bright realization that only a harmonious fusion of the personal and the social, and the primacy of the social over the personal, gives full meaning, significance, and joy to life.

> "In whatever work I find myself, I will be able to combine my duties as a citizen of the Soviet Union with my personal life, which I cannot even imagine as running separately from the social. For me, this is completely unthinkable and impossible," writes student B.

His words express the general mood of the student collective. At school, B. stopped refusing social work, which had previously been his habit.

> "I do not want to lose these years," writes Ch. — "I often think about my future. My dream is to be an artillery officer who would not disgrace the glory of our weapons and would follow the path of our great ancestors and heroes of the Great Patriotic War. But for this, one needs to study hard and persistently. The main goal of my future is for my life to bring benefit to our state, so that not a minute of my life is wasted. Suvorov said: 'One minute decides the outcome of a battle, one hour—the outcome of a campaign, one day—the fate of an empire'".

Student Ts. writes:

> "After school, I will go to study at an artillery school. I plan to complete my military education at the Academy. In the unit I will command, I will establish discipline, roll out agitation work, try to instill in the soldiers a love for military studies, organize readings of newspapers and books, organize leisure sports games such as football, volleyball, billiards, *gorodki*, and chess. Perhaps this will be in the distant future, but to achieve this, one must get to work right now: read a lot, play sports, build strength of character, strengthen the will, develop powers of observation, and train oneself to quickly recognize people. An officer must be honest and faithful to his Soviet Motherland, precisely fulfill his duties, be brave, and at the same time modest".

At the end of the essay, Ts. returns again to describing the ideal Soviet officer he would like to be:

> "He must have an iron will; he is honest, precise, neat, and always well-groomed. In battle, he quickly assesses the situation and completes combat missions while losing as few people as possible. At the front, he is calm and rational—after all, the lives of many people depend on him. However, he must decisively fulfill his task without stopping before sacrifices, but without taking foolish risks, and study the enemy's tactics... But the most important trait is the striving to increase one's knowledge".

Ts. is indeed working on himself in this direction. His academic work is strictly systematic. Despite the general respect of teachers and students, his modesty never changes. But what is particularly touching about him is his unalterable truthfulness. Once he gave an excellent answer in class. “Why do you know so weakly...” I asked, picking up a pen to assign a mark. “I weakly know 'A Conversation with a Tax Inspector' about Mayakovsky's poetry,” Ts. calmly answered. And characteristically: this style of truthfulness, with very few exceptions, generally took root in the class—apparently both as a result of a decision made on principle and as a result of the organizing influence of Ts. and other students who firmly put into practice the task of self-education.

> “I dream of being a military historian,” writes V. — “I study military art, the military wisdom of the ages... A military historian must be a highly cultured person. He needs geography to assess the terrain, history for proper political orientation, and

> literature to properly understand the moral condition of troops, commander's decisions, and psychological moments. I understand this and try to study these sciences to expand my knowledge".

In the essay of Yuri G., we read:

> "I will give my life to the cause and interests of the people. I want to serve them through literature... In life, one must strive for great things. In this striving, in a clear understanding of one's tasks, surrounded by interesting people, in bringing benefit to people, in work that you passionately love—there lies great human happiness".

Both the study of history and literary theory, as well as his own literary efforts, bear witness to G.'s serious work.

> "Every person," writes Nikolai G., "to the best of their strength, must bring benefit to the Motherland wherever they can. I would like to (and I will make every effort to) graduate from school with good knowledge, as an educated person will bring more benefit. I am no longer satisfied with what I read in the textbook or hear in class; I try to get additional materials".

Student G. indeed spends all his free time from school at the Lenin Library, writes down a great deal, and generally writes—though so far, only in his diary.

Characteristically, this awareness of the importance of social purpose in an individual's personal life also helps later on to make sense of life in general in a new way. An excerpt from an essay by F., already in the 10th grade, is very typical in this regard:

> “If a person has an important social goal in life and strives toward it, this striving toward something great will not let them fall as Dmitry Ionych Startsev fell” (Chekhov — *Ionych*).

The awareness of this seems to me a moment of serious educational significance.

The great precepts of our native heritage, falling upon prepared soil, make a profound impression on students.

In the first quarter of 10th grade, in connection with reviewing the 8th-grade literature history course, a home essay topic was given: "The Theme of the Motherland in Ancient Russian Literature," with instructions to primarily use *The Primary Chronicle*, *The Tale of Igor's Campaign*, and *The Invasion of Batu on Ryazan*. What feelings this re-reading and reflection on the monuments of the distant past evoked is evidenced, for example, by the following excerpt from the essay of student Boris Zh.:

> "With great love, the author writes about the people of Ryazan, especially about Evpaty Kolovrat, who demonstrated such great patriotism. With respect he bows his head before their heroism. He admires their deeds, showing what true heroes and sons of the Motherland should be. 'This is how your grandfathers and great-grandfathers lived,' he seems to say. 'So do not disgrace the Russian land in the future. When you must stand chest to chest against the enemy, remember the people of Ryazan'".

The young man's thought continues to work independently in the same direction.

When, as a result of academic work and a series of specifically educational measures—as well as being prepared by the very life of our country—it becomes completely clear in the students' consciousness that great deeds are accomplished only in the name of great goals, and the greatest goal of our present and future is building a communist society, the question then arises of how to practically approach the realization of these set tasks. This question had already been touched upon repeatedly and, as shown above, resolved individually in one way or another; but now we have come right up to understanding the heroism of the everyday struggle for the future of the people as a whole and its individual representatives. It was necessary to move to a new stage in organizing self-education, to increasing its new stimuli.

In the second quarter of 9th grade, when the study of Goncharov's novel *Oblomov* was completed, a home essay topic was assigned: "The Theme of Labor in Creative Literature of the 18th and First Half of the 19th Century" (including *Oblomov* which fell somewhat outside the set chronological framework). The essay topic was complex and, like the previous one, raised many questions and different opinions; therefore, outline plans took shape in various ways. Here is the most typical among them:

1. Russian creative literature of the 18th and 19th centuries as an exponent of progressive ideas.

2. The theme of labor in the works of writers of the 18th and first half of the 19th century.

    a) Labor as the basis of the state's prosperity (Lomonosov, Krylov, Pushkin).

    b) The ennobling influence of labor on man (Fonvizin, Karamzin, Goncharov).

c) Labor—the primary condition for human greatness (Derzhavin, Pushkin).

d) The corrupting influence of idleness (Fonvizin, Karamzin, Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol, Goncharov).

3. Creative, socially useful labor as the meaning and joy of human life.

This topic primarily had literary significance: it forced students to review and shed new light on a number of literary phenomena; however, its role in boosting and strengthening the incentives for self-education was also very great. A number of lyrical digressions in the essays bear witness to how deeply this work gripped and moved many.

Student Sh. writes:

> "To tell the truth, I didn't attach much importance to it (labor) before this essay, but now I understand what power this mighty word holds within itself. After this, I am not surprised that our great writers attached such huge importance to labor and illuminated its significance in their best works".

Sh. drew an unexpected, but characteristic in its straightforwardness, conclusion for his life. Possessing good abilities, he studied somewhat lazily and now severely condemned himself for it. Although remaining behind for a second year was not a threat to him and he was always happy in class, he decided to start working at a factory as a laborer and carried out his decision two weeks later.

In the essay of student M., we find these impassioned lines:

> “It started with an inability to put on stockings, and ended with an inability to live. Did people who clearly understood where an idle life leads really lack the willpower to tear themselves away from

> this life, escape it, and go work for themselves and their Motherland? In Oblomov's place, I would have fought, held on, thrashed about, bitten, but gotten out of this swamp, no matter what effort it cost me... Let us think a little about human greatness and the paths by which a person arrives at it. For example, let us take the image of Peter I in Pushkin's work:

Now an academician, now a hero, Now a seafarer,
now a carpenter, He with an all-embracing soul
Was an eternal worker on the throne.

> "Labor is the goal, meaning, and joy of life... I feel this. And if you feel it, it means you understand it, and if you understand it, it means you put it into practice".

The passionate tone of this and a number of other essays showed me that a new incentive had been added for the further struggle for self-education, and that this work had a mobilizing significance.

In what followed, the appeal of a courageous human nature—someone who firmly fulfills their duty to the Motherland—is concretized and expanded, bringing it closer to the present day through the interpretation of images by Chernyshevsky, Nekrasov, Gorky, Mayakovsky, Sholokhov, Fadeyev, and others.

To reinforce in practical life what has been accepted as an ideal, moments of self-testing are very important. One form of such self-testing is a situation of free choice. I will give an example.

A very nervous and not always restrained student, M., behaved somewhat provocatively toward the head of the supply

warehouse[305]. The head punished him by refusing to issue new uniforms, while the old ones were severely worn. M. told me about his distress. I noted to him that he must understand the impropriety of his behavior, and an honest person, realizing their mistake, corrects it—in this case, with an apology.

After a brief pause, I added that he really did need the uniforms, and that I, regardless of whether he apologized or not would ask the director of the school to issue new ones on behalf of the person he had offended. The next day, M. came up to me and said that he had apologized to the head of the supply warehouse because he realized he was wrong; as for the uniforms, he asked me not to bother about them, as he felt uncomfortable making so much noise over it.

I will give a second example testifying to the educational value of a situation of free choice.

A very diligent but weak student, V., was called up for an oral answer. He was asked to answer first on one section of the latest assignment, and then on material covered previously. The topic of both answers was specified right away with complete precision. V. only managed to answer the first question when the bell rang for recess. The lesson was a double period, and as I left the classroom, I said: "You will answer the second question after recess". In the next period, V. came up to the desk and answered brilliantly.

"For your answer, you should be given a five, provided, of course, that you did not read the material during recess. One cannot learn everything you talked about in a single recess, but one can refresh their knowledge. Depending on whether you read during recess or not, I will give you your mark. Tell me how it was; I trust you completely".

---

[305] The fact described took place in a specialized school.

The boy kept silent, turning now red, now pale, and finally said: “I read during recess. I wanted to answer better”.

“Well, I cannot give you a five, but my respect for you has risen significantly”.

From that day on, it became a class tradition to tell the truth, no matter what the consequences might be.

In general, the key moments of the work I tried to highlight here were connected to daily life, with its cares, joys, disappointments, external and internal obstacles requiring overcoming, and big and small victories and defeats. Thus, step by step, principles turned into norms of behavior. The good that had once entered the life of the class was no longer supposed to leave it, and depending on various circumstances, we returned to paths already traveled.

The gradual accumulation of moral values (in the Soviet understanding of this concept) is the foundation of the honor of the class and the school; a feeling which, in turn, plays a positive educational role. It was observed by me that for its further development, measures demonstrating the achievements of the class and school to the school and out-of-school community were of great importance. Such events included: publishing a magazine, participating in a mathematics olympiad, organizing literary evenings, and participating in all kinds of athletic competitions. Performances by the literary circle (even in pre-war times) before voters during an election campaign held particularly great significance.

The principles and skills of self-education laid down in school do not lose their effective force even after graduation. Proof of this comes from statements during meetings and letters from

former students. It seems to me that we should listen attentively to these voices from afar in every possible way.

III

Summing up everything presented above, I will allow myself to briefly formulate those conclusions that seem to me to follow from it.

1. Along with using general tenets of psychology as a science in pedagogical work, the educator must also take individual study of students as a basis. This study should not be limited only to the area of academic performance and the degree of observance of external discipline: it should, if possible, encompass the inner world of the student as a whole.

2. On the basis of this study in the upper grades of secondary school, it is necessary to develop and strengthen internal stimuli for self-education.

3. In terms of organizing self-education in my pedagogical practice, the primary, defining factors for further work were the following points:

> a) Teaching students to understand the heroic essence of our life and redirecting youth's characteristic thirst for the heroic into everyday activity, heroizing socially useful labor.
>
> b) Developing an interest in the external and internal life of other people, nurturing thoughtful powers of observation, and consistent, well-founded thought.

3. Instilling and strengthening the skills of planned, systematic work, which in turn contributes to the development of will.

4. Teaching students to make sense of personal life and activity through its social purpose.

In this aspect of student self-mobilization, the techniques of teaching-educational and strictly educational work described above yielded positive results in the majority of cases. The main result among these was the rudiments of an active worldview of a Soviet person, who sets as their task the translation of revolutionary theory into practical constructive activity.

IV. The organization of self-education at school is one of the most reliable starting points for personality growth and the purposeful, systematic activity of a Soviet patriot, for the foundations of self-education laid down in school do not lose their effective force even after graduation.

I allow myself to think that the issue of organizing self-education in school deserves serious attention from our teachers, and the positive results they obtain will not pass without a trace for the cause dear to us all—the education of Soviet youth.

"Soviet Pedagogy", 1947, No. 12.

O. I. RUTA

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences

CHARACTERISTICS OF ETHICAL CONVERSATIONS IN PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Soviet school must have a developed program of moral education that organizes and directs the integral process of children's moral development—the formation of moral consciousness, emotions, will, moral habits, and skills. The school must have a program that eliminates elements of spontaneity in the educational process and establishes the significance and place of each form of our school's educational work.

Creating such a program is a difficult and complex task requiring intense work and the combined efforts of many researchers. Over a number of years, I engaged in developing a program of ethical conversations in primary school. I dedicated my small experimental study to solving this issue. Already in the process of experimental work, stepping outside the bounds of the ethical conversation itself and testing the effectiveness of the moral rules formulated as a result of the conversations, I established that the program of ethical conversations is an integral part of the program of moral education as a whole.

My work on the program went through two stages: drafting the program in the process of preparing for the experiment, and testing it in practice at school in work with children both during lessons (reading, speech development) and especially in extracurricular activities.

In drafting the program for ethical conversations, I proceeded from the following main fundamental premises:

1. The content of the program must consist of the principles and norms of communist morality;

2. The program must guide educators toward the purposeful, systematic development of a system of moral views, convictions, rules, and behavioral habits in students; the moral education program must initiate the introduction of those moral qualities that define the moral character of a Soviet person right from the first stage of education;

3. The program must strictly take into account the age characteristics of children.

In primary school, one should first and foremost develop moral qualities whose formation can rely on the general developmental level of the children and does not exceed the real capabilities and cognitive capacities of the children.

In accordance with the listed points, I attempted to outline a program of ethical conversations intended to help students grasp the portion of moral concepts and convictions accessible to a younger student that determine human behavior.

Through thorough acquaintance with the statements of the classics of Marxism-Leninism on the question of the moral character of a Soviet person, and by studying the moral traits of leading Soviet people and, most importantly, by studying the biographies of the leaders of our party, the vivid bearers of the new, communist morality, I initially outlined a schematic program for moral education as a whole.

Here is this scheme:

I. Soviet Patriotism. Service to the Motherland

1. Love for the Motherland—for native nature, native language, domestic science and art, and for the best people of the socialist country. Readiness to defend the great socialist

Motherland, sparing neither strength nor life itself. Pride in the best social system in the world, established on Soviet soil.

2. Hatred for the enemies of the Motherland. Vigilance.

3. Striving to serve one's Motherland. Faith in its prosperity and in building a communist society. Optimism. Purposefulness.

4. Subordination of personal interests to the interests of the Motherland.

II. Communist Attitude Toward Labor

1. Respect for labor as the primary driver of social development and as a decisive factor in building a communist society.

2. Contempt for parasites, idlers, and self-seekers who hinder the building of communism.

3. Understanding the necessity of participating in social labor as the fulfillment of duty to the Motherland.

4. Selflessness in labor. Labor enthusiasm. Labor heroism.

5. Struggle for high quality in labor.

6. Persistence in achieving goals. Will in overcoming difficulties.

7. Responsibility for assigned work. Discipline in labor.

8. Organization in labor.

9. Ability to work together in a collective, with mutual assistance in labor.

10. Care for public property as the result of the selfless labor of Soviet people.

III. Communist Attitude Toward People

1. Respect for people—the builders of a new, socialist life.

2. Care for Soviet people. Sensitivity, responsiveness, attentiveness. The attitude of Lenin and Stalin toward people as a model of communist care for them. Rendering assistance. Gratitude.

3. Comradely criticism and self-criticism as a means of mutual aid and the strengthening of new, socialist relationships among people.

4. Politeness, sincerity, and directness in interactions among Soviet people.

IV. Attitude Toward Oneself as a Member of the Great Collective of Soviet People

1. Faith in one's own abilities.

2. High standards for oneself, critical analysis of one's actions.

3. Striving to master science and to develop communist views, convictions, and behavioral principles.

4. Modesty.

5. Restraint. Self-control.

6. Concern for one's good name, the name of a Soviet citizen.

7. Neatness.

In accordance with the outlined scheme, a program of ethical conversations for primary school was compiled by me, reflecting a system of moral concepts that can be developed in younger schoolchildren. The goal of ethical conversations is the formation of moral concepts in the child and the instillation of moral views and convictions. This can be achieved only on the basis of a conscious attitude of students toward mastering moral norms and rules.

Since the knowledge of a primary school student regarding the laws of social development and the nature of human behavior

in a socialistic society is very limited, the scope of issues raised by the primary school program is significantly narrowed.

Naturally, the program of ethical conversations for primary school took on a more elementary form. It was not only significantly reduced in volume, but also formulated differently. The system of arranging the topics was also changed in it.

The program developed by me for primary school took the following form:

1. Love for one's native land, region, and the great Motherland.

2. Attitude toward parents.

3. Attitude toward the teacher.

4. Attitude toward comrades. Friendship.

5. Attitude toward the little, the weak, the sick, and the elderly.

6. Honesty.

7. Truthfulness.

8. Fidelity to one's word.

9. Industriousness and good discipline.

10. Care for public property.

11. Responsibility for assigned work.

12. Politeness.

The starting premises for drafting the program set forth above already explain the program itself. From my point of view, it encompasses those issues that are accessible to children of primary school age, connected to the child's realm of perception and experience, and are the most important for this age.

Speaking of "importance," I have two moments in mind: first, I categorize as "important" those moral rules that stem from the child's daily behavior and reflect both positive aspects of children's behavior and misdeeds already characteristic of this age. Second, I take into account the quantity and scope of moral rules that can be assimilated by primary school children who have just begun learning and grasp abstract truths with difficulty. The program I propose is an attempt to establish a minimum of moral concepts, norms, and rules.

The program begins with topics that combine moral qualities into groups. It is precisely with these topics, reflecting the real connections of children with the people around them (attitude toward one's native land, region, great Motherland, attitude toward parents, teacher, comrades, etc.), that I planned to begin conversations with children to help them make sense for the first time of what manifests in their behavior.

The general primary school program developed prior to the experiment was concretized by grade levels. Maintaining the principle of program structure across all grades, I excluded several topics from the Grade 1 and Grade 2 programs that seemed too complex for children to grasp.

In deciding the accessibility of particular moral concepts for children who had just arrived at school, I tried to rely on the practical experience of teachers and therefore carefully reviewed each point of the program with the city's best teachers.

Experimental work on the compiled program was carried out across twelve classes, covering three parallel classes per grade in primary school. In eight of them, conducting conversations with children was entrusted to the teachers; in the remaining four classes (from Grades I to IV), it was conducted by me as the director of the experiment.

****

In the process of implementing the program, certain deviations occurred due to various reasons: clarifying and supplementing its content as experimental material accumulated, taking into account the specific makeup of a given class, etc.

Be that as it may, all topics of the program found reflection in the experiment and were tested with varying degrees of thoroughness in work with children.

The results of the experiment confirmed the correctness of the program's intended structure, the relevance of the proposed topics, and their accessibility for primary school children.

A characteristic feature of the ethical conversation program structure developed before starting work in school was its division into two parts: the first part—general, dedicated to considering the child's relationship with surroundings, and the second part—clarifying moral concepts connected with individual sides, qualities, and traits of moral behavior.

The correctness of such an approach to structuring the program was justified in the course of work.

Designing the first part of the program proved to be grounded both psychologically, from the standpoint of moral education goals, and methodologically.

Children perceive the surrounding world visually; their thinking is still largely concrete. Therefore, a child's relationships with people are personified. For a child, there is no abstract "person"—there exists a father, mother, teacher, comrade, grandmother, younger brother, etc.

Since issues of fostering children's love for the Motherland starting from the lower grades of school have been repeatedly covered in the journal *Soviet Pedagogy*, I will focus on

conducting ethical conversations on relationships with parents, older comrades, etc.

When conducting a conversation with Grade 1 students at School No. 5 regarding their attitude toward the teacher, I posed a rhymed riddle listing traits characteristic of a teacher.

To my question, "Who guessed the riddle?", Yura P., without hesitation, replied: "That's a riddle about Vera Pavlovna" (the name of the Grade 1 teacher), and Lida S. added: "That's about Vera Pavlovna, she teaches us".

Moral rules carry concrete, sensory content for younger children. A child's behavior built on these rules extends only to the people they know. From this perspective, one cannot talk to children about their attitude toward "humanity in general," but can talk about their attitude toward mom, dad, etc.

Shortly after I finished the cycle of conversations on the first part of the program with the children, the mother of Grade 1 student Igor M. came to School No. 5. From her story, it turned out that under the influence of the conversations, Igor's behavior at home dramatically improved: he became more attentive to his parents and grandmother. However, Igor continued to quarrel with his older sister. When his mother remarked to Igor that his sister needed to be treated with respect, just like other elders, he answered: "Aunt Olga Ivanovna didn't say that to us".

And indeed, neither the content of the conversations nor the content of the moral rules I gave in that class touched upon the question of attitude toward older brothers and sisters. From this fact and similar ones, I concluded that the ethical conversation program needed to be supplemented with the topic "Attitude toward brothers and sisters".

The remarkable capacity of a child to treat everything connected with the words or actions of elders they respect or a beloved comrade with special reverence was clearly revealed during our experiment.

Volodya L., a Grade 3 student, is convinced that his mother is an ideal person. In classroom discussions and conversations with comrades, he always refers to his mother's words and actions. "My mom would never do that for anything," he stated during a discussion analyzing an anti-social deed by a student (incidentally, Volodya's mother is a cultured woman, a good worker, and an active community figure).

The educator's task should consist of using the younger student's inclination toward imitation to clearly and vividly present objects of imitation before them—objects upon which the child's special love and respect should focus. These objects are the best, famed people of our country, parents, good comrades, and teachers.

Building on imitation—toward which the child's attention is consistently and purposefully directed—the educator is obliged to lead the child toward a conscious attitude regarding human actions. From elementary rules like: "Mom takes care of you, feels sorry for you, so you should try not to upset your mom in any way," the educator must gradually move to clarifying all the connections expressing these relationships with the mother, establishing a conscious, loving relationship toward her.

The task of my experimental work was not only the formation of moral concepts and the conscious acceptance of moral rules by children, but also instilling in them the ability to act correctly and actively fight for communist moral views. The ability to critically evaluate the behavior of surrounding people and defend one's convictions presupposes a deepening and refinement of moral concepts. For a child not yet versed in

theoretical issues of morality and possessing weakly developed abstract thinking, the content of any moral concept is defined by the words "bad" and "good". "This boy is bad," or conversely, "this boy is good". Such a definition usually comes from the lips of a younger student. "And Lenya V. is bad," Grade 1 children say about their comrade, "he doesn't do his lessons". This example vividly illustrates the child's inherent tendency toward an astonishing ease of generalization based on a single trait. To force a child to abandon such general, complex, undifferentiated definitions means to concretize and enrich the concepts hidden behind these definitions—to break down the fused concept of "bad" into the concepts of "impolite," "disobedient," "lazy," etc.

Speaking about attitude toward parents, the educator usually arrives at this kind of generalization: "Mom takes care of you, it's bad to upset her".

Analyzing the attitude toward the teacher, the educator also generalizes: "The teacher teaches you, does a lot of good for you, it's bad to deceive her".

In the exact same way, when conversing with children about relationships with comrades, the teacher boundly concludes: "You study, work, and play with your comrade. If you deceive him, he won't trust you and won't want to play with you or help you anymore. Deceiving a comrade is bad".

Having accumulated rules of this kind related to children's relationships with people close to them through conversations on the first section of the program, and moving on to the second section, the educator generalizes these specific rules into abstract concepts like: "Soviet kids must be truthful".

Thus, step by step, the moral qualities that schoolchildren must possess take shape before them.

In the course of the experiment, during the conversations, both the teachers and I systematically reviewed the main points and conclusions of the previous conversation. This was done both to reinforce previously formed moral rules, to clarify and deepen them, and finally, to check how the moral rules were received and whether they reached the consciousness of the students. In the process of such review, it was revealed that children, having "mastered" a rule itself (the nature of this mastery will discuss this below), do not grasp all the motives that justify the rule and are unable to comprehend all its aspects and features.

Let me offer a few illustrations.

When Grade 1 children reproduced the rule from a previous conversation on the topic of attitude toward the teacher, they spoke correctly: “The teacher reads books to us and teaches us, so we need to treat her well and kindly”. However, they were unable to fully explain either the rule itself or its motivation, nor did they exhaust all the questions raised in the conversation (for example, that the teacher takes care to ensure that every student studies well and behaves well, that she is attentive to children and helps them in everything, etc.). We observe a similar phenomenon, though to a lesser extent, in older grades as well.

Here is how Grade 2 children reacted to the question: “Why did we decide that good kids should be polite?”

> “So as not to upset elders,” “So as not to offend elders.”

It required a follow-up question to obtain an almost fully developed answer: “One must be polite to adults, teachers, comrades, and little ones. When people are impolite, it feels offensive to others.”

As numerous observations made during the experiment show, a child assimilates only part of the motives, and this assimilation proceeds extremely subjectively; some children pay attention to certain aspects, others to different ones.

Taking into account these characteristics of the child's psyche, one must not strive for exhaustive completeness in the child's grasp of a moral rule. On the contrary, one should limit the number of aspects, features, and motives during the initial conversation, gradually expanding them in subsequent conversations.

On the other hand, the indispensable goal of every educator must be to achieve the maximum completeness of the moral concepts formed in children. Only when all aspects of a particular trait characterizing behavior are revealed to a primary school student—all possible concrete norms of behavioral manifestations—does the moral rule function as an effective rule. In other cases, it is effective only partially.

The following example is characteristic. Grade 1 children at School No. 5, as a result of a conversation about attitude toward public property conducted under the guidance of an educator, drew their own conclusion that "public property must not be spoiled; it must be taken care of." This generalization was built on the basis of preceding conclusions about why books must not be ruined, desks must not be dirtied or written on, and school walls must not be scratched; many public items were enumerated, and an attitude toward them was formed. Observations of the children showed a sharp improvement in their handling of public property. Every stain on a school book evoked indignation from all students in the class and became a subject of heated discussion. Valya S. and Slava T., as always, were at the forefront of the class and acted as passionate denouncers in such cases. Yet those same boys—Valya and Slava—without hesitation carved inscriptions on a public

fence. This fact is explained very simply: during the conversation, they spoke about attitudes toward books, desks, school buildings, and planted trees, but said nothing about attitudes toward fences. The children perceived the rule as applying only to specific objects, which caused flaws in their behavior.

This leads to the following conclusion: the broader and greater the number of objects, aspects, features, and connections covered with the children, the more effective the moral rule will be. The more comprehensive, complete, and at the same time more concrete the connections with people close to them and around them are clarified with children, the richer will be the reserve of representations necessary for forming leading moral qualities and moral traits that determine a child's behavior.

The first section of the program included the following topics:

1. Attitude toward parents.
2. Attitude toward the teacher.
3. Attitude toward comrades.
4. Attitude toward the little, the sick, and the weak.
5. Attitude toward girls.

In primary school age, the closest people to children are their parents. Feeling this and running to their parents with all their joys and sorrows, children, of course, do not fully realize the threads and motives that bind them to these closest people.

Internal connections are often replaced in the child’s consciousness by external, secondary connections that are objectively insignificant, yet significant to the child.

The following example is interesting, as it clearly shows that a child often fails to grasp the essence of relationships with parents itself.

In a conversation with Grade 1 children at School No. 5, I tried to show them how deeply and strongly a mother loves her child. Without resorting to abstract expressions, I tried using examples and showing concrete situations from family life to demonstrate to the children the power of maternal love (a story offered to the children's attention at the beginning of the conversation was dedicated to this). It seemed to me that love for a child can be most clearly revealed in cases when a child is sick, when a mother trembles for their life and shows special affection and special attention toward them. Striving to elicit how children imagine a mother's behavior in such cases, I asked a corresponding question and received an answer from Toli D.: "When a son gets sick, mom feeds him sweet things," and an addition from Viti E.: "Mom gives medicine."

It would be wrong to assert that a child does not value parental love and, in satisfying personal needs, approaches the behavior of people close to them only with this measure.

On the contrary, children are capable of feeling warm affection for their parents, harboring strong love for them, and being aware of the sacrifices parents often make for the sake of their children.

> "Mom gives all the best to the child," says Grade 2 student Yura M.

Moreover, children themselves are capable of making sacrifices, striving to show attention to their parents and their great love for them.

> "When they give gifts at school, I hurry home to share with mom and dad," says Borya S. "When

> mom is sick, I don't play or walk at all, even though I want to, but just sit near her and give her whatever she asks for," tells Lida P.

Work with children on the topic "Attitude toward parents" must establish the threads that bind a child to father and mother, and must reveal the motives of these relationships in their consciousness.

The multifaceted feelings that a child harbors for parents must be brought into a system and consolidated in consciousness; the impulsiveness characteristic of this age must be replaced by a stable attitude.

The possibility of achieving this goal is confirmed by experimental data. Here are the changes in relationships that parents observed as a result of conversations with their children.

Slava K.'s mother relates:

> "My son changed sharply for the better. When I come home from work, he definitely asks if I am tired, stopped persistently demanding the fulfillment of his desires, observes my mood, obeys in everything, admits to pranks and failures in school. Without being reminded, he brings firewood, washes his dishes, and cleans the cat's saucer."

Valya B.'s mother notes that her son used to be taciturn, stubborn, and rude...

> "...and now I notice big changes in his character. He has become more open and gentle, began sharing school news. I was going through a difficult personal drama. Valya during this time looked for anything to comfort me, and when he

> noticed that good grades made me happy, he started studying significantly better. On his own initiative, he helps with housework."

The program topic "Attitude toward parents" is close to children (parents are the closest people) and accessible for conscious mastery—it helps reveal before children the norms of moral attitude toward Soviet people in general.

The second program topic, "Attitude toward the teacher," holds a unique significance.

A teacher working with primary school students is, as a rule, the closest person to them after their parents.

As conversations show, children quite clearly imagine the role and importance of the teacher even in their first months at school.

> "Dad won't teach how to solve math problems, he only helps. But the teacher teaches, and teaches how to read," says Grade 1 student Yura P. "The teacher teaches children for a good cause," says Yura F. (Grade 1); "The teacher wants children to be good" (Vera V.—Grade 1); "The teacher wants children to love their Motherland and help it" (Vova L.—Grade 3).

Children feel great affection for their teacher, strive to show attention to her, and render small services. But at the same time, these positive manifestations in children's behavior peacefully coexist with talking that interferes with the teacher conducting the lesson, and with external manifestations of inattentiveness or impoliteness. Children do not imagine clearly enough in what forms gratitude to the teacher can and should be expressed.

Conversations dedicated to “Attitude toward the teacher” must establish concrete forms of mutual relationships between students and the teacher and motivate them.

Primary school children are already prepared for this. The necessary factors are present: the teacher’s authority, stemming from children feeling her superiority; the experience of relationships with the teacher-educator, which is especially significant in children who attended kindergarten; and constant communication with the teacher, which allows consolidating learned moral rules through action.

Here is how Grade 3 student O. T. Gostyeva depicts these relationships of girls with their teacher:

> “Everyone unquestioningly fulfills the teacher's instructions, and this obedience is already an expression of duty.” “Olga Trofimovna takes such care of us, gives us all her time, so we must listen to her,” reasons one of the girls.

Students express general indignation over Nina P. having prepared her lesson poorly. Valya T. states to her: “Not only are you hurting yourself, you'll upset Olga Trofimovna again.”

The girls try by all means to show care for their teacher and render her assistance: they ensure that her desk is covered with clean paper, that everything is prepared for the lesson, and help carry books, notebooks, and teaching aids. Valya L. once came home and began asking her mother for headache powders, stating: “Olga Trofimovna seems to have a headache again; she might get sick.”

In the sphere of a child's relationships with people—besides family members and the teacher—school comrades are included, with whom the child studies, engages in solving

public questions (especially after joining the Young Pioneer organization), and finally, relaxes and plays together.

Here, in this primary work of the student taking the form of learning, relationships with work comrades are formed for the first time; here, on the basis of learning—work—and shared interests, the first firm childhood friendship emerges.

Forms of connections between comrades are clarified, and duties toward them are defined. Grade 1 children at School No. 5 unite into a friendly, organized child collective. Mutual aid among children stands out as its most vivid feature. Children share pencils, paper, and toys; not a single instance of stinginess was noted. On the contrary, they often give away their last item. Thus, Slava T. (one of the most underprivileged boys) gave Lida A. his inkwell in place of one lost in the second shift, saying: “So mom doesn't scold Lida and doesn't think people steal in our class.” Without reminders from the teacher, children share textbooks when doing homework; when preparing for classroom copying, they distribute missing books across desks themselves. Students share not only school supplies, but also snacks. Children's care for one another is also shown in helping each other put on coats and tie scarves; checking whether someone forgot anything in their desk; helping each other cross through mud; and carrying across puddles those who have bad footwear. They show attentiveness to sick comrades, visit them, and strive to cheer them up. Vitya E.’s mother came to the school specifically to thank the children for not forgetting her sick son. If any child fails to come to school, others immediately run to visit.

The question of attitude toward the little, the weak, and the sick has great educational value. The student encounters younger brothers and sisters—who are often helpless creatures—as well as grandfathers and grandmothers who are frail and sick from

old age. His attention is captured by a “uncle on crutches” barely moving along a slippery sidewalk.

The sick and weak are always in the child's field of vision, as their behavior differs from that of the majority of surrounding people, and the child is extremely observant and nothing unusual escapes their gaze. Furthermore, feelings such as sympathy for people receive significant development as early as preschool age.

In working with primary school students, relying on their observations of people close to them and on their already comparatively developed sense of sympathy, all the prerequisites exist for cultivating an attitude toward the weak, sick, and elderly that rests upon the awareness of the need to show care for them.

This is confirmed by numerous facts of child behavior that was significantly restructured as a result of conversations. For the vast majority of children, as reported by parents, a sharp improvement in their attitude toward little ones was characteristic. Children help care for younger brothers and sisters, protect them, entertain them, and save tasty treats for them. Children who do not have little ones in their family also try to show this care for young children. Slava D., a Grade 1 student, saw on the street that a big boy playing “horse” with a little child abandoned his rider and ran away. The toddler started crying. Then Slava went up to him and offered to be his horse.

Rima S., a Grade 1 student, offered to let her neighbor bring her little daughter over whenever there was no one to leave her with at home. On their own initiative, several Grade 1 boys at School No. 9 brought toys to class and began distributing them to comrades who had little ones in their families.

No less indicative are facts showing a caring, gentle attitude toward older people.

Systematic instances of children helping the sick and weak were recorded by us during the experiment: children help elderly people walk up a hill, walk them home, and carry heavy items.

As our experiment shows, children are prepared to assimilate elementary moral rules associated with attitudes toward the sick and weak. On this basis, they manifest a sensitive, caring attitude toward Soviet people in general.

Introducing the question of "Attitude toward girls" into the experiment's program sparked heated debate among my assistants.

The majority of teachers insisted that primary school students, with proper organization of educational work, feel no difference between the sexes, and therefore this question should not be made a subject of discussion.

It was decided, while not excluding this question from the program, not to discuss it with children in the same way as other topics—not to raise the question sharply, not to attempt to explain the necessity of equal comradely relations between sexes, and not to formulate any moral rules, but to limit oneself merely to drawing upon vivid literary stories (such as an excerpt from Korolenko's *The Blind Musician* published in *Native Speech*) that show children examples of pure, deep friendship between boys and girls. This was implemented in all classes, with the exception of Grade IV at School No. 5, where conversations on relationships between boys and girls were dictated by sharp necessity due to the specific makeup of the class. In the previous school year, Grade IV had been a class in an all-boys school and consisted only of boys; at the start of the new school year, several girls were admitted, and the teacher

changed. Presumably, there had not been sufficient educational work with the students in previous years.

Three general conversations were conducted with the class: two by me and one by the school principal; Korolenko's *Friendship* (from *The Blind Musician*) and Gaidar's *Timur and His Team* were read in class. Finally, conversations were conducted by the teacher herself with the entire class and with individual students.

In the process of the conversations, we encountered two camps in the class holding quite firm convictions on both sides: on one side, that "girls are chatterboxes, gossips, and teasers," and on the other, that "boys are bullies, fighters, and hooligans."

The timeliness and significance of the conducted conversations were confirmed by their results. Fights and sharp verbal clashes ceased in the class, and joint games during recess became a common occurrence. The following interesting observations and facts were also recorded.

One evening, after students of this class performed in amateur arts before voters, a group of boys asked the teacher's permission to walk two girls home who lived on the edge of town, motivating their request thus: "So that outside boys don't pick on them."

We would consider it possible to retain the topic "Attitude toward girls" in the program only conditionally, resolving the question of how to unfold this topic with strict consideration of the characteristics of each senior primary school class.

The second part of the program was fully verified during experimental work and received a more complete and deep justification.

The topics of this section, as our work showed, cover a minimum of moral concepts upon which a student organizes

their behavior, covering them comprehensively when taking into account the level of the child's life connections.

Questions in the second section of the program are few (from six in Grade I to ten in Grade IV) and fully accessible in volume for a primary school student.

In the process of the experiment, another weighty circumstance in favor of the topics outlined in the second section of the program was discovered. It was revealed that the process of forming moral concepts in a primary school child is closely intertwined with the formation of moral skills and habits.

To put it more precisely: in cases where the formation of concepts and the assimilation of their verbal expressions—moral rules—is accompanied by the formation of moral habits, moral concepts-rules become an internal asset of the child and acquire an effective orientation. If one takes into account that instilling moral habits in primary school children is relatively simple, while forming concepts is significantly hindered by the child's limited experience and thinking characteristics, the desirability of such a combination—forming concepts in close connection with forming moral habits—becomes completely obvious.

I view my small study merely as a modest attempt to provide an experimental solution to one of the unaddressed, yet extremely urgent questions in the methodology of moral education.

"Soviet Pedagogy", 1949, No. 5.

Editor **F. F. Korolev**. Technical Editor **P. G. Islentyevea**.

A00753. Submitted for production 16/XI 1949.

Signed for printing 25/I 1950. Circulation 26,700 copies.

Printed sheets 26.5.

Publisher's author sheets 22.46. 38,965 characters per printed sheet.

Format 84*108 /32.

Price 9 rubles. Order No. 1039.

First Exemplary Printing Shop named after A. A. Zhdanov of Glavpoligrafizdat under the Council of Ministers of the USSR. Moscow, Valovaya St., 28.

The collection was prepared for publication by **N. I. BOLDYREV**.