ANTON SEMYONOVITCH MAKARENKO

An Analysis of His Educational Ideas in the Context of Soviet Society

BY

FREDERIC LILGE

ANTON SEMYONOVITCH

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS IN EDUCATION
EDITORS (BERKELEY): G. T. BUSWELL, H. D. CARTER, FREDERIC LILGE

Volume 18, No. 1, pp. 1–52

Submitted by editors May 21, 1957
Issued September 5, 1958
Price, $1.00

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON, ENGLAND

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

ANTON SEMYONOVITCH MAKARENKO

An Analysis of His Educational Ideas in the Context of Soviet Society

BY

FREDERIC LILGE

I. INTRODUCTION

ANTON SEMYONOVITCH MAKARENKO (1888–1939), who has thus far received little attention in English-speaking countries,[1] occupies an important place in the history of Soviet education. From an obscure post as director of a Ukrainian colony of juvenile delinquents, he rose to national renown both as an educator and as a writer. Not long before his death he was awarded the Order of the Red Banner of Labor for outstanding literary achievement; and the following year a directive of the Party Central Committee (March 29, 1940) commemorated his services to Soviet education and commended his ideas on collective discipline to all Soviet educators.

Makarenko's writings have since inspired a large number of articles, doctoral theses, and books in the Soviet Union. Nearly all the textbooks now used in Russian teachers' colleges contain references to and appreciations of his work, and there is hardly a Soviet teacher today who is unfamiliar with it. An institute devoted to research on Makarenko has been established at the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, and is currently editing a collection of his writings. Some of his work forms part of the Soviet cultural export to those countries of eastern and central Europe whose educational systems have become replicas of the Soviet system. These facts are sufficient to show the official standing of Makarenko's work and to suggest its importance in contemporary Soviet educational theory.

The significance of Makarenko, which it is the purpose of this study to explore and to interpret, was at least threefold. He was first of all remarkable for his work with the homeless juvenile delinquents known

This study was supported by a grant from the Research Fund of the Department of Education, University of California, Berkeley. To Reinhard Bendix I owe thanks for several perceptive criticisms.

[1] For a simple account of Makarenko's work, see W. L. Goodman, *A. S. Makarenko, Russian Teacher* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949). This is not a systematic study, is poorly documented, and relies heavily on quotations taken, for the most part, from *The Road to Life*. See also Robert S. Cohen, "On the Marxist Philosophy of Education," *Modern Philosophies and Education*, 54th Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), pp. 207–212.

as *besprizornye*, the lost generation of the 1920's who by their very numbers constituted a major social problem in the Soviet Union. Second, he was the only figure from the early period of revolutionary idealism and educational experimentation who weathered the political storms and the radical changes in educational policy of the 1930's. Third, and most important for this discussion, he was an educational theorist who went beyond ideological orthodoxies to discover in human nature itself the ethical and psychological justifications of socialist society.

Although due emphasis will be given to the originality and the force of Makarenko's educational ideas as they arose from his personal experience, their very nature requires that the interpreter relate them to the larger setting of Soviet political and social life. To discover in what respects his educational ethics served to prepare young people for the demands and tensions of Soviet life, and in what respects it merely helped to perpetuate an ideology even then attenuated and now becoming increasingly remote from actual Soviet behavior, has been perhaps the most interesting phase of this study.

The discussion that follows is based on all the major works and relevant articles by Makarenko. Translations have been used wherever possible. Only two of his works are available in English; several have been translated into German; but a number of papers on educational theory had to be consulted in Russian.

Since this study proceeds directly to an analysis of Makarenko's philosophy, a brief exposition of its main concepts may prove helpful. Of central importance is the concept of education *in and for the collective*. Although the collective is a familiar term in Soviet ideology, it had special significance for Makarenko because of his experience as a teacher of juvenile delinquents. Only by instilling in them the rudiments of a collective regimen was he able to reclaim them as human beings and to rehabilitate them as contributing members of Soviet society. The first requirement of Communist morality, as he conceived it, was to make every individual a participant in the youth collective so that his feelings, his aspirations, and his conduct would become representative of it. Such socialization does not make the individual a faceless member of a crowd and destroy him as a person. A collective is wholly unlike a crowd; in its ideal form it is an organization of mutual responsibility, self-governing and self-determining, within which the individual first learns the meaning of moral principles and in their observance finds the security he needs to mature. In Makarenko's view the collective provided the individual with nothing less than a character and a role to play in life.

This implies a second important concept: education in the collective is *planned moral growth*. It is achieved by making the individual member increasingly aware of the moral claims of the community in such a way that he feels his capacities enlarged and his own life raised to a higher power. In the Communist view, a good teacher expresses his respect for the personality of the student by convincing him that difficult things are expected of him. There is no limit to the progressive accomplishment of such tasks and therefore no limit to moral growth. To enable young people to meet these expectations, it is necessary first to foster feelings of trust and belonging in them when they are children, and then gradually to teach them how to defer and to sublimate gratification.

Third, the successful guidance of moral growth requires teachers who have learned how to use education as a *practical science*. Makarenko believed that it is possible to instruct even the average teacher in the art of gaining control over and molding the whole personality of his students, although Soviet teachers' colleges, in his opinion, fell far short of this goal. His conception of educational science bears little resemblance to that which prevails in American departments of education, for he did not rely on tests and measurements, but almost entirely on intuitive grasp and keen observation. What he really hoped to establish were techniques of personality engineering: what means to employ to obtain the desired results, how to gauge emotional reactions to certain measures, and how to convert individual energies into socially approved work.

Fourth and last, attention may be called to Makarenko's *sense of the mean*. This is as much an aesthetic as a moral component of his thought, and manifests itself in various ways. Children should be neither the recipients of blind affection nor the objects of harsh oppression, but should learn to feel the firmness of reasonable authority. Discipline is preferable to mere obedience because it is capable of becoming self-discipline conscious of its own utility and meaning. Communal organization not only serves socially productive purposes but also gives form and style to human life. To educate people is to teach them to live in community, and such a life is a balance of learning, productive work, self-government, and group ceremonial.

II. SOME REASONS FOR MAKARENKO'S POLITICAL SUCCESS

Those who are familiar with contemporary Soviet writing on education are likely to feel both surprise and relief on first reading Makarenko. For they find here none of the dull and repetitious writing,

the required vituperations and eulogies, and the many authoritative quotations which often mar the publications of Soviet intellectuals. Instead, they meet an author who impresses them as being a man of integrity, who writes what he believes, and who is for the most part uninhibited by the demands of that "Party vigilance" on the correct interpretation of which the reputation of Soviet intellectuals commonly depends. Makarenko's ideas and convictions pour forth from a wealth of personal experience. He thus succeeds in conveying to the reader a sense of what it meant to be passionately involved in a social revolution and to feel responsible for its outcome. The aim of all his labors, practical and theoretical alike, was to help bring into existence a new, distinctly Communist type of man; and, though this was scarcely an original aim for a Soviet educator, whose function consists in serving a well-defined ideology, Makarenko brought to its service much insight and earnest thought. He served not in a careerist but in a charismatic manner, and his identification with the ethics of communism was so complete as to leave the impression that the educational aims and means he formulated were products of his own mind rather than laboriously derived from a prescribed orthodoxy.

The question at once arises how a strong and independent thinker, who retained the missionary fervor of the early years of Soviet history, could achieve distinction in the Stalin era, when such men became suspect. Makarenko is the only educator whose work survives from the early period of experiments and lively controversies, whereas the reputations of Blonsky, Shul'gin, and many others have wilted under the blaze of more recently proclaimed truths. Briefly, the answer is that Makarenko's ideas and educational practices did not find favor with those whose theories were influential from the time of the Revolution until the early 1930's. Since that was a period of relative tolerance in the Soviet Union, Makarenko was able to continue his practical work, though not without difficulties, and even to publish, though scarcely anyone then read him. Later, when educational philosophy and policy underwent marked changes, Makarenko was fortunate in that they coincided with the trend of his own thought.

When Makarenko was first entrusted by the Ukrainian Commissariat of Public Education with the social rehabilitation of juvenile criminals in 1920, a variety of educational ideas flourished, but no authoritative Soviet theory existed to guide him. The work of Marx, Engels, and Lenin supposedly implied such a theory, just as it was supposed to imply principles of action for all the areas of socialist life. Judging from Makarenko's occasional autobiographical comments, and contrary

to some of his Soviet biographers, it is improbable that he was well acquainted with Marxist thought at that time. In any case, it is doubtful whether Marxism would have been of much help in solving a problem with which no Marxist thinker had had any reason to concern himself. Besides, Marxism was sufficiently broad to lend itself to different interpretations and educational applications. It is true that Marx supplied Soviet education with at least one definite principle, that of polytechnical training—a combination of school instruction and productive work that was designed to break down the division between manual and mental labor. Yet, in the forty years of Soviet educational history, even this principle has had widely fluctuating interpretations. Marxism in education meant what one chose it to mean, and this was especially true in the very early years of Makarenko's work. A measure of inner-party democracy then prevailed among those committed to the Bolshevik cause, and, in the top rank of Bolshevik leadership itself, various factions were proposing different plans for the solution of social and political problems. As late as 1929, men such as Tomsky, Rykov, and Bukharin were debating and criticizing the policies upon which Stalin had embarked.

The situation in education was similar. Different interpretations of Marxism coexisted, there was no rigid Party line, and people were as yet unintimidated by the consequences which deviations from such a line were later to entail. Makarenko was therefore relatively free to seek his own solutions in the difficult task he had been set. Most of the educational theorists and officials disagreed with his solutions, and some of the authorities who came to inspect the Gorky Colony for juveniles were openly hostile and put obstacles in his way. But Makarenko was not easily discouraged. When, after eight years of mounting criticism, he resigned as director of the Gorky Colony, he had already found a welcome elsewhere. The Cheka, or secret police, invited him to head a similar institution under its administration, the Dzershinsky Commune near Kharkov. Under his leadership, which lasted eight years, this institution won a great reputation and was visited by delegations and individuals from many countries.

The fact that it was the secret police who proved hospitable to Makarenko's educational ideas offers some clue to his eventual recognition by the Party leadership, and so does the fact that he saw embodied in its officers the type he had hoped to develop in his colony, against the opposition of the Ukrainian Commissariat and the Provincial Department of Public Education. These educationists were committed to a tenderhearted, child-centered theory of education which Maka-

renko rejected. The police officers, on the contrary, displayed the very qualities which, "with the aid of logic and literature," he had abstractly assembled in his own mind, but which he had nearly lost hope of ever meeting in flesh and blood. The Cheka represented to him a type badly needed in Russia—the practical intellectual who was able to translate his ideas into plans of action. Makarenko admired their pragmatic intelligence and thought it far superior to that of the pre-Revolutionary Russian intellectual of whose excessive theorizing he was deeply intolerant. He further praised the Cheka men for their efficiency, their great capacity for work, and their terseness of speech. Above all he was impressed by the strong internal cohesion of their organization, which, he felt, derived from a consciousness of a high common purpose. In short, these police officers were the first real Bolsheviks he had ever laid eyes on.[2]

The activities and the power of the Soviet secret police were as fearful then as they were later in the great purges, and it is surprising that any educator, whose purpose is the very opposite of repression and destruction, should have been so uncritical of this organization. It is, of course, possible that Makarenko, tucked away first in a small Ukrainian town and then in his colony in the country, had little knowledge of the extent of the police terror in the years 1918 to 1921.

Not all the activities of the secret police were nefarious, however. The Dzershinsky Commune was built and in part furnished by contributions from local Cheka officers, and there were other camps founded by the secret police. These educational and social services of the Cheka date from 1921, when the attention of the Soviet government was first called to the terrible condition of vast numbers of homeless, delinquent children. After hearing a report on the problem, the Party Central Executive Committee appointed an Extraordinary Commission to deal with it. The founder and head of the Cheka, Felix Dzershinsky, who had been moved by the report, became president of the Commission. Lounatcharsky, the first Soviet Commissar of Public Education, had been unable to cope with the problem and expected that decisive measures would now be taken.

> I am infinitely happy to learn that Dzershinsky, with his undaunted energy and his heart of gold, has accepted the direction of this organization. In what way should the Commission exercise its vigilance? A leading role will be played by the Cheka, whose chief will be the president of the Commission, and his deputy will also be an important functionary of the Cheka. The organs of the Cheka, with their military efficiency and well-developed communication system, will be the most active

[2] *The Road to Life* [*Pedagogicheskaya Poema*], trans. by Ivy and Tatiana Litvinov (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1951), III, 384–386.

instruments of the Commission. This is wonderful and most welcome even from the point of view of revolutionary morale. Indeed the work of the Cheka is a grim one, for it is punitive, and all of us are happy to think that the guards of the Revolution, having almost completed their task, should now find time to turn their attention to the children. These men have become imbued with the desire to preserve those who by their very existence are lending real beauty to the Revolution...[3]

Lounatcharsky's expectations were, however, not fulfilled. In the years following the great famine the situation of these children grew still more desperate. But Dzershinsky was long remembered for his noble gesture and his "golden heart." In a solemn testimonial written in 1936, Makarenko praised him as a great humanist, a modest and kindly man who took pity on the children maimed by revolutionary struggle and privations.[4] Maxim Gorky preserved a similarly benevolent image of the chief of the secret police. Gorky, who had witnessed and publicly protested the Cheka terror, had intervened successfully on behalf of a number of Russian intellectuals with both Lenin and Dzershinsky. He remained on friendly terms with the latter, and, on receiving the news of his death in 1926, sent a telegram to a Soviet dignitary which the Soviet press hastened to make public. It described Gorky as crushed by the death of Dzershinsky, a man of "tender heart and a great sense of justice" through whose coöperation Gorky had once been able to do a great deal of good.[5]

In view of Makarenko's eventual political success, the facts thus far described assume a certain significance. His theory was first forged in battling young anarchists and delinquents into recognizing some kind of social conscience, and it took shape under the sponsorship of an organization whose main duties were to guard the state against "antisocial" and criminal behavior. An educational philosophy arrived at under these conditions fulfilled the requirements of a regime that regarded all its citizens as at least potentially delinquent. Makarenko's own rough experience with unruly gangs of young criminals had taught him the necessity for the sternest individual and social discipline. Hence there was between him and the Stalinist dictatorship an understanding and sympathy deeper and more natural than any mere "ideological loyalty" could have established. This is the most important reason that can be given for the recognition Makarenko's educational system eventually received. But he was of service to the regime also in sustaining

[3] *Izvestiya*, no. 41 (Feb. 24, 1921), p. 2.

[4] "Prekrasnyi Pamyatnik," *O Kommunisticheskom Vospitanii* [hereafter abbrev. *OKV*] (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Uchebno-pedagogicheskoe Izdatel'stvo, 1952), pp. 13–16.

[5] Grégoire Alexinsky, *La Vie amère de Maxime Gorki* (Paris: B. Arthaud, 1950), p. 219.

the original fraternal vision of the socialist revolution long after it had become clouded by the realities of Soviet life. However Bolshevik policies may in fact ignore or betray the humanistic elements of the original faith, the Party leadership has always valued reaffirmations of that faith; for it has no other resource for reviving and fortifying the morale of the people.

It should not be concluded from these arguments that the favorable reception of Makarenko's work was predetermined. Under a regime in which sudden shifts of policy have had fatal consequences for individuals and in which punishments and persecution have been arbitrary and indiscriminate, the chances of a man being rewarded according to his deserts are poor. Besides, Makarenko's was not altogether a simple case. Some elements in his work stood opposed to certain features of the educational system as it developed even in his lifetime. There are also facts in his personal life and career which, had he been less fortunate, might have caused his ruin. That he was a Ukrainian and did all his practical work in his native republic could have laid him open to the charge of nationalism, a charge on which many Ukrainian intellectuals were convicted between 1932 and 1934, and again during the great purges in 1937 and 1938.[6] More serious, he was so completely engrossed in directing his two youth colonies and so independent of external authority that the charge of local or "organizational patriotism" could have been leveled against him. Finally, he might have been accused of "leftist deviation," as were many others in whom the earlier missionary spirit survived. We do not know and probably will not know how he happened to elude all these traps. The biographies we have are Soviet or derived from Soviet sources, and it would be idle to expect them to shed any light on this question. Perhaps what saved him was the relative obscurity in which he spent most of his life, and the fact that he was not a Party member or functionary. If he had been, the chances of his being liquidated along with many other Old Bolsheviks in the great purges of 1936–1938 would have been high indeed. In those years he seems to have done what he could to ward off suspicion. He wrote a number of newspaper articles in which he sang the praises of the Stalin Constitution of 1936 and proclaimed that human happiness had for the first time in history become a reality in Soviet society.[7] Even his last serious papers on educational themes

[6] Frederick C. Barghoorn, *Soviet Russian Nationalism* (New York: Oxford, 1956), p. 37.

[7] See, among others, the articles "Unser Banner" and "Glück," *Ausgewählte pädagogische Schriften* [hereafter abbrev. *APS*], trans. by Friedrich Redlich (Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1953), pp. 170–176.

seem to reflect political anxiety in their numerous references to men in the top rank of the Party, who are quoted as authorities—a practice from which he had abstained almost entirely in his main works.

III. THE INFLUENCE OF MAXIM GORKY

Makarenko was born of working-class parents in 1888 in Belopole, a small town of the Ukraine. At the age of twelve he entered a six-year town school, an institution intended for the lower ranks of employees and small tradesmen. His father, who realized that this was a school for people a class above him, admonished the boy to make up in ability what he lacked in social status. This Makarenko did, and consistently received top grades. After attending for three years, he enrolled in a one-year teacher-training course that qualified him for a position in an elementary school.

Between 1905 and 1914, Makarenko taught in a number of elementary schools in the Ukraine, all of them maintained by the State Railway Authority. Many of these were five-year schools, and are reported[8] to have been better financed, staffed, and equipped than some others—for example, those maintained by the Orthodox Church. The Railway Schools offered training in several trades in addition to a general elementary education. In 1914 Makarenko entered the Poltava Teachers' Institute. On graduating in 1917 with a gold medal, he was appointed principal of the higher elementary school of Kriukov, the same one in which he had begun his formal education. He remained there until 1920, when he was asked to organize a colony for homeless vagabond children.

Makarenko grew to intellectual maturity in years of political ferment between the revolutions of 1905 and 1917. He read widely in search of guidance and at last discovered what he wanted in Maxim Gorky. Gorky, who began his literary career in 1892, had published *The Lower Depths* in 1902, and the first part of his autobiography, *My Childhood,* in 1914. Makarenko regarded *The Lower Depths* as the greatest drama in modern world literature, and the autobiography was to play an important part in his educational work. Thereafter Gorky became the spiritual father who helped to form his values and to direct his aspirations.

In 1914, when Makarenko had hoped to follow directly in Gorky's footsteps, he sent a story to him, but, instead of encouragement, received the sobering reply that he lacked the necessary talent to become a writer.

[8] J. N. Medynsky, *Anton Semjonowitsch Makarenko,* trans. by Ruth Fuhrmann and Ernest Stöckl (Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1954), p. 16.

He thereupon abandoned that ambition and concentrated on teaching as the vocation through which to contribute to the regeneration of the Russian people. But the urge to express himself and give aesthetic form to his experiences remained.

When he first began to work with juvenile delinquents there was no educational theory to which he could turn for guidance. In this initial helplessness he took time out to reread all of Gorky. Not that he expected the stories, novels, and plays to suggest educational methods or techniques. He knew that he would have to discover these for himself. But he needed to clarify in his own mind the conception of man by which he was to direct his educational efforts. Confronted as he was by corrupt and debased young people, he had to nerve himself for his task by the faith that even in the meanest of them lay hidden potentialities of moral strength and beauty. Gorky reaffirmed this faith. The test of education, so Makarenko understood him to say, was the ability of educators to create a community in which the potentials for human good could be systematically fostered. It is significant that the first colony Makarenko directed was named after Gorky.

Makarenko remained in touch with his mentor, and more than once Gorky's letters reassured him in periods of crisis and doubt about the rightness of his pedagogical ventures. The interest and admiration of a number of his boys were aroused when, on long winter evenings, Makarenko read aloud to them from Gorky's autobiography. They recognized a fellow sufferer in this story of the hard and bitter childhood of an orphan, and took courage from it. Between 1925 and 1928 they corresponded regularly with the author, who, on his return to Russia from abroad in 1928, visited the colony.

When Makarenko spoke of his plan to write the story of the development of the colony from its critical, obscure beginnings to a model juvenile institution, Gorky's response was encouraging. That same year Makarenko finished his account, entitled *The Road to Life*. However, because of Gorky's earlier criticism, which was still fresh in his mind, Makarenko put the manuscript away for five years, afraid to show it to his friend. While his masterwork-to-be lay buried in a drawer, and he had moved on to the Dzershinsky Commune, Makarenko wrote a description of daily life in this institution which was published in 1932 under the title *The March of the Year Thirty*. It was generally ignored, but Gorky read it and wrote him a letter of praise. Overcoming his fear at last, he published the first part of *The Road to Life* in 1933. In a few years the book became an educational classic, and twenty

years later it had gone through forty-one editions and sold 1,125,000 copies in the Soviet Union alone.[9]

In the relationship between the two men, in which Makarenko was the disciple and receiver, Gorky the master and giver, we observe a number of socially significant attitudes they held in common. Though they worked in different media, both were educators and moralists. At the beginning of his literary career Gorky had written that it was his "intention to awaken the feeling of shame in the hearts of men,"[10] shame at tolerating the conditions which degraded their lives. Both were optimists, and their optimism had about it a desperate quality: the evils of the older Russian life they had known *must* be uprooted and to this task the work of a lifetime was devoted. But both were at least vaguely aware that such a moral revolution would not be easily or quickly accomplished. The older culture patterns might be destroyed and replaced by new ones, but human personality was not thereby changed completely. Makarenko was still to testify to the power of the older patterns in his last years when he wrote that "most dangerous of all were the old longings, the old habits, and the old conceptions of happiness."[11]

Both men were anti-intellectual: their intolerance was directed against a specifically Russian intelligentsia whom they reproached for excessive reasoning and theorizing, for denying the possibility of a true revolution, and above all for being separated from the masses. Neither would concede that the intellectual, in order to fulfill his special role in society, lived necessarily at a certain distance from social movements and struggles. This anti-intellectualism showed itself early in Gorky and made him popular with the Russian Marxists in the pre-Revolutionary period. Contrary to Marx, who in the Communist Manifesto placed the intellectual outside the class struggle to enable him to diagnose and project the total historical process, the Marxists tolerated the intellectual only as a spokesman of the intertests of the proletariat.

This leads to a comment on the final parallelism of their careers: both became apologists and propagandists of Stalinism. Gorky helped establish that mandatory optimism—expressed in the formula "socialist realism"—from the sterility of which Soviet writers have struggled to escape since Stalin's death. Makarenko, dividing history into the periods before and after Stalin, gloried in the new happiness of Soviet

[9] *Bol'shaya Sovietskaya Entsiklopediya* (2d ed., 1954), XXVI, 91.
[10] Alexinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 88.
[11] Medynsky, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

man. Propaganda written by such men was, of course, appreciated by the regime, for it increased Party prestige at home and abroad. Whereas the professional propagandist could only repeat the authorized slogans, these men lent to their propaganda the authority of their art; and, since they had arrived at the socialist ethos freely and from their own experience, they were able to give even their propaganda a tone of individual conviction.

Makarenko venerated Gorky not only as a writer but also as a political revolutionary. In reflections written on the occasion of Gorky's death in 1936, Makarenko said that for him and his charges Maxim Gorky had been "the organizer of a Marxist feeling about the world. Though our understanding for history was awakened by Bolshevik propaganda and the revolutionary events themselves, Gorky taught us to feel that history."[12]

Theirs was a very unorthodox Marxism. Teacher and disciple alike were undoctrinaire though radical and perhaps even romantic revolutionaries. Both Gorky and Makarenko hated the life they had known. Gorky described the greed and bestiality of the peasants, the Philistinism of the petty bourgeosie, the futility and hypocrisy of the intelligentsia, and the fatalism of the Russian character. They also had a moral and aesthetic conception, or at least a dream, of what life could be. But how to pass from dream to reality—the problem on which Marxism expended its energies—was, for Gorky at least, of secondary interest. Their sympathy for the Social Democratic Party, and later the Bolshevik Party, was aroused not by its elaborate economic doctrine, its philosophy of history, or even its social strategy, but by its avowal of a strong moral purpose and its promise of large-scale reforms.

IV. THE GROWTH OF A COLLECTIVE

Homeless children, the *besprizornye,* became a social problem during World War I when several million Russians fled from areas affected or threatened by military action and foreign occupation, and parents and children became separated. The number of such children greatly increased during the civil war (1918–1921) and reached a maximum after the famine of 1921–1922. No figures are available and estimates vary greatly. The Commissar of Public Education, Lounatcharsky, reported two million; the American Commission for Russian Relief, five million; and the *Large Soviet Encyclopedia* (1927 edition) as well as Mme Krupskaya[13] estimated seven million for the year 1922. It is generally agreed that the plight of these children was aggravated by

[12] "Maxim Gorky v Moei Zhizni," *OKV,* p. 24.

[13] N. K. Krupskaya, *Vospitanie Molodeshi v Leninskom Dukhe* (Moscow: Molodaya Gvardiya, 1925), p. 260.

the economic collapse of the country, by unemployment, and by a general social disorganization. But in 1925 Krupskaya, Lenin's widow, who remained active in educational work, conceded that the social conditions of the past were no longer solely to blame: the situation of three-quarters of the homeless children resulted from current conditions.[14]

In spite of Dzershinsky's Extraordinary Commission there was no organized governmental control of juvenile vagrancy and delinquency. Nor was the government able to provide the necessary funds for the housing, care, and education of the children. All the institutions that were hurriedly improvised or established for these purposes, such as homes, orphanages, and work colonies, may never have accommodated more than 300,000, less than 10 per cent of the total number during the worst years.[15] The current propaganda against the institution of the family contributed to the abandonment and neglect of children by their parents. Though Lenin himself discouraged extreme views on this subject, important Party functionaries and educationists denounced the family as a bourgeois institution and demanded the nationalization of all children. Most of these ideas remained propaganda slogans, but the emancipation of women and sexual freedom were in fact advanced by liberal divorce laws and the legalization of abortion.

This emancipatory policy reached its high mark before the inception of the first Five-Year Plan and was sharply reversed in the 'thirties. Both the earlier and the later policies affected educational thinking and practice. The opinions of some prominent Bolshevists in the 'twenties illustrate the contrast between the two decades. Lilina, the wife of Zinoviev, called parental love a pernicious influence on children, and regarded the family as a stronghold of individualism and egoism. Professor Zalkind, though admitting the physical and moral dangers to which the *besprizornye* were exposed, recognized certain positive aspects: they were capable of group action, and they had developed a strong aversion to the bourgeois way of life. Mme Levitina-Maro went even farther and recognized in the homeless children some admirable traits which they had in common with the young Communists: they were thoroughly materialist and free from religious bias; they prized liberty above everything else; and they took a great interest in work and in the rapidly changing contemporary life.[16]

[14] Luigi Volpicelli, *L'Evolution de la Pédagogique soviétique*, trans. from the Italian by Pierre Bovel (Neuchatel, Switzerland: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1954), p. 62.

[15] E. Koutaizoff, "Soviet Education and the New Man," *Soviet Studies*, V:2 (Oct., 1953), 110.

[16] For a more extended review of these opinions, see Vladimir Zenzinov, *Deserted* (London: H. Joseph, 1931). See also A. B. Zalkind, "Besprizornye," *Bol'shaya Sovietskaya Entsiklopediya* (1927), V, 783–790.

By 1927 the number of homeless children had greatly decreased, but in 1928 this trend was reversed as a result of the massive expropriation, imprisonment, and breaking up of kulak families. Thus the *besprizornye* remained a social problem in the Soviet Union well into the middle 'thirties, when the government at last took measures to combat crime among minors. Notable among these was a decree subjecting all children above the age of twelve to the provisions of the criminal code.[17] This was a drastic change from the legislation promulgated immediately after the Revolution of 1917, according to which delinquent minors below the age of seventeen were not judged by ordinary tribunals but by special commissions staffed mainly by educationists and medical men who treated young criminals as victims of misfortune.

The life of these children has often been described in its physical, moral, and psychological aspects. Novels, scientific studies, reports of commissions, and countless newspaper articles have been written on the subject, most of them Soviet. It is, however, significant that the latest edition of the *Large Soviet Encyclopedia* no longer carries an entry on the *besprizornye*. It is safe to assume that this is a chapter in its history which Soviet Russia would prefer to forget.

The *besprizornye*, undernourished and diseased, lived by begging, theft, and prostitution. Occasionally they carried out organized banditry, and committed more serious crimes as well. In winter they rode the trains to the Ukraine and the Crimea. Infested with vermin, and clothed in stinking rags, they slept in cellars, sewers, abandoned houses, freight cars on sidings, and any other shelter they could find. Most of them were accustomed to the use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs. It is probable that the greater number died of famine and epidemics, that others grew up into adult criminals, and only a small minority were rehabilitated. Many who were temporarily accommodated ran away either because of intolerable conditions in the overcrowded asylums, or because the directors were unable to discipline or accustom the children to work or study. Directors who, like Makarenko, succeeded were rare exceptions.

The Gorky Colony did not begin as a well-designed experiment. Neither Makarenko nor the chief of the Provincial Education Department in Poltava knew how to make juvenile delinquents into productive, self-respecting members of society. When Makarenko ventured to say that he might make a muddle of this difficult job, his superior

[17] *Ugolovny Kodeks RSFSR* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Iuridicheskoi Literatury, 1950), Article 12, p. 7.

shouted back at him, "Muddle or no muddle, the work's got to be done. We'll have to judge by results . . . Anyhow, we've all got to learn and you'll learn."[18] After the first winter, during which he read and reread educational theory, Makarenko concluded that books yielded him little and that he would have to rely on "immediate analysis of the situation followed by immediate action."

The colony during the first year resembled more a den of thieves and cutthroats than a place of education, and the boys were openly insolent to the director and the teachers. Makarenko was enraged at their behavior and at his inability to manage them. One day, after receiving an impudent reply from one of the oldest and strongest boys, he lost control of himself and struck the boy hard. The incident proved to be a turning point in the discipline of the colony. Although corporal punishment was against the law and contrary to his own ethic, the boys were impressed by the demonstration of human fury. It seemed to Makarenko, as he reflected upon his action later, that they were impressed not only by his physical courage—the boy was far stronger and bigger than he—but by the very fact that someone *cared.* He had hope, therefore, that a human spark had been kindled in them.

Such methods, which he occasionally had to employ, did not, of course, solve his disciplinary, much less his educational, problem. He was dealing with young people who were inured to filth and vermin, with whom it had become habitual to lie, steal, gamble, and knife one another. Some of them had committed armed robbery and even murder. Makarenko began to realize that his basic task was to create a collective with sufficient psychological authority to break his young hooligans of their criminal and anarchical habits, and to replace them with a sense of belonging. Persuasion, shaming, and even the threat of expulsion were ineffective so long as a real collective did not exist. Decisive progress was made only when the colonists could be mobilized against outsiders suspected of illegal and antisocial behavior. When, for example, the state foresters appealed for help in patroling the woods against nightly tree fellers, or when Makarenko obtained a warrant to search some peasant dwellings for illicit stills, a crew of his boys enjoyed their unusual role as social guardians and policemen. These were dramatic and risky pedagogical methods, but he was frank to concede that they "fostered the first shy growth of a healthy collective spirit."[19] Makarenko thus succeeded in familiarizing the colonists with social right and wrong, and gradually these notions were reflected in their conduct.

[18] *The Road to Life,* I, 4–5.
[19] *Ibid.,* I, 66.

Still, the frequent breakdowns of discipline and regressions to destructive behavior drove Makarenko close to despair, and he felt that more permanent and reliable means of molding his charges into a community had to be found. "In obedience to some unconscious pedagogical instinct" he began to introduce military gymnastics, routine, and discipline into the colony. The boys, who regarded this as a form of play, responded with enthusiasm, and their general bearing, manners, and work habits underwent a marked change for the better. All the colonists were organized into work detachments with a "commander" in charge of each. These commanders in turn formed a "council of commanders" which Makarenko convened whenever important matters were to be decided, and this council gradually developed from an advisory into an executive committee.

At last, after nearly three years of groping and arduous labor, he had found a type of social organization through which he might control and reform the behavior of the young hooligans. "Socialist competition" between the work detachments in shops and fields created a sense of achievement, pride, and group solidarity. Self-government meant power with responsibility. And as the colony prospered and began to function smoothly, the colonists deemed it an honor to belong, and dreaded expulsion as the worst punishment. Makarenko acted dictatorially in getting the collective established, but, considering the human material he had to work with, he had little choice. According to his account of the Gorky Colony in *The Road to Life,* he gradually relinquished his dictatorship in favor of collective self-government by the colony soviet. The latter remained, of course, subject to his promptings and his veto—as colony director he had the final responsibility—and it functioned within the forms which Makarenko had initiated and imposed. Within these limitations, however, it exercised effective self-government such as the soviets on the various levels of Russian political life were supposed to exercise but ceased to do immediately after 1917. At the same time the colony remained free from boss rule. Although the commanders of the permanent detachments held their positions for a long time, they enjoyed no privileges and were never exempt from work. They served also as rank-and-file members in so-called "mixed" detachments which were organized for short periods to do temporary work such as seasonal agricultural labor. The commanders of all detachments, mixed and permanent alike, were at first appointed by Makarenko, then elected by the council of commanders, and in the end elected by all the members of the colony. It was in this alternation

between serving and commanding, doing work assignments and having some organizing responsibility, that the director saw the chief value of communistic education.

V. THE EMERGENCE OF MAKARENKO'S THEORY

The numerous visitors who came to inspect the colony from curiosity or on official business were struck by its quasi-military organization, and soon the place began to acquire a reputation for "regimental pedagogics" and "barracks discipline." Professors of education and members of the Commissariat of Public Education objected to the use of punishments and rewards, and accused Makarenko of denying by his methods the dignity of the human being, which for them resided in spontaneous activity. The time and thought required to reply to these charges sorely tried his patience, and the criticisms and threats which issued from the Commissariat or, more often, from the Provincial Department of Public Education, led to vehement arguments and dramatic scenes. Yet it is evident from his writing that Makarenko's philosophy of education became articulate and more sharply defined through the constant need to justify himself before hostile critics and superiors.

To the charge of barracks discipline, he replied that it was not his aim to militarize young people. He was searching for a style of communal life, and he wished to institute a tradition and an authority without which collectives for juveniles were bound to fail, and in fact did fail in overwhelming numbers. He explained that he was seeking outward forms with which to objectify the aesthetic and spiritual qualities of collective life—qualities which had to be stabilized by well-established social rituals. Apart from the task immediately before him, Makarenko seems to have recognized that the traditions swept away by the Revolution had not yet been replaced by new ones, that abstract moral ideas were inadequate substitutes, and that as long as Soviet education relied on these alone, it would remain impotent to create new forms of social life.

To the accusation that punishments and rewards impeded the free unfolding of the child's nature, Makarenko replied that not every punishment was degrading; and, more important still, that children do not grow up in some paradise but in a society where their actions are subject to approval and disapproval. He also defended wages, a damnable heresy to the prevailing educational theory. The Gorky Colony, which was agricultural and hardly achieved subsistence level,

did not pay wages to its juveniles, but the Dzershinsky Commune, which engaged in profitable industrial production, did. Makarenko pointed out that the coördination of personal and social interests became real to young people once they had a modest sum to spend. They should not have to leave the colony like young ladies from boarding school who had acquired nothing but "ideals." When, finally, he was blamed for not basing his educational system on the children's interests and for imposing an adult discipline instead of developing self-discipline, he retorted that children are not the best judges of what is good for them and that discipline develops "as a result of the friendly pressure of the collective."[20]

These quarrels, which eventually ended in the condemnation of Makarenko's methods by the Commissariat of Public Education, led him to reflect on the differences that separated him from those who, as he said, "voyaged on the boundless ocean of childhood in the abstract." Their goals were the same: both wished to produce a new type of man capable of constituting Communist society. But there was a vast difference in means. The so-called "free" Russian educators of the period believed that through creative interests the children would flower spontaneously into Communist personalities—a comforting theory, but invalidated by a single day spent in the effort to tame lawless youth. This was indeed a strenuous and almost sacrificial labor, and it is not to be wondered at that Makarenko, exasperated by his critics and by the poverty of educational knowledge, occasionally cursed educational theorists as the most sanctimonious of hypocrites.

Yet he continued to search for a technique of education. The problems which chiefly occupied him were those of educational control, predictability, and efficiency. Experience had taught him that certain aspects of human personality and behavior could be developed en masse if only education could provide the dies. Although he granted that teaching was, at its best, a highly personal art, he was seeking in the main a technology of education. "How is it," he complained, "that the resistance of materials is studied in all higher technical institutes, while in the pedagogical institutes no study is made of the resistance of personalities to educational measures?"[21]

Here Makarenko's theory begins to emerge. The first reaction of a liberal or a humanist is likely to be a protest against the debasement of human nature which Makarenko's technology threatens; and, since the threat comes from a Communist, it is felt to be all the more ominous. Although Makarenko's analogy may not be appropriate for convey-

[20] *Ibid.*, III, 266.
[21] *Ibid.*, III, 268.

ing the whole truth, human beings *are* alike in important ways. The irony is that the behavioral sciences such as psychology, sociology, and anthropology, which seek to establish determinatives for human nature, are cultivated far more intensely in liberal societies than they are in the Soviet Union. Moreover, the history of education includes a number of illustrious men who thought of education in terms not unlike those used by Makarenko: Plato's rigorous conditioning of the young guardians; the faith which Helvetius and Robert Owen expressed in the determining power of a controlled social environment; and the reliance placed on method by Comenius, who in his *Didactica Magna* held out the promise of perfecting classroom instruction with the precision of clockwork or the accuracy of the printing press. To say that the theories of these educators and the practices, if any, to which they led debased human nature would not do justice to their intentions. Given a deep moral concern and the personal experience of social crisis, the desire for a science of human engineering is quite understandable.

A more serious criticism of Makarenko's theory has been set forth by a contemporary German writer,[25] who states that Makarenko reduced the philosophy of education to a technology because he served a state which had established beyond dispute what the aims of education were to be. Educational philosophy is thereby relieved of asking the important questions of what people should do with their lives, and of what is good, true, and just. Free inquiry and serious debate have been made impossible.

Though this is a valid criticism of current Soviet philosophy and intellectual life in general, it does not wholly apply to Makarenko. His ideas were not ideologically derived or ready-made, but were inspired by strong moral conviction and gathered from a wealth of personal experience. If he arrived at conclusions the regime had reason to welcome, he did so ingenuously and without premeditation. The distinguishing characteristics of the new Communist man had not been clearly defined before Makarenko's writings appeared, and his work helped to focus the image. It would therefore be unfair to say that Makarenko had abandoned the quest for the good life or that he was immune to self-questioning and doubt. His philosophical stance, of course, was not that of classical detachment, for he was a thoroughly committed man. But in accepting the hegemony of politics over education, he did not (with the exception of the Stalinist propaganda of

[25] M. G. Lange, *Totalitäre Erziehung: Das Erziehungssystem der Sowjetzone Deutschlands* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Frankfurter Hefte, 1954), pp. 257–262.

his last years) surrender his responsibility as a thinker. He was painfully aware, as many of his fellow educators were not, that the principles of Communist ethics and education remained largely formalistic. Besides perfecting a technology of education, his aim was to clarify those principles.

VI. THE DISCIPLINE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

One of the recurrent problems in Western educational theory has been to mediate the claims of society and of the individual. In a rational society, if it existed, these claims would not conflict. For, just as the self requires for its realization and integration relatively stable social traditions, so society needs individuals capable of adjusting its institutions to changing conditions. But the history of Western education rarely records such a balance. Plato, Rousseau, and Dewey, to mention but a few illustrious names, were all concerned with redressing the cause of the one side against the other, depending on which they believed had suffered injury or neglect.

In Soviet educational theory the reconciliation of the conflicting interests of society and the individual is again of crucial importance. In open reaction to the individualism of the West, which through ignorance and deliberate exaggeration is conjured up as an immensely destructive force, Soviet educators (aside from an incipient flurry of libertarian ideas) perceive their task to be the creation of collectives that will control the formation of individual character. Yet Soviet educationists do not therefore plead guilty to suppressing the individual or frustrating his free development. On the contrary, they maintain that they have solved a problem which has eluded Western minds. In the words of Makarenko, the solution is "to incorporate the individual into the collective in such a way that he believes himself to belong to it freely and without compulsion."[22]

Since compulsion and coercion prevail both in Soviet society and in Soviet education, we may be inclined to regard such a statement as a cynical avowal of the unlimited power of persuasion. Or we may simply dismiss it as just another example of propaganda that bears little resemblance to the facts. Yet Makarenko was neither a cynic nor a mere propagandist, but an intensely serious man for whom communism culminated in nothing less than the making of a new moral man. When he equated the discipline of the collective with the freedom of the individual member, he was not merely repeating a dialectical cliché but was referring to his own experience as an educator. The majority of

[22] "Die Pädagogen zucken die Achseln," *APS*, p. 141.

the children he received into his colonies had lived in gangs where they were subject to the power of older and stronger leaders who intimidated and exploited them, much as in capitalist society individuals are allegedly exploited by a powerful and ruthless minority. Makarenko maintained that the discipline of the collective was the salvation of such children and the very basis of their human development. They learned that "discipline in the collective is for every single person nothing else but complete security."[24] Everyone knew what his rights were and how they were protected. Once Makarenko had succeeded in establishing discipline by the drastic and unconventional means previously described, his children and adolescents doubtless came to rely upon it and to condemn infringements as undermining their newly won sense of security. In fact, those who had suffered most from the anarchy of the streets and "the war of all against all" became the staunchest defenders of colony discipline.

While discipline was thus being justified as protection for the individual, it also implied that in cases of conflict, whose eventual elimination was the very purpose of Makarenko's educational system, the interests of the group would prevail over those of the individual. This is a general Soviet axiom that operates in all areas of activity. To avoid reading the Western conception of "group" into the Soviet meaning, it should be added that Russia has no autonomous groups to which individuals owe their loyalty. The leadership of every collective represents the interests of the Party. If it did not, single-party rule would be threatened by the formation of nuclei of potential opposition, a situation deemed intolerable by the Party leadership.

Like every other Soviet writer, Makarenko was bound to support this conception of the monolithic Party state. Yet it is interesting to observe that his educational practice and even his educational theory were not wholly in conformity with it. In all his discussions of the educational value of the collective, whether youth colonies or schools, he placed great emphasis on a single strong authority that would impress an individual style upon the group and initiate traditions of group life with which the members could identify themselves. Thus to create a sense of belonging among members of groups small enough to know each other did not, perhaps, constitute a serious threat to the monolithic state. The members were, after all, minors, and the purpose of these educational collectives was to induct them into the larger collective of the Soviet state. Makarenko, however, did not regard youth collectives as merely preparatory but as social institutions in their

[24] "Probleme der sowjetischen Erziehung in der Schule," *APS*, p. 28.

own right, whose members learned, through the discipline of common labor and self-government, how to conduct themselves in a manner acceptable to society. Such an education was bound to develop loyalty and the sense of belonging. Many of the young people whom Makarenko had launched on productive and honorable careers in adult life continued to write to him and to remember him with gratitude.

These intimate personal values do not fit into—they even conflict with—the type of relationship that the Party leadership seeks to create throughout Soviet society. Because of the necessity of checking upon the execution of central policy decisions and nipping in the bud any diversity of belief, the Soviet state operates as a mutual watch and ward society in which the various echelons of Party organizations are set against local soviets, ministries, and factory and farm managers. There are also special roving units of Party "instructors" and labor activists, not to mention the secret police which watches over them all. This system of multiple controls and mutual suspicion discovers an unending series of "obstructions," "errors," and difficulties that are in large part created by contradictory and ambiguous directives. They harass all but the very top Party leaders and give functionaries in responsible positions an acute sense of insecurity. Barrington Moore has called this system "a vested interest in confusion," and Fainsod refers to it as "institutionalized suspicion." In reaction to this system, personal ties, alliances, and mutual protection spring up, and help to make the system function in spite of itself. But these are frequently denounced in the Soviet press as "familyness" and broken up wherever possible.

As director of two youth collectives, Makarenko seems to have been spared the irritation and frustration of this "squeeze" system. His differences with the Commissariat of Public Education were of quite another nature and concerned educational method. Very likely it took some time to perfect the system, even under Stalin, and Makarenko may therefore have been at a natural advantage in the early period of his work. But even during his later years in the Dzershinsky Commune, when he was under the authority of the Commissariat of the Interior or the secret police, he remained—and perhaps for this very reason—free from outside interference. As educational administrator and theorist alike, he enjoyed the rare privilege of fairly undisturbed authority, a fact which is reflected in the forcefulness of his personality. The one organization which could, and by Soviet rules should, have been a competing authority was the Komsomol. But its influence in the Gorky Colony was negligible, and in the Dzershinsky Com-

mune, where it was well represented, it remained subordinate to the discipline of the whole collective.

This obviously irregular situation has been noted by the authors of a current and widely used text in Soviet teachers' colleges. They not only point out, in full accord with Soviet principle, that the Komsomol organization is "the vanguard" of every youth and school collective and that the teacher must enlist its support in giving young people a moral education; they also improve upon Makarenko's record: "It is well known," they write, "that the great Soviet pedagogue, A. S. Makarenko, succeeded in forming a genuine Soviet collective of his charges only after a Komsomol organization was established in his colony."[25] The facts, as reported in *The Road to Life*, are that a Komsomol political instructor entered the Gorky Colony in 1923, well after Makarenko had succeeded in putting collective discipline on a firm basis. The activity of this Komsomol representative, who had a criminal record, is briefly mentioned once in the entire book, and there is no evidence that the Komsomol played any real part in the system which Makarenko had initiated and continued to control.[26]

It might be said that the distinctions drawn in the preceding discussion are academic and that it makes no real difference whether Makarenko was his own master or whether he was a controlled functionary executing directives from above. For, with all his independence, no one could have been a more earnest and devoted spokesman for the Party's long-term interests in the construction of a truly Communist education. The objection, however, overlooks one thing: service rendered out of personal conviction and service performed because one is part of a system of multiple control and suspicion do not have the same moral value. The paradox is that the Party leadership, while praising Makarenko's work and devotion and holding them up as examples for others, makes it impossible for educators of similar qualities to arise nowadays because it subjects them to the controls described above. Even under Stalin, Soviet leadership did not want merely slavish obedience from the masses and did not rely on power alone, but attempted to justify its very existence as well as its major policies in terms of man's spiritual aspirations. Yet it would seem that only in the Soviet past is it possible to find concrete evidence of individuals who, by their own example, nourished and inspired belief in the mission of Soviet society.

Makarenko used his freedom from authority to discipline the indi-

[25] I. T. Ogorodnikow and P. N. Schimbirew, *Lehrbuch der Pädagogik* (Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1953), p. 245.
[26] *The Road to Life*, I, 390.

vidual in order to subjugate his interests to those of the collective. A young person who followed his own desires was considered guilty of antisocial behavior. It made no difference whether the desire led to socially useful or to criminal and destructive acts: either way, the individual became subject to collective judgment and condemnation. To illustrate this point, Makarenko relates an episode about a Komsomol member and commander of the Dzershinsky Commune who had regressed to his former life and stolen a radio set from a younger boy. The colony assembly resolved to expel the boy because he had violated the trust which the collective placed in a commander. Makarenko objected to the verdict, and sought to give the boy another chance. In this he was supported by the Commissariat of the Interior, which sent several representatives who urged the communards to retain the boy on the ground that his expulsion would put a blemish on their record. Besides, they should be willing to meet the challenge of "reëducating" the culprit. The secret police officers and the communards argued the matter at length, but the latter stood by their verdict. Makarenko states that he reflected long on this incident and in the end concluded that the collective was right. So it would seem that it educated even its own founder and master! The interests of the collective were to be guarded even if this meant taking merciless action against the individual.[27]

In another incident, which occurred in a Soviet public school, the teacher in charge took a very different course of action. A pupil had stolen a few rubles from a classmate and on being discovered was taken aside by his teacher, who discussed the matter with him privately. Makarenko strongly disapproved of this "tactful" and "sensitive" approach, which saved the boy from public exposure. Such tender "moralizing," he commented, might be education of a kind, but it was not Communistic education. The teacher's action confirmed the boy in his belief that he was independent of the collective's opinion and deprived him of the crucial experience of being directly answerable to it rather than to the morality of a single person.[28]

To us, Makarenko's judgment may seem unnecessarily harsh, even inhuman. Liberal society, like any other, insists on the socialization of the individual, but so far as it is true to its basic values it will let the teacher decide how this task may best be accomplished. In America the teacher is thought of as a therapist rather than as a stern judge, and both public opinion and educational theory expect the profession

[27] "Probleme der sowjetischen Erziehung in der Schule," *APS*, p. 33.
[28] "Das Erziehungsziel," *APS*, pp. 166–167.

to help individual students in overcoming their difficulties, whether moral, psychological, or intellectual.

The rigorous Communist, by contrast, cannot admit any such professional autonomy; our trust in individual discretion and our concern for individual growth appear to him dangerous. In the incident cited, the teacher may have been, as Makarenko commented, a "good" man, but a counterrevolutionary might have adopted the same tactics. Communist education cannot on principle depend upon so-called "good" men, just as it cannot proceed through private relationships and private actions. "A Soviet person cannot be educated by the direct influence of one personality, whatever qualities this personality may possess,"[29] because Communist education is a social and public process. If the conduct of the "tactful" teacher were to become general, the students' collective would be disrupted by mutual suspicion, since they did not find out who committed the theft, and, still worse, they might become indifferent to antisocial behavior of any kind. How would Soviet leadership be able to encourage the alertness and indeed the collective passion required to keep the individual under control? If the teacher had acted on the principles of Communist morality, he would have charged the class itself with the investigation and judgment of the petty theft, thereby compelling every student to participate in collective, public action and to identify himself with it.

It was by such identification that the disciplining of the individual was achieved in Makarenko's colony. He was well aware that by implicating a young person in the strict maintenance of the collective's code and standards, he had discovered the most powerful means of binding him to the group. A young member who had only recently been rehabilitated, and who had as yet no firm hold on the moral standards he was asked to help enforce, was likely to be harsh in his judgment, harsher even than Makarenko himself. For in voting for the expulsion of a comrade convicted of theft, he was punishing someone for a misdeed he himself had been tempted to commit. His unconscious reaction was bound to be a feeling of guilt for which he could atone only by submitting himself in the future still more completely to the group. In Soviet language, which shuns mention of the unconscious, this moral implication in group judgment "steeled his will" to resist antisocial behavior in himself as in others, and equipped him for the prolonged battle of regenerating society. Therefore, Makarenko defended the view that "severity was the highest form of humanity

[29] *A Book for Parents*, written in coöperation with Galina S. Makarenko, trans. by Robert Daglish (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1954), p. 18.

which it was possible to show a person,"[30] and that this overrode all consideration of emotional suffering.

Makarenko did not exempt himself from the severe and repressive behavior that he required from his charges. His directorship of the Dzershinsky Commune was suddenly terminated one day by a telegram from the Commissariat of the Interior in Kiev instructing him to leave immediately for a new assignment. It was by his own testimony perhaps the saddest day of his life. Eight years of intense and devoted work came unexpectedly and unceremoniously to an end. Some of his assistants wept, and, as he called the entire commune together for a brief farewell address, he found it difficult to speak. He noticed, however, that there was dust on top of the piano and, after ascertaining the name of the boy whose duty it was to clean the hall that day, ordered him five hours of arrest on the spot. To the boy's astonished appeal, "But Anton Semyonovitch, you are about to take your leave of us!" he remained unyielding.[31] It is fair to assume that Makarenko suffered no less than the boy, despite his stern pose.

Whereas Makarenko advocated rigidity and harsh discipline as the dominant factors in Communist education, they were in his actual practice tempered by frequent instances of affectionate concern for individual colonists and their difficulties. It could hardly have been otherwise with a man who was as devoted to human beings as he was interested in developing a consistent educational theory. With all his insistence on discipline, he did not wish to sacrifice "the grace, originality, and beauty of individual personality." This choice of terms is in itself significant, for it indicates that he thought of education not in exclusively moral but in aesthetic terms as well. He was aware that to apply these two standards might result in conflicting practices, and it speaks for his modesty that he admitted in one of his last major statements (1938) that education was a complex and many-sided enterprise: he himself had known "periods of tormenting doubt" in his practical work, and he recognized ambiguities and inadequacies in his educational theory.[32] Comments such as these, apart from showing his humanity, make it clear that empiricism was a strong element of his intellectual make-up and that his theory of education was not consistently deduced from Marxist doctrine.

One of the problems which still occupied him in his last years was whether he ought to submit every personality to the same require-

[30] "Die Pädagogen zucken die Achseln," *APS*, p. 143.

[31] *Einige Schlussfolgerungen aus meiner pädagogischen Erfahrung*, trans. by Friedrich Redlich (Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1954), p. 65.

[32] "Probleme der sowjetischen Erziehung in der Schule," *APS*, pp. 10–16.

ments, as his rigid views on discipline seemed to demand. He concluded that a general norm had to be established, but, at the same time, it had to be modified and adjusted in dealing with individual cases. Thus a certain flexibility was admitted into a theory of education which heretofore had been set forth in the most rigid terms. He expected all young Soviets to grow up into "fearless, manly, righteous, and industrious patriots." More difficult than insistence on the fulfillment of this obligation was the appraisal and development of the tender shoots of individual talent; but this also he regarded as an educator's duty.

One of his boys, an able fellow who had finished the ten-year school with excellent grades, wished to study engineering, which was then becoming a glorified profession in the Soviet Union. Makarenko, however, had observed that the boy possessed unusual gifts as a comedian and could have a great career on the stage, whereas he would be only an average engineer. When the boy refused to change his mind, and entered an engineering institute, Makarenko decided to have him called before the general assembly for breach of collective discipline. It was a ruse but it worked. The assembly ordered the boy to leave the engineering institute and to enroll in a school for actors. Heartbroken, he obeyed because—Makarenko had taken a well-calculated risk—he did not have the strength to defy the will of the collective. He studied acting while he continued to live in the commune, and by Makarenko's account he rose in a relatively short time to play in one of the best theaters in the Soviet Far East and was grateful to Makarenko for having compelled him to change his plans.[33]

Again, by way of comparison, a liberal society may entertain an educational philosophy that makes it everyone's duty to develop his potential to the fullest, and it may provide the necessary opportunities for this, but it cannot *force* the individual so to develop himself. Makarenko argued to the contrary that if young people are left to follow their own inclinations (strictly speaking, of course, the inclinations were not really *theirs*) at a time of life when they are not the best judge of their potentials, they themselves as well as society will be the losers. To prevent such loss was precisely the educator's duty. Makarenko thus maintained a paradoxical individualism according to which the individual could be compelled to perfect himself in spite of himself. Still, in reflecting upon his action in this case, Makarenko admitted a profound uneasiness. "What right have I to use force?"[34] he asked, but could arrive at no clear answer. He maintained, on the

[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 15–16.
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

one hand, that the educator had an inclusive authority empowering him to form character directly and decisively. But, on the other hand, when confronted by the particular task of using that authority, Makarenko experienced a very natural anxiety and fear. In the end he tabled the question and took refuge in the future when, he hoped, the science of education would be so perfected as to allow its practitioners to undertake major operations on a person's character with little or no risk.

VII. SOCIALIST HUMANISM

Although Makarenko was at odds with the educational ideas dominant in Russia during the 1920's, the broad changes that took place in educational outlook, legislation, and practice in the middle 'thirties made his views acceptable, and eventually they came to be regarded as representative of official thinking on the subject.

The general tendency underlying these changes may be referred to as "socialist humanism" as long as it is understood that this term is not confined to education but extends to a variety of social activities and programs. Thus it signifies a revaluation of the past, especially the Russian past, as well as a revaluation of the role of the family. It also refers to "socialist emulation," to the increased productivity of industrial labor (Stakhanovism), and to increased status distinctions and opportunities for social advancement. Equality is dismissed as a petty-bourgeois heresy. Socialist humanism is not a return to the individualist and libertarian ideas that found expression in the 1917 revolution. The term rather conveys the belief that the progress of socialist society depends on the moral qualities of the people—the will power, zeal, and sacrifice that have made rapid industrialization possible. "Socialist humanism" came to be associated with a slogan coined by Stalin in a speech delivered in 1935: "Cadres decide everything." Man rather than the machine was declared to be the principal value of socialist society. "People are frequently flung about like pawns," Stalin complained, not without irony. "We must learn to value people, to value cadres, to value every worker capable of benefitting our common cause."[35]

The impact of socialist humanism on Soviet educational practice and theory was perhaps most dramatic in the defeat of the pedologists, whose epitaph was the decree of the Central Committee on "Pedological Perversions" (July 4, 1936). Pedology was the science of child study which made use of psychology, physiology, sociology, and medi-

[35] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1945), p. 524.

cine, and, on the whole, took a behavioristic approach to the study of human nature. Its philosophic orientation was that of mechanistic materialism and determinism: it trusted in the lawfulness inherent in events, and these, when scientifically investigated, were to yield directives for human action in education as in other fields. In its implications it differed considerably from dialectical materialism, which, as espoused by Lenin and more forcefully by Stalin, placed on man the responsibility for organized action to direct the course of events. Dialectical materialism was thus voluntarist rather than determinist, and it was backed by the authority of Marx, who, early in his *Theses on Feuerbach,* said that circumstances are changed precisely by men and that "the educator must himself be educated." The pedologists, on the contrary, thought of man not as a purposive, revolutionizing agent but as an adaptive organism automatically maintaining a state of equilibrium between himself and the environment. Their explanation of human behavior relied on the two factors of heredity and social conditioning. Following Pavlov and other Russian psychologists whose main interests were in physiolgy, they regarded consciousness as the least reliable object of scientific investigation. In consequence they neglected the conscious and deliberate modes of education, including the art of teaching, systematic learning, and the formation of character.[36] It was therefore not difficult to condemn pedology for minimizing the role of the school in the formation of future Soviet citizens and for its "fatalistic" outlook.

Even several years before the publication of this decree, a number of educational directives had repudiated the assumption that the eventual victory of socialism was a matter of immanent development, whether in human beings or in the realms of history, society, and economics. These decrees put an end to any libertarian practices that still survived in the schools. From 1931 on, attempts were made to restore classroom discipline and to strengthen the authority of the teacher. The "complex methods" of teaching (so-called because they subdivided knowledge into the three large areas of nature, labor, and society instead of into specific subjects) as well as the project method were replaced by a traditional subject-matter curriculum that put heavy emphasis on memorization and the acquisition of systematic knowledge. Examinations at the end of each grade for promotion to the next and from one school to the next were reinstituted, homework became heavy, and grades acquired great importance in the life of the student, for they determined his chances in the keen competition for the limited

[36] Raymond A. Bauer, *The New Man in Soviet Psychology* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), chap. viii.

number of places available in universities and institutes. All this placed greater responsibility upon school, teacher, and student. Those like Shul'gin and his collaborators, who in 1930 still maintained that the school was an instrument of bourgeois domination to be replaced by productive labor in factories and on farms, fell quickly into oblivion. Contrary to utopian expectations that state or school were about to fade out of existence, both institutions rose to new heights of power and importance. If forced industrialization and agricultural collectivization were to succeed permanently, schools, universities, and institutes had to supply the rapidly increasing demand for trained manpower and competent specialists while at the same time disciplining young people for a life of devoted service to the state.

Other aspects of socialist humanism include values and institutions which Bolshevism, in attempting to distinguish itself from bourgeois society, had first discredited but now made an effort to restore. Here belong the revival of a patriotic cult of national historic figures, including certain tsars such as Ivan and Peter the Great, and the reprinting of Russian and foreign literary classics. The family, which had been an object of socialist criticism, was now regarded as making indispensable contributions to socialist construction. Adults were recalled to marital fidelity and familial duties, young people were admonished to be chaste, and the nationalization of children was no longer heard of. Social equalization was openly repudiated by Stalin as the infatuation of "leftist blockheads." Within the class of industrial workers a new activist elite of Stakhanovites was encouraged by high piece-rate earnings and large cash prizes—a fact that has been cited as proof of the possibility of getting ahead in the Soviet system.[87] The distinction between mental and manual labor which polytechnical education had once tried to eliminate was now admitted: the intelligentsia was acknowledged to be a social "stratum," though not a class, because, according to Stalin, it recruited itself from the workers and peasants.

Makarenko had long been committed to most of the values which socialist humanism sought to restore, and his denunciation of pedologists, libertarians, and utopians in education preceded the official one. His basic principle of making great demands upon young people's moral resources; his use of rewards and punishments; his insistence on the conscious understanding of duty instead of blind discipline; his emphasis upon the training of will and the formation of character,

[87] Barrington Moore, Jr., *Soviet Politics—The Dilemma of Power* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), chap. x.

which placed great responsibility upon the teachers—all these fitted well into the new conception of education.

It was several years, however, before this new conception penetrated and was generally adopted by the educational profession. The first textbook on psychology[38] to note the importance of duty, will power, ideals, and self-discipline did not appear until 1940, and even after that many educators seem to have felt that the vogue of these concepts was just an echo of the bourgeois past and irreconcilable with a socialist education. Makarenko, on the contrary, found his main insights and conclusions confirmed and supported by the new policies, and this favorable situation probably contributed to his literary productivity during the last four years of his life.

Long impatient with the excessive theorizing which he felt had characterized Bolshevik education for too many years, Makarenko probed into some practical problems which had been neglected. During his latter years in the Dzershinsky Commune he had accepted a number of boys who were not abandoned or delinquent, but merely difficult in the sense that their parents were unable to manage them. Such cases led him to the discovery of a widespread parental ineptitude, ignorance, and irresponsibility which in turn suggested a general lack of adult manners and morals as a cause of juvenile delinquency. But it was only during the last years of his life that he found the leisure to write about these problems in *A Book for Parents* and *Lectures on Child Education.*

These writings are more humane and less severe in regard to character formation and the socialization of the individual than those previously discussed, and indeed they contain much good sense from any point of view. They show that Makarenko realized the importance of intimate personal relationships to the healthy emotional growth of children, and they remind parents that their own conduct must command respect if they are to exercise moral authority over their children. There is a noticeable relaxation of his customary moral rigor when he writes that parents are not only citizens but persons, and that they in turn should bring up good citizens *and* good men.[39] Parents should occupy themselves with their children, should know their interests, their likes and dislikes, their difficulties. They should know what their children read, and how they behave at school. The family is described as the basic institution that makes human fulfillment and

[38] Bauer, *op. cit.*, chap. ix.

[39] *Vorträge über Kindererziehung*, trans. by Alexander Böltz (Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1953), p. 25.

happiness possible, and Makarenko seems to agree with Western students of personality when he warns that "people brought up without parental love are often deformed people."[40] The same recognition of psychic needs is evident in his reminder that the socialist respect for work is grounded not only in the social utility of work but also in its great importance to personality: people who are capable of achievement are happy people.

Yet even in these writings on parental authority and early childhood education, Makarenko never divorces personal fulfillment from the requirements of socialist ethics. He rejects the single-child family as unsound because it is no longer a collective able to bring up the child in an ensemble of human relations. Rather, it is likely to produce overanxiety in parents. Makarenko criticizes the excessive tenderness and sentimental love that Russian parents are prone to lavish on their children. In this kind of relationship, he warns, children learn to deceive and control their elders by demonstrating the desired affection and are thereby turned into calculating egotists and "greedy consumers." Parents who thus abuse or neglect their authority not only bring up unhappy children, but burden the state with parasitic and selfish people. They must learn to understand that their authority is delegated to them by society, to which they are ultimately responsible. Families do not exist as islands sufficient unto themselves; to prevent such seclusion, parents should make their public life, their economic activity, and participation in national events a part of family life.

This public-mindedness we expect from a socialist theory of education, but the large allowance for such psychic needs as responsiveness, love, trust, and care comes as a surprise. To a Soviet writer who reviewed *A Book for Parents* in a leading educational journal, this great concern for the intimate life was suspect, and he accused Makarenko of "pedagogical nihilism," that is, of attempting to divorce home education from public-school education.[41] This was not Makarenko's intention, and he explicitly guarded against such heresy elsewhere in his writings. Nevertheless, it would seem that children brought up with affectionate care tend to respect and admire their parents, and throughout their lives are likely to feel themselves supported by positive parent identifications that aid in the formation of strong ego-ideals. Yet the major aim of character education, according to Makarenko, was the inculcation of dependence upon public opinion. The censorship of the superego was harsh and ever present. Would the alert superego not

[40] *A Book for Parents*, p. 37.
[41] *Sovietskaya Pedagogika*, II:3 (1938), 124–128.

lead to inner conflict by frustrating the achievement of ego-ideals? Was Makarenko then fostering two conflicting psychic tendencies?

To this as to previous criticisms Makarenko would probably have retorted that the Western observer is as incapable of comprehending the psychology and ethics of socialist education as he is of standing outside his own shadow. Where he suspects conflict, there stretches an unbroken line of development: individual self-realization and the process of socializing the self are inseparable. This identity Makarenko explains in a special theory which he calls "the system of perspectives."[43] It describes education as the art of constantly enlarging the objects of individual aspiration. Through a series of widening perspectives the individual proceeds from simple gratifications to the performance of the highest and most difficult social duties. Children, he grants, have short-range objectives, and their actions are directed toward pleasurable things. "However, it would be a great mistake to base even a short-range perspective solely on the pleasure principle even though such pleasure may contain useful elements. We would thereby accustom children to an absolutely inadmissible epicureanism."[44] This passage is italicized by Makarenko, and throughout the essay he emphasizes the importance of habituating young people to forego "primitive," personal, and immediate gratifications and to learn to substitute the promise of collective and distant "joys." The term "joy," which figures prominently in the official Soviet ethics, is defined by Makarenko as the reward of participating in collective strivings that involve the expenditure of work effort on behalf of common aims which become increasingly difficult to attain. When young people, after having passed from immediate to intermediate perspectives, are finally ready to identify themselves with the great forward movement of the Soviet Union, they will be mature enough to be content with only a promise of the ultimate success of socialist construction, and the beauty and strength of their personalities will consist precisely in sustaining the tension of laboring for this distant goal. Makarenko's conception of "perspectives" is simple yet remarkable in that it translates the official ethics of unremitting deprivation, renunciation, and deferred consumption into the terms of educational method. These essentially negative, or at best instrumental, values are thereby imbued with the highest moral and aesthetic excellence.

In sum, Makarenko's humanism is expounded so eloquently and with such conviction that he gives the impression of having discovered the

[43] "Perspektiva," *OKV*, pp. 216–224.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 219.

golden mean in social education, between the two extremes of the standardized automatism illustrated in George Orwell's *1984* and the hypertrophied individualism which Soviet ideology attributes to Western liberalism. The values of individuality, Makarenko maintained, can be fully realized only within a meaningful social order. "In the Soviet Union a personality cannot exist outside the collective, and therefore there can be no isolated personal destiny, no personal way, and no personal happiness which are opposed to the destiny and happiness of the collective."[44]

This is an argument difficult to gainsay, and much of Western cultural anthropology and sociology in fact support it. "No individual," to quote a familiar American text, "can arrive even at the threshhold of his potentialities without a culture in which he participates."[45] The role of the individual in society is described by prominent students of the behavioral sciences as predominantly passive. "Under ordinary circumstances," writes Ralph Linton, "the more perfect his conditioning and consequent integration into the social structure, the more effective his contribution to the smooth functioning of the whole and the surer his rewards."[46] This seems scarcely to differ from the view expressed by Makarenko in the passage last quoted. Individuality, in Linton's analysis, survives, but only by default and as a "residue": it is not the purpose but only the chance by-product of a society not fully in control of itself. Although "society and culture have done their utmost" to reduce individuals to smoothly functioning units of the whole, they fail because the process of social conditioning is disrupted by external uncontrolled changes before it is ever completed.

It is this matter of control, or its lack, that points to an important difference between the social determinism described by Western social scientists and that exemplified by Makarenko. The first is automatic and accidental; the second is pragmatic and planned, and therefore, ideally at least, highly efficient. A socialist society that deliberately introduces large-scale changes will logically plan the formation of individual character in order that its citizens may sustain these changes by incorporating them in their mode of life. Major uncontrolled changes in the social environment are prevented from occurring and from disrupting the individual's integration into the social structure.

However, both kinds of determinism, whether planned or automatic, conceive of individuals as mere actors performing roles assigned them

[44] "Das Erziehungsziel," *APS*, p. 168.

[45] Ruth Benedict, *Patterns of Culture* (New York: Penguin Books, 1946), p. 234.

[46] Ralph Linton, *The Cultural Background of Personality* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1945), p. 22.

by society, and this conception can give no comfort to the minority of educators who still seek to preserve the humanistic tradition of Western education. If the individual is to construct his own world and attain a measure of autonomy, he must be able to resist cultural conditioning. But if the social determinists are right, then the belief to which Freud still clung, that "there was some point at which it was possible to stand beyond the reach of culture,"[47] turns out to have been an illusion. This uncertainty forms part of what in recent years has been termed the spiritual crisis of the West, which has had its repercussions in the search for moral and spiritual values in American education. It is evident that the philosophy of social determination, which Western social theorists are widely understood to support, affords a poor basis on which to criticize Makarenko's human engineering and the absorption of the individual in the collective.

VIII. THE RELATION OF MAKARENKO'S THEORY TO SOVIET REALITIES

One remaining basis for criticism is the lack of consistency or congruence between the requirements of Makarenko's strenuous morality and prevailing Soviet behavior. Evidence of such discrepancies in Soviet life is obtained both by direct Soviet testimony and from careful Western studies of Soviet society. A few relevant examples selected from the areas of literature, psychology, sociology, and public education strongly suggest, and some clearly show, that Makarenko aimed too high and that not all his objectives were realized. The identification of individual and social purpose remains an ideal. Organized terrorism, or the mere threat of its unpredictable use, and the mutual suspicion built into human relations invalidate the internalization of discipline which Makarenko made the crux of character formation. His belief that there can be no private happiness apart from the happiness of the collective does not describe the actual feelings of contemporary Soviet citizens so far as literature and personality studies can be said to reveal these feelings. The optimism which he sought to inculcate has not wholly conquered doubt and depression which, suppressed though they are, still seem to afflict many Soviet citizens.

After Stalin's death, when controls over the emotional and intellectual life were temporarily relaxed, some Russian novels and plays abandoned the compulsive optimism and let a good deal of disillusionment and discontent come to the surface. The most recent example

[47] Lionel Trilling, *Freud and the Crisis of Our Culture* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955), p. 40.

of this literature is the novel *Not by Bread Alone,*[48] in which an inventor battles against the combined conspiracy of administrators and academicians. In contrast to Makarenko's thesis, another novel portrays a man who finds personal fulfillment through devotion to his art and in the love of his wife, even though he is unable to exhibit his work and lives withdrawn in dire poverty. Successful colleagues who have compromised their integrity by painting and writing according to the canons of social realism envy him because he has remained true to his own feelings and standards, which are not shared by the collective. Another character in the novel sums up the dilemma: "We have taken a lot of trouble over one half of the human being, but the other half is neglected. The result is that one half of the house is a slum. I remember that article of Gorky's I read long ago, while I was still at school; he said we needed our own Soviet humanism. The word has been forgotten; the task is still to be done."[49]

An example of defiant nonparticipation in a collective enterprise is reported in a leading Soviet philosophical journal. In 1947 the standard text on the history of philosophy by G. F. Alexandrov was withdrawn after criticisms by Zhdanov, who then controlled intellectual life in the Soviet Union, and a large committee was appointed by the Party Central Committee to prepare a new text. This collective of scholars and professors got no farther than drawing up a prospectus of the proposed revision, which took several months because they encountered thorny problems of organization and interpretation. In his report on the committee's deliberations, the chairman complained of the attitude of some of its members. "The work was also hindered by the fact," he wrote, "that a number of Comrades who were brought together to work on the book evaded all discussion of the prospectus of the book without valid reasons and without giving any kind of explanation."[50] Since the committee was appointed by highest Party authority, this nonparticipation seems unusually bold.

More common among intellectuals was a combination of external compliance and inner reservation. If the observations of Czeslaw Milosz,[51] the Polish poet and writer who witnessed the subjection of Polish intellectual life to Moscow, may be applied to the Soviets them-

[48] Vladimir Dudintzev, *Not by Bread Alone* (New York: Dutton, 1957). For a brief review of other relevant literature, see Jeri Laber, "The Writer's Search for New Values," *Problems of Communism,* V:1 (Jan.–Feb., 1956), 14–20.

[49] Ilya Ehrenburg, *The Thaw,* trans. by Manya Harari (Chicago: Regnery, 1955), p. 153.

[50] "Materialy k Obsuzhdeniu, Prospekt Knigi. Projekt," *Voprosy Filosofii,* I:2 1947, 345.

[51] Czeslaw Milosz, *The Captive Mind,* trans. by Jane Zielonko (New York: Knopf, 1955), chap. iii.

selves, writers and painters write and paint as they must, yet cannot eradicate from their consciousness the older moral and aesthetic standards. Milosz fears, however, that future generations will not suffer from this inner conflict. After fifty years of education in the new ethics, a new and "irretrievable" species of man, he thinks, will have been developed. His prognosis allows the conditioning process more time than Makarenko's. But the hope of the one supports the fear of the other.

To judge from actual Russian behavior, however, the eventual success of cultural conditioning would seem doubtful. The recurrence of anxieties and frustrations among Soviet citizens suggests the prevalence of a personality type different from that which Makarenko's educational theory had confidently predicted. In perhaps the best analytic study of this sort, Henry V. Dicks[53] found that the official Soviet ethics, though a strong factor in Russian behavior, is resisted by older culture patterns and personality traits; as a result, there is conflict and tension rather than harmony between the individual and the collective. The new Soviet leadership, which is or desires to be efficient, self-denying, and hard-working, and which maintains strict taboos on sentiment, doubt, and depression, is an authority that people fear. But even though they submit to its power, they resist it inwardly. This resistance creates guilt and depressive states of apathy and futility which resemble the reactions to pre-Revolutionary Russian authority. Ideological pressure seeks to control these undesirable reactions by what Dicks aptly calls "omnipotence propaganda" and by a strident rationalism in educational philosophy. Thus human resources are strained to the breaking point and excessive demands are made on the conscious will in order to suppress the life of impulse.

Makarenko's insistence on severity in human relations and "on being hard" with young people is the kind of educational ethics which Bolshevik leadership requires for the realization of its goals. Makarenko's justification was that only by the use of severity could young people be induced to realize their full potentials; and, as Gorky had taught him, making great demands on people is the best way of showing your respect for them. It is not necessary to doubt the original sincerity of this kind of humanism, and on the conscious and rational level it is a plausible philosophy. Yet, when we consider the psychic realities involved, we question the possibility that this humanism could be embodied in confident, self-respecting, and free men. Psychological

[53] Henry V. Dicks, "Observations on Contemporary Russian Behaviour," *Human Relations*, V:2 (1952), 111–175. See also R. A. Bauer, A. Inkeles, and C. Kluckhohn, *How the Soviet System Works* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956).

studies suggest that Russians are ridden by guilt and driven by shame. They experience guilt because they are afraid of being found out and punished for actual and still more for possible transgressions (questioning by the secret police proceeds on the assumption of a person's guilt); and they experience shame because they are afraid of being scorned and eventually abandoned by the group for failing to measure up to its expectations.[53] To these motives should be added that of fear: intimidation is still widely used to compel compliance. Makarenko, too, made use of guilt, shame, and fear in binding his morally unstable delinquents to the youth collective. The motivations he employed were far more complex than his theory anywhere admits. The main object of the theory was to demonstrate how collective discipline may be established and maintained, and in this respect his theory was in complete agreement with the ideological pressure which the Party leadership exerts both on its own functionaries and on government officials. A ruthless and driving pragmatism passes over the psychic dimension of life, action and achievement are made to depend on will power alone, and the productivity of work is reckoned in "objective" social terms which ignore the psychic cost to individuals. When this cost is taken into account, the proud declarations of "respect for man" by Gorky and Makarenko seem rhetorical.

This analysis of Soviet character and emotional life, which is admittedly somewhat speculative, is supported by sociological studies that locate the sources of insecurity, mistrust, and hostility in the methods by which power over people is exercised. A permanent national emergency resulting from capitalist encirclement is alleged to exist, and, with this as justification, the utmost in work performance and material production as well as in ideological vigilance and loyalty is exacted from all citizens in responsible positions. In order to control the achievement of both Party and government personnel a double hierarchy of authority or a double system of directives is used, and it is manipulated in such a way as to expose individuals to a crossfire of instructions which are difficult and sometimes impossible to follow.

This system of controls is referred to in a general way in studies of Soviet society.[54] But the most thorough analysis of its operation with

[53] In distinguishing between the two concepts, I am following Piers in Gerhart Piers and Milton B. Singer, *Shame and Guilt: A Psychoanalytic and a Cultural Study* (Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1953).

[54] See Merle Fainsod, *How Russia Is Ruled* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), chaps. xii, xv; and W. W. Rostow, *The Dynamics of Soviet Society* (New York: New American Library of World Literature, 1954), Part 2, chaps. x–xii.

regard to management and labor was made by Reinhard Bendix[55] on East Germany, where social life, education included, has been completely sovietized since about 1950. Party functionaries are instructed to be vigilant, to discover "errors," to raise work norms and output, and in general *help* the factory director to fulfill the plan; but they must *not interfere* with the operation of the factory in which they are to perform these duties. Conversely, it is the director's duty to get things done efficiently, and supposedly he has absolute authority over his plant; but he must also consult and coöperate at every step with the local Party unit or its secretary. Managerial officials must observe maximum safety and show solicitude for the workers' welfare; but they must also fulfill and overfulfill the production plan. Party functionaries must be loyal and follow directions; but they are also expected to show initiative and "have a head on their shoulders." They must establish "contact with the masses" in order to enlist the collaboration of the workers in attaining the Party's political and economic objectives. Through this contact the functionaries must defend the prevailing Party line in order to win a growing number of convinced followers of the Party leadership, while at the same time they must concern themselves with the grievances and personal interests of the workers. In all these instances the assigned duties prove incompatible in practice and expose Party functionaries and executive officials to criticism for failing in one or the other of their activities. East German communism is a special case, however, and to conclude that the situation in Soviet Russia today is the same as that described by Bendix is probably erroneous. Contemporary Soviet practice of controlling individual performance may be relatively relaxed.

Thus far the relation of Makarenko's educational theory to the realities of Soviet life has been discussed in terms of the discrepancies between his high idealism and the actual feelings and behavior of Soviet people. This, however, is not the whole truth. There are also positive correlations. Important parts of Makarenko's theory were well designed to adjust young people to the dynamics of Soviet authority. They must learn to reconcile seemingly conflicting claims. They must be capable of absolute loyalty and creative initiative, of obedience and responsibility. Makarenko defended the view that the realization of human values depends wholly on a certain type of social organization and never on the good intentions and actions of individual teachers.[56] He

[55] Reinhard Bendix, *Work and Authority in Industry: Ideologies of Management in the Course of Industrialization* (New York: Wiley, 1956), Part 3, chap. vi.

[56] "Das Erziehungsziel," *APS*, p. 169.

made it clear that the collective was not interested in the perfection of individuals, but rather in making individuals faithful representatives of its common strivings and attributes. "We must graduate from our schools," he concluded, "energetic and ideologically firm members of socialist society who are capable of finding at every moment of their lives unwaveringly the right criterion of their conduct and who are capable of demanding the right conduct from others."[57] Yet he maintained that conscious self-discipline, not blind obedience, was the goal. Not only was every young person to understand why he was to carry out an order and to do so intelligently: he "should at every moment of his life be prepared to do his duty without waiting for instructions and orders; initiative and creative will are expected from him."[58] These moral imperatives no more explain how the individual is to meet this dual set of obligations than do the Party directives. In either case it is the individual who must provide the answer. I venture to suggest what this answer is likely to be: the very necessity of having to acquire a kind of tough worldly wisdom in order to survive and succeed puts the individual on his mettle, and thus he is driven after all to evince if not a creative, then at least a manipulative, initiative and shrewdness.

To resolve the dilemma in this fashion is to resolve it pragmatically and to treat it as perhaps a young Soviet citizen would as he embarks upon a political or administrative career. And perhaps this is the only way out, for, when examined on a purely theoretical level, the imperatives of Makarenko's ethics remain paradoxical. Individuals cannot become free agents unless their education allows them a measure of doubt, experimentation, and even error: to find the right answer to every question "unwaveringly" is possible only to automatons, and these Makarenko scorned. A liberal critic will remark further that individuals can freely make the common good their object only if that good is stated in terms general enough to solicit individual participation in its definition and clarification. When, on the contrary, a ruling party provides an authoritative definition through a rigidly enforced ideology which applies to every individual action and decison, then personal conviction becomes irrelevant and dangerous besides.

Although the tensions set up by Makarenko's educational ethics and those pervading Soviet social relations correspond rather closely, it is doubtful whether his conceptions of discipline and loyalty coincided with the attributes desired for Party functionaries and activists. Makarenko was above all an educator whose chief aim was to equip the young with consistent criteria that would serve them in making im-

[57] *Ibid.*
[58] *Vorträge über Kindererziehung*, p. 26.

portant decisions. Thus, in his repeated discussion of discipline and loyalty he seems to be thinking of a stock of moral principles and shared understandings rather than of "complete flexibility" which compels Party functionaries to move promptly as changing Party directives dictate. Even though in fairness to Makarenko this distinction should be made, it may still be objected that he must have been aware that the values he taught could find application only as the power requirements of a ruling party prescribed.

IX. THE UNREGENERACY OF THE NEW SOVIET MAN

Depsite his frequent affirmations that a distinctly new type of education had evolved in the Soviet Union, Makarenko was unable to conclude his career on anything like a note of certainty. After two decades of arduous labor in educational theory and practice, he had to admit that the remaking of human nature was still a very distant goal; although he asserted that soon there would be no more incorrigibles, this optimism could not conceal the fact that great obstacles remained in the path of Communist education.

The most formidable of these, by his own account, were old ideas, values, and habits derived from Christianity and an individualistic ethical tradition. What made them so difficult to eradicate was their subtlety: they rarely manifested themselves in obvious or blatant ways. Makarenko was above all disturbed by certain modes of feeling.

> Sentimentality, tender languor, the need to take pleasure in a good action, to cry over a good deed, without thought where such sentimentality will lead us—this amounts to the greatest cynicism in practical life. These remnants are still with us. This one is kind. That one forgives all. This one is too convivial, and that one too tender. The true Soviet citizen understands that all these are manifestations of a weak ethics of "the good" and contradict our revolutionary work... we must not speak of ideals, of "the good," of the perfect personality, or of the perfect deed. We must always think in a prosaic sort of way in terms of the practical requirements of today and tomorrow... Our ethics should be prosaic and businesslike, adapted to our normal everyday behavior.[59]

Makarenko condemned adultery, drinking, impulsive behavior, "poetic disorder," and the bohemianism of Russian intellectuals. He was disturbed by the continued use of profanity, "a cheap, wretched, utterly petty foulness, a sign of the most savage and most primitive culture."[60] All these stood in the way of a reorganization of social life in which sobriety, punctuality, accuracy, and a "strict and even severe consistency" acquired a beauty and poetry of their own.

[59] "Kommunisticheskoe Vospitanie i Povedenie," *OKV*, p. 104.
[60] *Talks to Parents*, p. 305.

The extirpation of the deeper and more subtle remnants of the past in human motivation was made all the more difficult by the fact that those who harbored them were "usually sincere Soviet people who do not even know the enemy they carry within themselves."[81] Speech and action afforded an inadequate basis for judging whether a person had successfully acquired the new ethics. The great purges proved, Makarenko said, that many were skillful in the arts of dissimulation and verbal camouflage. Thus he too was affected by that boundless suspicion which neither rational nor empirical means could allay.

As we know, the police terror of those years did not spare even Old Bolsheviks, devoted supporters of Stalin, and members of the Party Central Committee, but proceeded on the assumption that Party membership served as a protective cover for wreckers, spies, murderers, and deviationists. Terrorism and indiscriminate persecution helped Stalin to intimidate the entire population and to fortify his power beyond all opposition and criticism. But it is difficult to see what Makarenko's purpose was in magnifying the "sinfulness" of Soviet people. The only answer perhaps, and a lame one at that, is that he sought to spur Soviet educators to new and unparalleled efforts. But what methods of eradicating the past promised complete success? Should those remnants be ignored and allowed to die of themselves? Should they be repressed? Should offenders be persuaded to mend their ways? He did not really know.

It is rather pathetic to see a man who was clear and firm in defining and proposing aims and methods of socialist education reduced to helplessness before a problem which his own suspicion had magnified into something insurmountable. There was nothing he could suggest but a reversion to what he had recommended years ago. Already, in *The Road to Life,* he had expressed the hope that a foolproof educational technology would be devised to make it possible to study "the resistance of personalities to educational measures." He now reaffirmed this hope: "The most important task confronting us is the building up of Communist traditions of behavior."[82] The implication here as before is that the results of educational measures would become more predictable if they relied less on consciousness and depended rather on habituation and conditioning. Makarenko, in his study of the history of education, had learned that every educational system of the past was defective in the sense that it did not provide sufficient control over all the contributing factors and conditions. He referred to the pre-

[81] "O Kommunisticheskoi Etike," *OKV,* p. 81.
[82] *Ibid.,* p. 88.

Revolutionary priests' seminaries of the Russian Orthodox Church, in which attendance was restricted and education was well organized; but still the seminaries did not prevent atheists, cynics, and even revolutionaries from entering the ranks of the priesthood. He was fanatically determined that Communist education should succeed where other systems had failed, and should turn out "absolutely reliable products."

The radical consistency with which Makarenko sought a solution to the problem of Communist education was without parallel among Soviet educators of the Stalin era, and it did not receive effective support from the Party leadership. The latter often stressed the desirability of producing a new and superior type of man, just as it periodically complained about the backwardness of the educational sector of the socialist front. But it never sanctioned or instituted the consistent body of educational measures that its avowed aims required. Contrary to Makarenko, who advised total character formation in a tightly controlled collective, the Party leadership contented itself with requiring ideological instruction. And when the results proved disappointing, vain attempts at revitalizing the required courses, and criticism of those who taught them, were the customary "remedies" to which the leadership resorted. This difference in the two conceptions of Communist education as total character formation and as ideological instruction derives from differences in outlook and professional preoccupation. Makarenko remained at bottom a revolutionary idealist who wanted the spirit of the Revolution to be speedily embodied in a new and higher type of human experience, and the realization of this goal was for him the primary purpose of education. The Party leadership, on the contrary, was preoccupied with the problem of achieving maximum power over Soviet society rather than with a fundamental remaking of human nature; to this end it was sufficient that education, besides supplying trained and specialized manpower, should achieve a high degree of ideological orthodoxy. A quotation from Stalin's last work illustrates the distinction.

> The fact is that we, the leading core, are joined every year by thousands of new and young forces who are ardently desirous of assisting us and ardently desirous of proving their worth, but who do not possess an adequate Marxist education, are unfamiliar with many truths that are well known to us, and are therefore compelled to grope in the darkness. They are staggered by the colossal achievements of Soviet government, they are dazzled by the extraordinary successes of the Soviet system, and they begin to imagine that Soviet government can "do anything," that "nothing is beyond it," that it can abolish scientific laws and form new ones. What are we to do with these comrades? How are we to educate them in Marxism-Leninism? I think

studies suggest that Russians are ridden by guilt and driven by shame. They experience guilt because they are afraid of being found out and punished for actual and still more for possible transgressions (questioning by the secret police proceeds on the assumption of a person's guilt); and they experience shame because they are afraid of being scorned and eventually abandoned by the group for failing to measure up to its expectations.[53] To these motives should be added that of fear: intimidation is still widely used to compel compliance. Makarenko, too, made use of guilt, shame, and fear in binding his morally unstable delinquents to the youth collective. The motivations he employed were far more complex than his theory anywhere admits. The main object of the theory was to demonstrate how collective discipline may be established and maintained, and in this respect his theory was in complete agreement with the ideological pressure which the Party leadership exerts both on its own functionaries and on government officials. A ruthless and driving pragmatism passes over the psychic dimension of life, action and achievement are made to depend on will power alone, and the productivity of work is reckoned in "objective" social terms which ignore the psychic cost to individuals. When this cost is taken into account, the proud declarations of "respect for man" by Gorky and Makarenko seem rhetorical.

This analysis of Soviet character and emotional life, which is admittedly somewhat speculative, is supported by sociological studies that locate the sources of insecurity, mistrust, and hostility in the methods by which power over people is exercised. A permanent national emergency resulting from capitalist encirclement is alleged to exist, and, with this as justification, the utmost in work performance and material production as well as in ideological vigilance and loyalty is exacted from all citizens in responsible positions. In order to control the achievement of both Party and government personnel a double hierarchy of authority or a double system of directives is used, and it is manipulated in such a way as to expose individuals to a crossfire of instructions which are difficult and sometimes impossible to follow.

This system of controls is referred to in a general way in studies of Soviet society.[54] But the most thorough analysis of its operation with

[53] In distinguishing between the two concepts, I am following Piers in Gerhart Piers and Milton B. Singer, *Shame and Guilt: A Psychoanalytic and a Cultural Study* (Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1953).

[54] See Merle Fainsod, *How Russia Is Ruled* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), chaps. xii, xv; and W. W. Rostow, *The Dynamics of Soviet Society* (New York: New American Library of World Literature, 1954), Part 2, chaps. x–xii.

which Soviet education and society had to guard. For in later life they often reverted to petty bourgeois ways, obtained jobs through connections, tended to cultivate their own gardens and drop their membership in organizations, neither attended meetings nor read newspapers, and even became petty speculators.[85]

Makarenko's apprehensions on this score were well founded. The behavior he condemned was not eliminated from Soviet life, and a few years after his death the continued and widespread lapses from socialist morality were officially acknowledged. Certain pronouncements of Zhdanov concerning Soviet intellectual life prompted renewed emphasis on the necessity for socialist criticism and self-criticism. Although these terms had been in use before, they now served to develop the formal ideological thesis that Marxist socialism, because it was scientific, shared with all sciences the attributes of being inherently self-corrective and progressive; and that criticism and self-criticism were the particular mechanisms on which Soviet society had to rely for its forward movement and for sustaining the principles of Communist morality.[86]

Although there is no evidence that Makarenko's educational ideas helped to formulate this thesis, several striking analogies between the two exist. The thesis of criticism and self-criticism rests on the premises that socialist society is not exempt from contradictions and that these, far from damaging it, are needed to propel it forward into communism. Criticism and self-criticism are the tools of the unending dialectic by which contradictions are uncovered and overcome. Contradictions are held to arise in all spheres of socialist life, and even the ideological classics themselves are not exempt: on several occasions Engels was shown to be in error by Stalin or by the Central Committee. But contradictions are particularly important in industrial production. Strong emphasis is placed on the radical difference between the contradictions manifested in capitalism and those occurring in socialism. In the former, contradictions mean ruinous competition and economic crises; in the latter, they spur a people to ever greater common efforts and achievements.

The standing contradiction between socialist production and socialist consumption is admitted: the needs of the masses may outgrow the productive capacity of Soviet industry and agriculture at any time. This deficiency serves to arouse the workers, who, dissatisfied with their

[85] "Probleme der sowjetischen Erziehung in der Schule," *APS*, p. 53.

[86] M. A. Leonov, *Kritik und Selbstkritik*, trans. by W. Fickenscher (Berlin: Verlag Kultur und Fortschritt, n.d. [1947?]). For a first-hand account of self-criticism in a Komintern school in Soviet Russia, see Wolfgang Leonhard, *Child of the Revolution*, trans. by C. M. Woodhouse (Chicago: Regnery, 1958).

previous achievements, seek to expand productive capacity by such means as socialist competition, the Stakhanov and activist movements, and, more recently, personal pledges to fulfill production quotas ahead of time. These and other forms of criticism and self-criticism do not, of course, develop spontaneously and automatically, but under the leadership and orientation of the Party.[87] Yet at the same time—and here, incidentally, is a contradiction which is not part of the official thesis—the leaders take care to present the self-criticism of the masses as coming "from below," as beginning "somehow of itself," as Stalin said in his address to the All-Union Conference of Stakhanovites in 1935, "without any pressure whatsoever from the administrators of our enterprises." In fact, Stakhanov, Busygin, Mussinsky, and the other heroes of socialist labor were called heroes not only because of their phenomenal output, but also because they were lone protagonists beset by the opposition both of managers and of "certain workers." Stakhanov was "jeered at and hounded . . . because of his 'new-fangled ideas.' "[88]

This kind of contradiction illustrates the official thesis, and the removal of the contradiction is taken to demonstrate the scientific, progressive character of socialism. The progressive section of the working class uncovers, on the one hand, outmoded production techniques maintained by plant engineers, and overly conservative estimates of managers; on the other hand, it helps liquidate low work norms, violations of discipline, and the inertia of the more backward workers. That hostility and resentment may be aroused among the masses by these heroes of socialist labor is obliquely acknowledged by Stalin in the speech just referred to, but such emotions are prevented from finding organized expression. According to the official thesis, criticism of the backward masses by the more progressive section of the working class is a form of help extended to them in the interest of social progress. Thus the progressive elements are held responsible for the rest of the population.

While fulfilling these economic and social functions, criticism and self-criticism serve also as a continuing education in Communist morality. They are the chief discipline by which men become intolerant of their shortcomings and make ever greater demands upon themselves and others to satisfy their material as well as their spiritual needs. This self-critical attitude guards society against the kind of friendship and "mutual understanding" that allows those in responsible positions

[87] Leonov, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
[88] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 530.

to cover up their mistakes and misjudgments, and it counteracts the desire of officials and administrators "to live in peace." Thus the individual's attitude toward criticism and self-criticism becomes the touchstone of his socialist consciousness, which consists in putting the public interest above his own comfort. By constantly criticizing himself and his fellow workers, he is said to participate in socialist government.

It is clear that Makarenko's educational methods and ideas are fundamentally in tune with this view of socialist ethics, even though he did not use precisely the same language. There is, for example, his dictum that severity toward oneself and others is the highest expression of love for humanity, overriding all considerations of personal sensitivity. This is particularly evident in his condemnation of the tactful teacher who tried to spare a schoolboy public exposure for a petty crime. There is his system of socialist competition between the detachments of the colony in which the laggards are under great pressure not to spoil the group's record, and all the members of the collective exercise mutual vigilance over each other's conduct. His "system of perspectives" opened possibilities of unlimited growth to the individual in the service of the community by the deferment and denial of gratification and the rejection of the pleasure principle. Makarenko differentiated between the collective and a club or "a society of friends who have come to an agreement among each other,"[60] and who live a somewhat secluded life. He claimed to know, perhaps more intuitively than empirically, that any youth collective that begins with a nucleus of less than seven members will inevitably deteriorate into "an isolated group of friends and bosom friends." However, he did not want his collectives to turn into mere crowds, and guarded against this by asserting his own firm leadership, and instituting traditions and rituals which a nucleus of members could preserve.

From recurrent complaints in recent Russian newspapers and periodicals, it would seem that criticism and self-criticism will continue to find ample material in the behavior in all ranks of Soviet society. Apathy to ideology among the masses remains widespread; among the intelligentsia there is a partial evasion of it; and Soviet youth have been impatient with the repetition of ideological clichés.

The loyalty of the intellectuals is first of all to the values inherent in their work. Such loyalty cannot be practiced or displayed openly, but must be combined with confessions of orthodoxy and protected by cautious behavior. With such protective coloring, however, it is possible to satisfy one's intellectual curiosity and take pride in one's

[60] *Einige Schlussfolgerungen* . . . , p. 30.

work, especially where, as in certain sciences, it is little affected by political pressures. Since such spiritual satisfactions depend on scholarly and scientific competence, there is, as Milosz has observed, a great impetus toward education in the Soviet Union and in Soviet-dominated countries.[70] The state in its turn reaps advantages from having qualified workers, and, in spite of periodically denouncing the apolitical tendencies among the intelligentsia, maintains high educational and professional standards. The Soviet intelligentsia, however, continue to express discontent over the unending interference with their work by Party functionaries and bureaucrats. As economic productivity and wealth increase and the general level of education rises, it will become more difficult to confine the intelligence, tastes, and interests of the people within a system of formalistic ideology or a system of Spartan morals such as Makarenko proposed.

The critical temper of university students has been mentioned. Among the rest of Soviet youth, symptoms of boredom and indifference toward the required code of ethics may be observed. In the larger cities, small groups of *stilyagi*, children of the upper ranks of the new state bourgeoisie, flaunt their sartorial eccentricities, collect American jazz records, and imitate American slang. More widespread is a hooliganism which manifests itself in drunkenness, rude behavior, and occasional violence, although official campaigns against it have been under way since 1953.[71] The Komsomol youth organization seems powerless to cope with this decline in youthful morals, and many Komsomol members are in fact found among the offenders. The reason is perhaps that the nature of this youth organization, once a bulwark of revolutionary faith and activism, has changed as a result of a greatly increased membership. The more than twenty million young Russians who belong to it today seem to regard membership largely as a matter of social respectability and prudence.

The increasingly hierarchical organization of Soviet society has reinstated aspirations and values which, on the one hand, narrow the differences between the behavior of Soviet citizens and that of the members of Western liberal societies, and, on the other hand, closely resemble the remnants of the past which Makarenko sought to extirpate. An elaborate system of social stratification has come to be recognized in the Soviet Union, which distinguishes as many as ten classes in terms of income, status, authority, and education.[72] The upper classes in this

[70] Milosz, *The Captive Mind*, p. 66.

[71] Edward Crankshaw, *Russia without Stalin* (New York: Viking, 1956). The appendix contains translations from the Soviet press of articles on disorderly youth.

[72] Alex Inkeles, "Social Stratification and Mobility in the Soviet Union: 1940–1950," *American Sociological Review*, XV (Aug., 1950), 465–479.

system are composed of the various ranks of the intelligentsia, a broad term which includes Party, military, administrative, managerial, scientific, artistic, and professional elite. A new state bourgeoisie seems to be in the process of formation, favored by a low inheritance tax which does not exceed 10 per cent and a flat income tax of 13 per cent on all incomes above 1,000 rubles a month.

Access to most of the elite groups is obtained through higher educational institutions which have more applicants than vacancies. In the leading institutions preparing for the coveted occupations in engineering and science, there may be as many as twelve applicants for each vacancy.[73] Entrance to all institutions of higher learning is by competitive examination, except for those who have completed secondary school with excellent grades. This highly selective educational system is still a major factor in upward social mobility, but inequalities of educational opportunity exist. They work to the advantage of the children of the intelligentsia and upper bureaucracy who reside in the large cities and have access to better schools than do the masses of workers and peasants. These children further enjoy the economic support of their parents, and even though fees for the last three grades of secondary school, in force since 1940, were abolished in 1952, such support is decisive for the completion of general education and for advanced study. It has been estimated that in the postwar period less than 10 per cent of the children of *kolkhozniks* got beyond the seventh grade.[74]

The educational implications of these conditions are obvious. Because the life of the lower classes is hard and drab, they aspire to advance into a class which, in addition to being better rewarded and socially respected, provides its members with certain privileges and amenities. Since advancement depends on scholastic achievement in the ten-year school, the acquisition of knowledge takes precedence over both political and character education. Makarenko reproached the public schools for failing in these respects and for not developing a strong collective spirit, but he seems not to have understood that the true causes for these failures lay in social trends beyond the control of teachers and principals. As long as these trends continue, educational practices in the Soviet Union are likely to move away from the aim he wanted to realize.

This does not mean, however, that Makarenko's work will be ignored.

[73] Nicholas DeWitt, *Soviet Professional Manpower: Its Education, Training, and Supply* (Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1955), p. 103.

[74] Irving Rosow, "Educational Patterns in the Soviet Union" (unpublished MS, Russian Research Center, Harvard University, 1954), p. 70.

Polytechnical education, which was revived at the Nineteenth Party Congress in 1952 and has reëntered the curriculum since 1955, and the new boarding schools which opened in 1956 are educational trends of some promise that Makarenko's work will continue to be a living heritage in the Soviet Union. Far from being Soviet Etons and Harrows, as the foreign press suggested, these boarding schools are intended primarily for children who are neglected at home and threaten to become a problem and a burden to society: orphans, children of unmarried mothers or working parents, children in large families, and the like. The cost of education in these schools is high (800 rubles per child per year), but parents pay no more than 5 per cent of this sum, and some children are admitted free. According to Deputy Minister Zimin, whom I interviewed in April, 1958, only a small, gradual increase in the number of these schools is planned. There are 276 at present in the R.S.F.S.R., with an enrollment of 68,000 pupils. Makarenko no doubt would have preferred to see them become universal, for it is true that they come closer to giving a socialist education than do the day schools.

I spent a morning in one of the Moscow boarding schools and found that strenuous efforts are being made to build up a school tradition and to stimulate group competition. When I asked the director if he had taken Makarenko as his model, he answered with a qualified yes. Here, as in other schools I visited, it was pointed out that Makarenko worked under conditions rather different from those prevailing in Soviet schools today. Although the directors spoke of him with admiration, they are seeking to capture the spirit of his achievements without copying him literally. One reason for their reservation may be that, in their opinion, Makarenko was insufficiently aware that schools are primarily places for the acquisition of knowledge. Even though the boarding schools promise to balance learning with character education, there can be little doubt that as they grow into full-fledged secondary schools—they comprise only seven grades thus far—they cannot afford to compare unfavorably with the level of achievement in the common Soviet middle school, which is still an old-fashioned learning school by English and American standards.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL POSTSCRIPT

DURING my stay as Fulbright scholar in Germany (winter, 1957–58), several studies on Makarenko not available in the United States came to my attention. They are here summarized and commented on.

Leonhard Froese, *Ideengeschichtliche Triebkräfte der russischen und sowjetischen Pädagogik.* Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer, 1956.

In this history of Russian and Soviet educational thought, two chapters deal with Makarenko's contribution (Part 2, chaps. iii, iv). The book is based on a thorough knowledge of Russian and Soviet educational literature, which makes Froese *the* German authority on Russian education past and present.

The decisive question for Froese is whether Makarenko's work has a value that transcends its particular use to Soviet society. He answers emphatically in the affirmative: under adverse conditions, Makarenko is said to have defended the principle of the autonomy of education. His sense of moral responsibility and his dedication to the welfare of youth abandoned by everyone else demonstrate an educational, not a political, motive. The same must be said of the forms of collective life he created; and the categories of his educational thought ("perspective," "pedagogical mastery," "collective," etc.), even though they may have a double and ideologically useful meaning, should be examined without prejudice by Western educators, for they may prove fruitful.

Because Froese is intent on giving the universal and positive elements of Makarenko's work their due, he fails to elaborate its peculiar fitness to serve the aims of Stalinism. Had he dealt with this as well, his final condemnation of Makarenko for having "sacrificed his educational system and especially his charges on the altar of politics" would be more intelligible to the reader.

Several Soviet studies on Makarenko that were not available to me have been used by Froese and are listed in his bibliography. They add a certain amount of biographical material about Makarenko's childhood, youth, and pre-Revolutionary teaching, but seem to contain nothing that would cause me to alter my interpretation or my conclusions.

Leonhard Froese, "Das sowjetische Bildungsideal mit besonderer Berücksichtigung A. S. Makarenkos," *Ostpädagogik,* no. 11 (1957), 76–91.

A well-rounded discussion of Makarenko's aims as related to Soviet education at large. In this paper Froese does justice to the dual aspect of Makarenko's work. The author speaks of Makarenko's "political naïveté" in accepting extraneous ideological aims which prevented him from realizing his earnest educational efforts.

H. H. Groothoff, "A. S. Makarenko und das Problem der Selbstentfremdung in der europäischen und der sowjetischen Pädagogik," special reprint from *Marxismusstudien,* 2.Folge. Tübingen: Mohr, n.d., pp. 227–265.

The philosophical basis of Makarenko's work is the Marxian thesis of man's self-alienation: man can no longer be himself, but is degraded to an instrument of production. Makarenko's educational theory seeks to overcome this alienation and thereby challenges Western individualism, in which man seeks isolation from, and power over, others. This is an abuse of freedom as much as collectivism, in which man becomes a particle of a mass. After a very sympathetic interpretation, Groot-

hoff declares that Makarenko's work is ambiguous and questionable: although his youth collective may be understood as a moral community committing the individual to a necessary order, it is also a justification of the Soviet political order. Thus Makarenko's collective is no solution of the problem of man's self-alienation because it deprives him of his selfhood.

Elisabeth Heimpel, *Das Jugendkollektiv A. S. Makarenkos.* Würzburg: Werkbund Verlag, 1956.

By limiting her account to the two youth colonies directed by Makarenko, the author isolates his work from the political ideology and social dynamics of the Soviet Union. Thus the youth collectives become "pedagogical provinces," and the Dzershinsky Commune is seen as an island in the sea of Stalinism. As a result, the conflicts between educational and political aims are overlooked, and Makarenko appears as the latest "post-Christian" exponent of a long Western tradition, successfully harmonizing the individual's claim to self-realization with the claims of society.