WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

N.K. KRUPSKAYA

ON EDUCATION

SELECTED ARTICLES AND SPEECHES

ISBN: 978-1-387-51946-0

Translated from the Russian
by: G.P. Ivanov-Mumjiev

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE
MOSCOW 1957

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE
OTTAWA 2022

N.K. KRUPSKAYA

CONTENTS

SCHOOL AND POLYTECHNICAL EDUCATION

SELF-EDUCATION

MY LIFE

THE REMOTE PAST

I was born in 1869. My parents, though of noble birth, had neither house nor home, and after their marriage often had to borrow money to buy food.

Mother was an orphan. She studied on a scholarship and went to work as a governess straight from the institute.

FATHER

Father's parents died early and he was educated at a military school and then at a military college, from which he graduated as an officer. Discontent was rife among the officers in those days. Father read a lot, did not believe in God, and knew all about the socialist movement in the West. While he was alive revolutionaries — first Nihilists, then Narodniks and lastly members of the People's Will — were frequent visitors in the house. I don't know whether he himself took an active part in the revolutionary movement. I was only fourteen when he died, and, moreover, revolutionary activity at that time called for strict secrecy, so that revolutionaries spoke very little of their work. Whenever talk turned to this subject, I would be sent away on some errand. Still, I heard enough about it and my sympathies, naturally, were on the side of the revolutionaries.

Father was an impulsive man and could not tolerate injustice. As a young officer, he had to take part in suppressing the 1863 uprising in Poland. But he was

not much of a pacifier: he released Polish prisoners, helped them to escape and did everything to minimize the victories that the Tsarist army won over the Polish people who were fighting against the unbearable oppression of Russian Tsarism. After this military campaign, Father entered the Military Law Academy, finished it and went to Poland as chief of the district administration. He always held that only honest people should be sent to that country. There were outrageous goings-on in the district when he arrived there: Jews were being dragged into the square where their sidelocks were cut off to the beat of the drum; Poles were forbidden to fence off their cemetery and pigs were herded there and allowed to dig up graves. Father put an end to all that. He set up a model hospital and persecuted bribe-takers, and thus earned the hatred of the gendarmes and Russian officials, and the love of the population, especially of the Poles and needy Jews.

Soon Father was made the target of anonymous accusations. He was proclaimed a political suspect, dismissed without being told why and put on trial. There were 22 charges brought against him: he was accused of speaking Polish, dancing the mazurka, failing to illuminate his office on the Tsar's birthday, refusing to go to church, etc., and deprived of the right to serve in government offices. The case dragged on for ten years and was reviewed by the Senate which finally acquitted Father, actually on the eve of his death.

HOW I CAME TO HATE AUTOCRACY

I came to hate national oppression early in life

when I saw that the Jews, Poles and other peoples were not a whit worse than the Russians, and that was why, when I grew up, I accepted whole-heartedly the programme of the Russian Communist Party which claimed for the nations the right to live and govern themselves as they wished. I thought the programme was quite correct in recognizing the right of nations to self-determination.

I was very young when I realized how despotic and high-handed Tsarist officials were, and later I became a revolutionary and fought autocracy.

Dismissed from government service, Father took any job that came his way: he worked as an insurance agent, as a factory inspector, took on court cases, etc. We were forever moving from town to town and I saw all sorts of people and how they lived.

Mother often told me how she had worked as a governess in a landowner's family, how landlords treated peasants, how brutal they were with them. One summer, while Father was looking for a job, Mother took me on a visit to the landlord's family where she had worked as a governess. Although I was only five then, I caused a lot of trouble, refused to greet our hostess or say goodnight to her or thank her after the meals, so that Mother was very glad when Father finally came and took us away from Rusanovo (as the estate was called). By that time winter had set in and on our way our hooded sleigh was stopped by peasants who took us for a landlord family, beat up the coachman and threatened to drown us all in an ice hole.

Father did not hold it against them. He said that he understood their age-old hatred for the landlords

and added that the latter fully deserved it.

In Rusanovo I made friends with peasant children and their mothers, who liked me. I was on the side of the peasants. I never forgot what Father had said, and it is easy to understand why, when I had grown up, I favoured the confiscation of the landlords' estates and their distribution among the peasants.

I learned to hate factory owners almost just as early (I was six then). Father worked as an inspector at the Howard Factory in Uglich and I often heard him speak of the awful goings-on there, of how the workers were exploited, and so on.

I played with workers' children, and we always did our best to hit the manager with a snowball from behind a corner.

I was eight when the war with Turkey broke out. We were living in Kiev at the time. I saw the outburst of chauvinistic feeling and heard countless stories of Turkish atrocities, but I also saw wounded Turkish prisoners, played with a Turkish boy who had been taken by our troops and realized that war was the worst thing possible.

One day Father took me to an exhibition of paintings by Vereshchagin. One of the pictures showed staff officers and some grand duke, dressed in white jackets and armed with field-glasses, watching from a safe place how our soldiers were dying on the battlefield. I did not understand everything then, but later, during World War I, I sympathized wholeheartedly with the army when it refused to go on fighting.

"TIMOFEIKA"

One spring, when I was eleven, I was sent to the countryside. Father was then managing the affairs of the Kosyakovskayas, landowners who had a small stationery-factory in Pskov Gubernia. The affairs were all tangled up, and Father had been putting them straight. The Kosyakovskayas needed him badly and treated him very nicely.

I had been seriously ill that spring and the Kosyakovskayas offered to take me to their estate some 25 miles from the Belaya Station. The estate was called "Studenets." My parents agreed. I was rather shy before strangers, but it was wonderful driving there through a forest and past fields, with immortelles dotting the hillsides and the fragrance of soil and greenery in the air.

I spent the first night in a luxurious bed in one of the beautifully furnished guest rooms. But it was stiflingly hot, so I got up and opened a window. The room was immediately filled with the fragrance of lilac; somewhere a nightingale was singing. I remained long at the window. The next morning I got up very early and went into the garden that sloped down to the river. There I met a girl in a simple cotton dress. She was about eighteen and had a low forehead and dark wavy hair. She introduced herself as the local teacher, Alexandra Timofeyevna, or "Timofeika," as she was called. Ten minutes later we were good friends and I told her of my impressions. She taught in the school kept by the landowners and the senior class, in which there were five pupils — Ilyusha, Senya, Mitya, Vanya and Pavel — was preparing for the exams. I often went there and vied with the boys in solving problems, or read with them. It was jolly.

"Timofeika" had many children's books in her room and I helped her to patch them up. She always had visitors on Sundays — adolescents and youths — and we read Nekrasov. "Timofeika" told us many stories, and I gathered that landlords were very bad, that they never helped the peasants, but, on the contrary, exploited them. That convinced me that the peasants should be helped. I did not like the Kosyakovsakayas. They were so pompous. The mother always dressed in white, spoke through her teeth, grumbled at the servants and I just could not get used to her.

NAZIMOVA AND HER DOGS

I began to dislike landlords even more after my visit to a nearby estate where I went with the Kosyakovskayas, "Timofeika" and the five senior pupils who were to take their exams there.

The estate belonged to Nazimova. Everybody flattered the rich woman. When she went to church, she always slipped 25 rubles to the priest after kissing his hand and that was why he never started the service without her.

The exams were held at the school and the pupils were questioned by the priest and a visiting school inspector. The boys were scared. Ilyusha was so frightened he misspelled the word "*shchi*."[1] That was too much for me. I made a point to go and tell him to correct the mistake. "Timofeika" told me to be quiet and not to meddle; she herself was worried. The boys passed the exams all right. It took Ilyusha a long time

[1] *Shchi* — Russian cabbage soup.

to get over his fright; he was pale and trembled like a leaf. After the exams we were invited by Nazimova to dinner. I was struck by the number of pet dogs she had. They jumped on chairs, ran about the room. When we sat down to the table, there appeared two barefooted girls. Nazimova first poured out soup for the dogs and the girls served each its plate. After that we got ours. There was luxury in everything. The garden was beautifully laid out, with gorgeous rosebushes girding the pond. Yet I felt bored and was very glad to leave. "Yes," I thought, "'Timofeika' is right when she says that we could get along without landlords." I had heard Father say the same thing.

"Timofeika" always took me with her when she visited nearby villages with books for the peasants. She talked to them, but I could not grasp everything she said.

Then "Timofeika" went somewhere for a month.

WITH FACTORY WORKERS

Meanwhile, Father and Mother took up lodging near the factory, a mile or so from the Kosyakovskayas' estate, and I went to live with them. There I made friends with some youngsters working at the factory (Ilyusha was also employed there) and often spent hours helping them to stack up quires and reams of wrapping paper. I also became friends with the old man who brought firewood to the factory. He allowed me to drive his horse standing in the cart, and I liked that very much. We would go to the forest and there I would help him to load the cart. Then we would walk alongside the cart to the factory and unload the fire-

wood. Father and Mother used to laugh at my enthusiasm and my scratched hands.

Then there were women who sat all day long under a shed near the factory, singing as they sorted out dirty rags. It was from tattered blue shirts and other unusable old clothes, purchased in the villages by special buyers, that paper was manufactured. I would join the women, sing songs with them and sort out the rags.

One of the women gave me a little hare for a pet which I kept under the stairs. I also had another good friend — a chestnut mongrel called Carson. After dinner I would fill his plate with soup, sour milk, bones and bread, and call him. Carson would come rushing and gobble his meal.

Finally, the time came to leave. I was sorry to part with "Timofeika," who had returned by that time, sorry to part with the children, with the old man, with Aunt Maria, with Carson. When the carriage pulled up at the door and we were already in it, Carson lay down under it and had to be dragged out.

In winter I learned that Carson had been devoured by wolves. That made me very sad.

I often asked about "Timofeika." One day Father told us that her room was raided by the police, who found forbidden literature and a portrait of the Tsar covered with figures — she had used it as a piece of paper to solve some problem. Later I heard that "Timofeika" had been locked up for two years in a windowless cell in the Pskov prison. I never saw her again. Her name was Yavorskaya. That winter, sitting in class, I would draw little houses with the signboard "School" on them and dream of becoming a village

teacher.

Since then I have always been interested in village schools and teaching village children.

MARCH 1, 1881

How could I help sympathizing with the revolutionaries?

I remember very vividly the evening of March 1, 1881, when members of the People's Will assassinated Tsar Alexander II. First some relatives came over; they looked frightened, but said nothing. Then an old classmate of father's, an officer, rushed in panting and gave a detailed description of the assassination, of how the carriage had blown up, etc. "I have already bought some crape for the arm band," he said, showing us the material. I remember how surprised I was that he should want to go into mourning for the Tsar he had always criticized. He was quite a miser, and I thought: "Well, if he has gone to the expense of buying crape, then he's telling the truth." That night I could not sleep. Now that the Tsar had been killed, I thought, everything would be different and people would be free.

But that was not the way things turned out. Everything remained as it had been; in fact, it became worse. The police began arresting members of the People's Will. The Tsar's assassins were executed. On their way to the execution they were taken past my *gymnasium*. In the evening, my uncle described how the rope gave way when Mikhailov was being hanged.

Several revolutionary friends of ours were also seized. Social activity came to a standstill.

STUDYING

At first I studied at home, with Mother for a teacher. I learned to read very early. I loved books, for they revealed a new world to me, and I virtually swallowed one book after another.

I was eager to go to the *gymnasium*, but when I did at ten, I did not like it. The class was a big one: there were about fifty of us. I felt very shy and lost. No one paid any attention to me. The teachers would give us homework, call us out, make us recite, and give us marks. It was against rules to ask questions. The teacher in charge of our class was very unfair: she fussed over rich girls, who came to school in their own carriages, and shouted at and found faults with those who were poorly dressed. But there was something even worse: lack of friendship among the girls, and I felt lonely and bored. I studied hard and knew more than many other girls, but I recited my lessons badly because my mind was always occupied with other things.

Father saw that I did not like the *gymnasium* and transferred me to another — the Obolensky private *gymnasium*.

There things were different. No one shouted at us, the children were allowed a lot of freedom, were chummy and I had many friends. Studying there was much more interesting. I cherish pleasant memories of that *gymnasium* — it gave me much, taught me how to work and made me social-minded.

MAKING A LIVING

Father, with whom I was great friends and to whom I took all my doubts, died when I was fourteen. Mother and I were left all alone. She was a very good, lively woman, but regarded me as a child. And I stubbornly insisted on being independent. We became friends much later, when she began to treat me as an equal. She loved me very much, and we never parted. She sympathized with my revolutionary activity and helped me. The party comrades who came to see me liked Mother. She never let anybody go home without a meal and took care of everyone. When Father died, we had to support ourselves, so I started giving lessons. Mother and I also did some copying work. Then we rented a big house and let rooms. We came into contact with all sorts of people — students, intellectuals, telephone operators, seamstresses, doctors' assistants, etc. Since I was top of the class, I obtained teaching work through the *gymnasium*. The job was not pleasant. Rich people usually looked down on teachers and interfered with their work. I had dreamed of becoming a school teacher after graduation, but could not find a job.

NO WAY OUT?

Meanwhile I read a great deal of Lev Tolstoi. He attacked the idle rich and luxury, criticized the way the country was run, showed how everything was being done to make the life of landowners and the rich people in general pleasant and full and described how workers were dying from overwork and how peasants were breaking their backs in the fields. Tolstoi knew how to describe things very vividly. I thought about

things around me and saw that he was right. From then on I looked at the revolutionary struggle from another angle and saw better why it was being waged. But what could one do? Terrorist activity and the assassinations of rotten officials or of Tsars would not help things. Tolstoi showed the way out — physical labour and self-perfection. I started doing all the household chores; in summer, I worked like a peasant in the fields. I denied myself little luxuries in life, became more attentive to people, more patient with them. But I soon realized that no matter how much I strained myself, this would not change things or do away with injustice. True, I saw how the peasants lived and learned how to speak simply with peasants and workers, but what kind of a way out was that? I thought that the university would show me what to do to change conditions of living and abolish exploitation.

In those days women were not admitted to universities or, for that matter, to any institutions of higher learning. The Tsarina claimed that women should stay at home and look after their husbands and children instead of studying, and ordered the closing of women's medical courses and the Higher Courses for Women. So I studied by myself as best I could.

Eventually, the Higher Courses for Women were reopened in Petersburg. They proved extremely disappointing. Within two months I realized that I would never learn what I wanted to know, because the highly learned things they taught had very little in common with life.

HOW I BECAME A MARXIST

Times were very much different then. There were no good books on social problems, no meetings. The workers were not organized and they had no party of their own. Though twenty, I did not know who Marx was and had not heard either of the labour movement or communism.

One day I happened to attend a student's political circle — the student movement was on the rise then — and that opened my eyes. I stopped going to the courses, began to read Marx and other necessary books. I realized that only a workers' revolutionary movement could change life, and that to be useful, one had to dedicate oneself completely to the workers' cause.

In spring I asked a friend to get me the first volume of Marx's *Capital* and other useful books. It was very hard to come by Marx in those days — you could not have his books issued to you even at the Public Libraries. In addition to *Capital* I got *Essays on Primitive Economic Culture* by N. Sieber, *The Destinies of Capitalism in Russia* by V.V. (V.P. Vorontsov) and *Exploring the North* by Yefimenko.

Early that spring Mother and I had rented a little house in the countryside and I took these books with me. All through the summer I helped our landlord's family who did not have enough hands — washing the children, working in the kitchen garden, raking hay, reaping the harvest. Village life became my chief interest. Often I would wake up in the middle of the night and start worrying that the horses might trample the oat field. In my free time I diligently read *Capital*. The first two chapters were very difficult to understand, but after that it became easier. It was like

drinking spring water. I realized that Tolstoi's idea of self-improvement was no way out. The way out lay in a powerful labour movement.

Early one evening I was sitting on the porch, reading the lines: "The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated." I could hear my heart go thumpety-thump. I was so engrossed, I did not understand what the young nurse, sitting beside me with the landlord's child, was prattling about: "We call it *shchi* and you call it soup; we call it a boat and you call it a skiff; we call it an oar and heaven knows what you call it." And she went on chattering, puzzled by my silence. It never occurred to me then that I would live to see "the expropriators expropriated." That question did not interest me then. What did was that the goal was clear and so was the path to it. And then, every time there was a labour movement outburst — in 1896 (the Petersburg textile strike), on January 9 in 1903-05, in 1912 (the Lena massacre[1]) and in 1917 — I thought of the death hour of capitalism and saw that it had drawn closer. I thought of it at the Second Congress of Soviets too, when land and means of production were proclaimed people's property. How many more steps had to be taken before the final goal was achieved? Would I live to see the last step? I did not know and did not think that important. What was important was that the realization of this dream was possible and close at hand.

[1] On April 4, 1912, the Tsarist government massacred the workers of the Lena gold fields in Siberia. The Russian proletariat replied with mass political strikes and demonstrations, which marked the beginning of a new revolutionary upsurge in 1912-14. — *Ed.*

One could already sense it. It was obvious to all that nothing and no one could prevent its realization. Capitalism was in agony.

THE NEVSKAYA ZASTAVA

I went to circle meetings for three years, learned a lot there and began to take an entirely different view of things. But knowing was not enough; I wanted to work, to be useful. The ties between the students and the workers were very weak. The students were persecuted for mixing with workers. The Tsarist government sought to separate them by a stone wall, and to go and talk with workers students had to disguise themselves. Contact between students and workers was insignificant. So I resolved to become a teacher at a Sunday evening school in Smolenskoye Village beyond the Nevskaya Zastava, now called Volodarsky District.

The school was pretty big, there were some 600 pupils — workers from the Maxwell, Semyannikov and other factories. I went there almost every day.

I established close contacts at that school, made friends with workers and familiarized myself with their life. Regulations in those days were extremely drastic: a visiting inspector could close a refresher course for the simple reason that the pupils were studying fractions instead of the first four rules of arithmetic, as set down in the curriculum, and a worker could be deported for using the words "labour intensification" in a talk with the manager. And yet one could work in this school, for one could say anything so long as one did not use terrible words such as

"Tsarism," "strike" or "revolution." We (more Marxists joined the school in the following year) tried to teach Marxism to our pupils without mentioning Marx's name. I was surprised how easy it was to explain the most difficult things to workers when one spoke from the Marxist viewpoint. The environment was conducive to their taking to Marxism. One autumn, a lad would come from a village. At first, at our "geography" or "grammar" lessons he would stop his ears and read Rudakov's Old or New Testament. By spring, however, you could see him rush after school to a circle meeting, smiling meaningfully when asked where he was going. At a "geography" lesson a worker had only to say that "handicrafts cannot compete with large-scale production" or to ask about "the difference between an Arkhangelsk muzhik and an Ivanovo-Voznesensk worker" for you to know that he was a member of a Marxist circle and that he knew what he meant by these words. They were like a password establishing contact between friends. Anyone using such words would greet you in a peculiar way, as if to say: "You're all right, you're one of us." But even those who did not attend circle meetings and who did not know "the difference between an Arkhangelsk muzhik and an Ivanovo-Voznesensk worker" — even they treated us with touching respect and affection.

"Don't distribute books today," one of my pupils would warn me one day (although usually these books came from the library). "There's a new-comer here, a former monk. Who knows what he's about. We'll learn more about him later..."

"Don't say anything while that dark fellow is around," an elderly worker would warn me. "He's connected with the secret police."

One of the pupils was called up for military service. Before leaving he brought a friend of his from the Putilov Works.

"It's too far for him to come here regularly every evening, but he can come on Sundays, for the 'geography' lesson."

I taught in that school for five years, until I was sent to prison.

In these five years I greatly improved my knowledge of Marxism and threw in my lot with the working class for good.

In the meantime, active Marxists formed an organization, though a weak one at first. They called themselves Social-Democrats, as the German workers' party did. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin came to Petersburg in 1894 and things became livelier, the organization became stronger. Vladimir Ilyich and I worked in the same district and we were soon fast friends. Our organization passed on to widespread agitation with the aid of leaflets. We began to issue illegal pamphlets and were planning to publish a popular illegal magazine. When it was all but ready, Vladimir Ilyich and several other comrades were arrested. That was a serious blow to the organization, but we rallied our forces and continued publishing leaflets. In August 1896, we gave a strike among the weavers all the support we could, helping them to carry it on in an organized way. Many people were arrested after the strike, and I was one of them. In exile I married Vladimir Ilyich. From then on my life followed in the tracks of

his own, and I helped him as best I could in his work. To tell you about that would be to tell the story of the life and work of Vladimir Ilyich. In my émigré years my chief job was to maintain contact with Russia. In 1905-07, I was a secretary of the Central Committee. Since 1917 I have been busy with public education. I like my work in this field, which I think important. To bring the cause of the October Revolution to a successful close the workers and peasants must acquire knowledge. Without it, the latter will not be able consciously to follow the working class; without it, it will take the peasants longer to unite in collective farms. My public education work is closely linked with the Party's propaganda work.

AFTERTHOUGHT

It has been my fortune to watch the working class grow in strength, to watch the growth of its Party, to witness the greatest revolution in the world, to see the birth of a new, socialist system, to see life being completely rebuilt.

I had always been sorry that I had no children of my own. Now I am not, for I have many of them — the Young Communist League members and the Young Pioneers. They are all Leninists, they want to be Leninists.

It is at the request of the Young Pioneers that I have written the autobiography.

And it is to them, to my dear children, that I dedicate it.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA

Selected Pedagogical Works,
1955, pp. 5-18

ARTICLES ABOUT V.I. LENIN

CHILDHOOD AND EARLY YEARS OF ILYICH

In writing about the childhood of Vladimir Ilyich I will rely chiefly on what he told me himself in the course of our life together. True, his absorption with revolutionary activity left him very little time for reminiscing. However, we belonged to the same generation (I was a year older), and we grew up in more or less the same environment — the environment of what was called the commoners. Consequently, his reminiscences, although related in sporadic fashion, told me a good deal.

Vladimir Ilyich was born on April 22, 1870, in the Volga town of Simbirsk and lived there until he reached the age of 17. Although Simbirsk was the administrative centre of a gubernia now, when we look at drawings of the streets, houses and environs of the Simbirsk of those days, we feel what a peaceful and tranquil retreat it was. There were no factories of any kind, not even a railway line; telephones and radio, of course, there were none.

Ilyich's real name was Ulyanov. It was only much later, after he had become a revolutionary and had begun to write, that he assumed the name of Lenin for reasons of conspiracy. Simbirsk has been renamed Ulyanovsk in his memory. Today Ulyanovsk is chiefly a seat of learning. There are many students in the town and there is also a branch of the Lenin Museum.

Vladimir Ilyich's father, Ilya Nikolayevich, came from a lower middle-class family in Astrakhan. He lived in poor circumstances, belonging to the so-called poll-tax paying estate, to whom the road to education

was barred. At the age of seven he became an orphan, and thanks only to the help of an older brother, who spent his last coppers on him, as well as to his remarkable talent and diligence, did Ilya Nikolayevich succeed in rising in the world — he graduated from the *gymnasium* and entered Kazan University which he finished in 1854. He became a teacher — at first a teacher of physics and mathematics in the senior classes of the Penza College for Noblemen and later in the *gymnasiums* for boys and for girls in Nizhny Novgorod; promotion came his way and he was appointed Inspector and, finally, Director of Primary Schools in Simbirsk. Ilya Nikolayevich graduated from Kazan University when the Crimean War was at its height. This war disclosed with particular force the rottenness of serfdom and laid bare the savagery of the Tsarist regime under Nicholas I. This was a time when serfdom and its way of life were subjected to sharp criticism, but the revolutionary movement had not yet taken shape.

In order to really appreciate Ilya Nikolayevich's mettle one should read *Sovremennik*, which was edited jointly by Nekrasov and Panayev, with Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov as active contributors. Vladimir Ilyich and his eldest sister, Anna, often recalled how Ilya Nikolayevich loved Nekrasov's poems. As a teacher Ilya Nikolayevich made a special point of reading Dobrolyubov. At that time the teaching profession was an arena of the struggle against serfdom. In 1856 Dal, who compiled the *Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language*, sharply opposed literacy among the peasantry. A regime of the utmost brutality prevailed in the schools; even in the *gymna-*

siums, where only the children of the nobles and officials were taught, flogging was practised.

Dobrolyubov, it will be recalled, waged a bitter struggle against the school conditions of those days. Dobrolyubov died in 1861, at the age of 25. His article "The Importance of Authority in Education," published in 1857, compared the authority of the teacher in the slave conditions of the school under serfdom with the authority acquired by the teacher who has won the respect of his pupils. Dobrolyubov quoted Pirogov on the role of convictions:

"...Convictions are not easily acquired: 'Only those can have convictions, who *from their earliest years have been trained to look penetratingly into themselves*, who from their earliest years have been trained *to love truth sincerely*, *staunchly to stand up for it*, *and to be unconstrainedly frank* — both with *their teachers* as well as with their fellows.'" Further Dobrolyubov said: "That is why the child is often sacrificed to pedagogical considerations. Mounted on his moral hobbyhorse, the teacher regards his pupil as his property, as a thing to do with as he pleases." But in doing so "he loses sight of one very important circumstance, *viz*., the actual life and nature of children and, in general, of all those who are being educated..." In this article Dobrolyubov passionately denounced blind, slavish, unconditional subordination. "Is it necessary to speak," he wrote, "of the fatal influence the habit of *absolute* obedience exerts upon the development of the will?"

In this same article, in which he points out that the unconditional obedience of the child requires unconditional faultlessness in the teacher, Dobrolyubov

wrote: "But even if we assume that the teacher can always rise above the individuality of the pupil (which happens, although, of course, not always, not by any means) he, at all events, cannot rise above an entire generation. The child is preparing to live in new surroundings, his environment will not be that of 20 or 30 years ago, when his teacher received his education. And usually, a teacher not only fails to foresee, but he simply fails to understand the requirements of the new times and thinks they are absurd."

In this article Dobrolyubov stressed the correct ideas of Pirogov, surgeon and educator, but, when Pirogov trailed in the wake of reactionaries and insisted on punishment, including flogging and expulsion from school as a means of inculcating respect for law and order, Dobrolyubov did not hesitate to denounce him with all the passion at his command.

Nekrasov, of whom Lenin's father, Ilya Nikolayevich, was so fond, dedicated a poem to Dobrolyubov, in which he said:

You never satisfied the craving of your heart;
But like a woman you loved your native land.
Your aspirations, labours and your art
You gave to it; you gathered round its shrine
All pure and honest souls; to a new life
Of joy, and love, and liberty divine
You called your land so full of grief and strife.
But all too early struck your fatal hour,
No more shall shed its light that noble mind
Which spoke with words of such unequalled power,
That heart which yearned to liberate mankind.

Ilya Nikolayevich also greatly admired Dobrolyubov, a factor which influenced his work both as Director of Primary Schools in Simbirsk Gubernia and as educator of his son, Lenin, and of his other children, all of whom became revolutionaries.

At the time Ilya Nikolayevich began work in Simbirsk Gubernia the peasantry were almost 100 per cent illiterate. Thanks to his efforts the number of schools in the gubernia rose to 450; he carried on an enormous amount of work among the teachers. Schools were not opened merely by giving orders: he travelled to the villages, experiencing the discomfort of riding in carts and sleeping in roadside inns; there were endless arguments with local officials and talks and meetings with peasants. Ilyich listened eagerly to his father's stories about village life. As a child he had heard about the village from his nurse, to whom he was very devoted, and also from his mother, who grew up in the countryside.

Thanks to this upbringing, Ilyich, from his earliest years, gave close attention to village life; it left its stamp on his entire activity as a revolutionary, and it enabled him, after studying Marxism, to realize that socialism could triumph even in our backward Russia with its numerous and impoverished peasantry, enabled him correctly to outline the path of struggle which has led our great country to victory.

Ilya Nikolayevich grew up in Astrakhan in close contact with life. As Director of Primary Schools he devoted special attention to the job of imparting knowledge to the numerous *inorodtsi*, as the non-Russian inhabitants of Simbirsk Gubernia were then contemptuously called.

In 1937 I received a letter from Ivan Zaitsev, a Chuvash, teacher in a seven-year school in Polevo-Sundyr (Chuvash Autonomous Republic). Zaitsev has spent 55 of his 77 years teaching in Chuvash schools and has been honoured with the titles of Hero of Labour and Distinguished Educator. He is an active public worker; he taught in classes for abolishing illiteracy and semi-literacy, was Chairman of the Educational Workers' Union and member of the village Soviet and local trade-union council, collected agricultural data, acted as an instructor during census-taking, helped at the local meteorological station, and so on.

Ivan Zaitsev's father was a farm labourer. As a boy, until the age of 13, Ivan tended geese. He thirsted for education and ran away from home in order to enter school. It took him two days to get to Simbirsk, and although late for the beginning of the term, he succeeded, thanks to the help of Ilya Nikolayevich Ulyanov, who took pity on the boy. In his letter Zaitsev related how on one occasion, during his first year, Ilya Nikolayevich attended an arithmetic lesson. He called Zaitsev to the blackboard. After Zaitsev had solved the problem and told how he had done it, Ilya Nikolayevich said to him: "Excellent, go back to your seat."

"After the recess," the letter went on, "we were told to write a composition on the topic 'One of Today's Impressions.' The teacher said that we could write about any event from school life which we considered important. In a word, we could write as we pleased.

"The pupils paused a few minutes thinking about

the topic. Some of them recalled funny episodes, while others tried to think up something. I had no difficulty in choosing a topic because I couldn't forget Ilya Nikolayevich's visit during the arithmetic lesson and his explanation of the problem. And so I decided to write about this.

"I wrote: 'Today at 9 o'clock in the morning, during the arithmetic lesson, we received a visit from Director Ulyanov. I was called to the blackboard and given a problem in which the word *grivennik*[1] was repeated several times. I wrote out the problem, read it over, and began to think about how to solve it. Director Ulyanov asked me a number of leading questions, and here I noticed that when he came to the word *grivennik* he had difficulty in pronouncing the *r*; instead of *grivennik* he would say *ghivennik*. This struck me as being somewhat strange and made me think: Here am I, a pupil, and I can pronounce *gr* correctly, while the Director, a very important and learned man, cannot pronounce *gr* and says *gh*.

"Then I added some minor details and finished the composition. The copy-books were collected and handed over to teacher Kalashnikov.

"Two days later we were to write a précis of an article we had read. When the copy-books were handed out, we anxiously looked at the marks for the previous composition. Some of the pupils were delighted, while others gave expression neither to joy nor to sorrow.

"Kalashnikov deliberately withheld my copy-book. Afterwards he threw it at me and, in a voice burning with rage, exclaimed, 'Pig!'

[1] A ten-kopek piece. — *Ed.*

"I picked up the copy-book, opened it, and saw that my composition had been crossed out in red ink, had a nought at the end and, underneath, a signature. I almost wept. The tears welled up in my eyes. By nature I was simple-hearted, naïve, impressionable and truthful. And I have remained so all my life.

"Ilya Nikolayevich came in during the lesson. We greeted him and carried on with our précis. He walked up and down between the desks, stopping now and then to observe the boys at work. He came up to my desk. Upon seeing my previous composition with the red cross and the nought, he put his hand on my shoulder, picked up the copy-book, and began to read. As he read he smiled. Then he called the teacher over and said: 'Tell me, why have you given this boy the order of the red cross and a big potato? There are no grammatical mistakes in his composition, it is logical, and there is nothing artificial in it. The best thing about it is that it is *sincere* and keeps to the topic you yourself named!'

"The teacher began to hem and haw, saying that there were things in the composition that were not very complimentary to the school administration. At this point Director Ulyanov interrupted him and said: 'This is one of the best compositions. Read it: "One of Today's Impressions." The pupil has written about the thing that impressed him most during the previous lesson. It is an excellent composition.' Then he took my pen and at the end of the composition wrote Excellent — and signed: Ulyanov.

"I have never forgotten that incident and I never will. Ilya Nikolayevich demonstrated his kindness, his simplicity and his sense of justice."

Ilyich followed in his father's footsteps; in the senior class at the *gymnasium* he spent a whole year coaching a Chuvash comrade, who was behind in Russian, in order to prepare him for the University entrance examinations.

Ilya Nikolayevich's sympathy for the national minorities influenced Lenin throughout his revolutionary activity: everybody knows the tremendous work done by Lenin in paving the way for the friendship of the peoples of the USSR.

Ilya Nikolayevich followed Dobrolyubov's methods in tempering the will-power of his children. Vladimir Ilyich, who entered the *gymnasium* when he was nine and a half years old, always had the highest marks and finished with a gold medal. This did not come as easy as many think. Ilyich was a very lively boy. He liked long walks, loved the Volga and the Sviyaga, loved to swim and skate.

He once told me: "I was very fond of skating, but when I found that it distracted me from my studies I gave it up." He was an avid reader. Books had a great attraction for him; they told him about life, about people and broadened his horizon, whereas the studies in the *gymnasium* were dull, lifeless, and one had to force oneself to memorize all kinds of useless rubbish. Ilyich had his own method of study: he first did his lessons and then settled down to reading. Thanks to self-discipline he managed to save time. He read very quickly and his reading was concentrated. When making notes he would save as much time as possible on writing. Those who have seen his handwriting know how he used abbreviations. This allowed him to take down whatever he needed, and he did it very

quickly.

He developed his will-power. If he said he would do a thing that thing was done. His word was his bond. Once, while still a boy, he began to smoke. When his mother got to know about it she was unhappy and pleaded with him to give it up. Ilyich promised to do so and never again touched a cigarette.

Ilya Nikolayevich, while teaching Ilyich to study diligently and well, also strove to inculcate in him that which Dobrolyubov had demanded, namely, a conscious attitude to what and how he was taught at school. The teacher Kashkadamova, who worked under Ilya Nikolayevich and always recalled him with particular affection, relates how he liked to tease Ilyich by joking at the expense of the *gymnasium* and its method of teaching, and by poking fun at its teachers. Ilyich always parried his father's blows and, in turn, would speak about the shortcomings of the elementary schools, and sometimes touched his father on the quick.

Kashkadamova relates how Ilya Nikolayevich taught Ilyich to observe life closely. But whenever Ilyich took the liberty of ridiculing the teachers during lessons, for example, the French teacher Port, his father summoned Ilyich and spoke to him about the impermissibility of rudeness towards teachers, even those whose teaching was far below the mark. And Ilyich restrained himself.

There was yet another feature of the Dobrolyubov attitude towards children that his father inculcated in Ilyich: to assess oneself and one's activity from the standpoint of the general good. This approach insured Ilyich against petty conceit and self-love.

In addition to being exacting with himself, Ilya Nikolayevich, as we see from Zaitsev's recollections, laid special stress on sincerity in children and developed this quality. Dobrolyubov wrote about the importance of sincerity. And sincerity was a special characteristic of Ilyich.

At the age of about 15 Ilyich was greatly attracted to Turgenev. He told me that at that time he particularly liked Turgenev's *Andrei Kolosov*, where the question of sincerity in love is posed. In those years I, too, had a great liking for *Andrei Kolosov*. Of course, the question is not always solved as easily as it is in the book, and the matter is not one of sincerity alone. It is necessary to have feeling for man and to be attentive to him; with us young people, who saw all around us in the middleclass *milieu* the then widespread practice of marrying for money and widespread insincerity, *Andrei Kolosov* was a great favourite. Afterwards, we were completely captivated by Chernyshevsky's *What Is To Be Done?* Ilyich read this book while still in the *gymnasium*. I recall that when we discussed these subjects in Siberia he surprised me with his detailed knowledge of Chernyshevsky's book. His liking for Chernyshevsky dates from his reading *What Is To Be Done?*

Ilya Nikolayevich took a prominent part in public affairs. He fought with all his strength against the ignorance in which the people were kept and against the consequences of serfdom. But he was a son of his times. And the things which excited his children — Alexander and Ilyich, the things of which Chernyshevsky wrote — the nature of the Reform of 1861 which was carried out in the interests of the landlords; the

land redemption payments, and the taking away from the peasants of the best land — those things did not excite him. For him Alexander II was the Tsar-Emancipator. Ilyich recalled how upset his father was when the news came of the assassination of the Tsar, how he put on his uniform and went to the Requiem in the Cathedral. Ilyich was only eleven years old at the time, but an event such as the assassination of Alexander II, which was the talk of the town, could not but excite juveniles too. After this Ilyich, as he himself told us, began to listen attentively to all political conversations.

He read all the children's journals and books to which his father subscribed, including *Children's Reading*. The children's journals of those days devoted much space to America (the years 1861-65 were the years of the Civil War for the abolition of Negro slavery in the southern states, a war fought to clear the way for broader development of capitalism, but fought under the flag of upholding freedom), to the war with Turkey, and to the Balkans. Ilyich also read the books of his elder brother.

A classmate, Kuznetsov, recalls that Ilyich always wrote excellent compositions on literature. The principal of the *gymnasium* during the years that Ilyich studied there was F.M. Kerensky (father of A.F. Kerensky, the Socialist-Revolutionary and Prime Minister in the Provisional Government in 1917); he also taught literature in the school. Kerensky always gave Ilyich the highest marks for his compositions. On one occasion, however, upon returning a composition, he said to Ilyich in a gruff tone: "What are these oppressed classes you've written about here; what are

they doing here?" The other pupils were anxious to know what mark Kerensky had given for the composition. It turned out that he had given Ilyich the highest mark.

The Ulyanovs were a large family; there were six children. They grew up in pairs — the eldest, Anna and Alexander, then Vladimir and Olga, and finally Dmitry and Maria. Ilyich was very fond of Olga. She was his playmate in childhood and later they studied Marx together. In 1890 she left for St. Petersburg to enter the Higher Courses for Women. Unfortunately, she contracted typhus and died in 1891.

Alexander, who became a revolutionary, strongly influenced Ilyich. Anna and Alexander were attracted to the *Iskra* poets (the Kurochkin brothers, Minayev, Zhulev and others) who were known as the Chernyshevian poets. This group bitterly attacked the hangovers of serfdom in social life and morals, and showed up the "indignity, foulness and evil" — bureaucratism, toadyism and phrasemongering. Anna knew many of the poems of the *Iskra* group, both legal and illegal, and wrote verse herself. She remembered them all her life, and towards the end of her days, when she lay paralysed, I, upon coming home from the office, would discuss the *Iskra* poets with her over a cup of tea and used to be amazed at her astonishing memory. She remembered a whole number of poems that were favourites with the intelligentsia of those days. During our exile in Siberia with Ilyich I was surprised at his knowledge of the verse of the *Iskra* poets.

Neither Alexander nor Ilyich could tolerate the drawing-room talk and tittle-tattle which were so rid-

iculed by the *Iskra* poets. When the brothers were visited by some of their numerous relatives, their favourite saying was: "Make us happy with your absence." Alexander loved to read Pisarev, whose articles on natural science took the ground away from the religious outlook and greatly interested him. Pisarev's works were banned at that time. Ilyich, too, at 14 and 15, eagerly devoured Pisarev's writings. It should be said that at that time, 1856, not even Dobrolyubov had made the final break with religion, and Ilya Nikolayevich, even though he was a teacher of physics and a meteorologist, believed in God until the end of his life. The fact that his sons had abandoned religion caused him anxiety. Alexander, chiefly because of Pisarev's influence, stopped going to church. Anna recalls that once at the dinner table when Ilya Nikolayevich asked Alexander if he were going to the midnight service, the latter replied firmly and briefly: "No." The question was never asked again. Ilyich, too, told us about a conversation between his father and a teacher friend in the course of which Ilya Nikolayevich said that his children were bad church attenders. Ilyich, who was present — he was 14 or 15 at the time — was sent off on an errand by his father, and when he returned, the visitor smiled and said: "Give him the stick, don't spare it." Upon hearing this Ilyich, burning with indignation, decided to break with religion; he rushed into the garden, took off the cross that he wore around his neck, and threw it away.

Alexander left for St. Petersburg to study natural science in the University. There he was drawn into revolutionary work, a fact which he concealed even from Anna, and when he came home for the summer

vacations he never uttered a word to anyone about it. Meanwhile, Ilyich was burning with the desire to share with someone the thoughts now engaging his mind. There was nobody in the *gymnasium* with whom he could talk. He once recalled a classmate who, he thought, had revolutionary inclinations; a walk to the Sviyaga was suggested by Ilyich with a view to broaching the subject of revolution. But the conversation did not take place. His fellow-pupil began to talk about making a career, saying that one should choose the most remunerative profession. "I came to the conclusion," said Ilyich, "that that chap was a careerist and not a revolutionary and so I held my tongue."

Throughout this last summer at home Alexander evaded conversation with Ilyich, and he, observing his brother preoccupied with a thesis on worms — he used to get up at dawn, spend hours studying worms, observe them under the microscope and make experiments — thought: "He will never be a revolutionary." He soon discovered his mistake. His brother's tragic fate exerted a tremendous influence on him.

In addition to being strongly influenced by his father and brother, Ilyich was also greatly influenced by his mother. His maternal grandmother was a German; his grandfather, who came from the Ukraine, was a prominent surgeon; towards the end of his 20 years of practice he bought a country-house in the village of Kokushkino, some 25 miles from Kazan, where he treated the local peasants. The surgeon was reluctant to send his daughter to a distant educational establishment, so she was taught at home. She became an excellent musician, read avidly and acquired a

good knowledge of life. Her father taught her to be methodical and painstaking; she became a good housekeeper, and these qualities she, in turn, transmitted to her daughters. Marriage and raising a family gave her plenty to do. Ilya Nikolayevich's salary barely sufficed to make ends meet, with the result that it took much effort on her part to create the comfort and smooth running which was typical of the Ulyanov household, and which enabled the children to study quietly and fruitfully and to acquire good manners and habits.

Like her husband, Ilyich's mother gave very close attention to her children's education; she taught them German, and Ilyich, smiling, used to recall how in the junior classes the German teacher praised him for his knowledge of the language. Afterwards the study of languages, including Latin, greatly attracted Ilyich. I think that the organizational talent which was inherent in Ilyich was largely inherited from his mother.

Moreover, the mother, by her example, showed the older children how to look after the younger ones. She arranged singsongs, which were the delight of the children, and played with them. From his earliest years Ilyich kept watch and ward over his younger brother and sister. Both Maria and Dmitry had many interesting things to say on this score. It was Ilyich who arranged the games and he was always gentle and considerate where the younger children were concerned.

This consideration for the young left its impress on his attitude to children throughout his life. He loved to play with children, to joke with them; I have never known him to be severe with them, nor did he

like it when others were severe with them; he never sermoned, as is sometimes depicted in paintings. In children he saw the continuers of the work to which he had dedicated his life. At times, when talking with children, he would say, without asking, but simply expressing his thoughts: "You'll become Communists when you grow up, won't you?" Everyone knows of the great interest he displayed in child welfare, in their food and education, in making their lives brighter and happier, in equipping them with the knowledge needed for victory, with the ability to work by hand and brain, as required by the modern machine age.

Ilyich, who deeply loved his mother, was particularly tender towards her during the years of her tribulations. Her husband died in 1886, and Ilyich told me of the fortitude with which she bore the loss of the man she so loved and respected. But especially did Ilyich display his tenderness for his mother and appreciate her after the execution of Alexander. Alexander, conscious of the bitter lot of the peasantry, and of all outrages perpetrated on the people, decided that it was necessary to combat Tsarism. Being four years older than Ilyich, he reacted differently to the events of March 1, 1881.

In St. Petersburg, Alexander joined the People's Will Party and took an active part in the conspiracy to assassinate Alexander III. The attempt failed, and on March 1, 1887, he and a group of his comrades were arrested. The news of Alexander's arrest was received in Simbirsk by the school-teacher. Kashkadamova, who informed Ilyich as the eldest (he was then 17) son of the Ulyanov family. Anna, then a student in St. Petersburg, in the Higher Courses for

Women, was also arrested. Ilyich had to break the terrible news to his mother. He saw how her face changed. She set out for St. Petersburg that same day. At that time the railway line had not come to Simbirsk; it was necessary to travel by coach to Syzran. Since coach travelling was a costly affair, those making the journey usually sought companions to share the fare. Ilyich went out in search of a fellow-traveller for his mother, but the news of Alexander's arrest was now the talk of the town, and no one wanted to travel with her, although up till then everyone had spoken highly of her as the school director's wife and widow. The Ulyanov family was ostracized by former friends, by all the liberal "society" of Simbirsk. His mother's sorrow and the fear displayed by the liberal intellectuals made a deep impression on the seventeen-year-old youth. She departed, and Ilyich, waiting anxiously for news from St. Petersburg, watched over the younger children and concentrated on his studies. He was now thinking hard. Chernyshevsky's writings took on a new meaning, and he began to look to Marx for the answers to his questions. Among Alexander's books was a copy of *Capital* — in the past it had proved difficult reading for Ilyich, but he now took it up with renewed zest.

Alexander was executed on May 8. Upon hearing the news, Ilyich said: "No, we shall not take that path. It is necessary to take a different path." Before interceding for her son and daughter, Maria Alexandrovna visited Alexander. The meeting greatly upset her. She tried to get his consent to a plea for mercy, but when Alexander said: "Mother, I cannot do such a thing, it would be insincere on my part," she no longer insisted

and, taking farewell of him, added: "Have courage!" She was present in the court when her son made his speech from the dock.

Anna, released under police surveillance, was deported to the village of Kokushkino, near Kazan.

The mother, who had changed under the stress, drew closer to the revolutionary activity of her children, who now loved her more than ever before.

In 1899 when she came to St. Petersburg — this time to plead that Ilyich, instead of being exiled to Yenisei Gubernia, should be allowed to go abroad, or, if not, then at least to reside somewhere nearer the capital — Zvolyansky, Chief of the Police Department, said to her: "You can be proud of your children, one has been hanged, and the rope is being got ready for another." Maria Alexandrovna rose and in a dignified manner said: "Yes, I am proud of my children." (M.B. Smirnov, who was present during the conversation, has described the incident in the newspaper *Sovetsky Yug*). Ilyich, who often spoke about his mother's tremendous will-power, once said: "It was a good thing that our father died before Alexander's arrest; had he been alive I don't know what would have happened." Afterwards, I myself had occasion to meet Maria Alexandrovna — in 1895 when Ilyich was ill in the preliminary detention prison, whither she had come to see him — and then I realized why Ilyich had so much love for her. In his *Letters to Relatives*, selected and prepared for publication by his sister Maria, every line of the letters to his mother breathes love and tenderness.

His mother's example was not lost on Ilyich, and, despite the grief gnawing at his heart, he kept a grip

on himself, passed the examinations successfully and finished the *gymnasium* with a gold medal.

In the summer the Ulyanovs left for Kazan, and Ilyich entered the University where his father had studied before him.

Reminiscences of Lenin
by His Relatives, 1955
pp. 171-87.

APPEAL TO WOMEN WORKERS AND PEASANT WOMEN ON V.I. LENIN'S DEATH

(*Pravda*, January 30, 1924)

Comrade workers and peasants, men and women! I have a big favour to ask of you: do not let your sorrow for Ilyich take the shape of glorification. Do not build monuments in his memory, do not call palaces after him, do not hold solemn meetings to commemorate him. He never cared for all that in his lifetime, never liked it. Just remember how much poverty there is in our country, how much has to be done. If you want to honour Vladimir Ilyich's memory, build crèches, kindergartens, houses, schools, libraries, dispensaries, hospitals, homes for invalids, etc., and, above all, let us carry out his behests in everything.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Woman in the Soviet Land Is an Equal Citizen*, 1938, pp. 23-24

LET US LEARN FROM ILYICH

(*The Worker and Peasant Correspondent* Magazine, No. 1, 1928)

One day, when we were burying a close comrade, I saw the slogan: "Leaders die, but their cause lives." How true this is!

It is four years now since Ilyich died, but the cause to which he devoted himself body and soul, lives and thrives.

In these four years Ilyich's thoughts, words and deeds have reached the remotest corners of our Soviet Union and have made him still nearer and dearer to the masses.

Reading and re-reading Ilyich's articles and speeches, a Party member seeks in them answers to the questions that agitate him, guidance in his struggle, guidance in his work. He seeks and finds them.

And so will the worker and peasant correspondent.

Generally speaking, Ilyich himself was an exemplary worker and peasant correspondent. He followed life very closely, noticed what others eyed with indifference, assessed every little detail from the viewpoint of workers' interests and later analysed all he had heard or seen in his articles making use of these little details to explain cardinal problems.

In 1895, Lenin and our other comrades in Petersburg decided to issue an illegal newspaper which they called *Rabocheye Delo*. The working-class movement was in its very infancy. Many workers did not understand why they lived badly, why they should struggle

against the capitalists, why they should fight against Tsarism. The *Rabocheye Delo* was to show the workers how they lived, explain to them why it was so and help them to see what was going on around. Ilyich became a regular worker correspondent. He visited workers and interviewed them. In his memoirs, one of the workers recalls that Ilyich used to shower them with questions, even on minute details, and "made us sweat" answering them.

Having become a worker correspondent, Ilyich enlisted all the other comrades as correspondents too. They would sit for hours discussing the information they obtained. Lenin set an inspiring example and demanded genuine facts only, facts that had been well checked. They often had to look for additional information. It was a regular school for worker correspondents. We all felt that under Ilyich's guidance we were learning to be observant, growing into expert correspondents. There were many arguments on how best to write and we all agreed that there should be fewer generalizations and arguments and more facts.

In Petersburg, Ilyich was a worker correspondent; in exile he became a peasant correspondent. The peasants knew he was a jurist and consulted him. Ilyich readily advised them and at the same time asked them how they lived and worked. The answers helped him to build up a vast store of information.

Abroad, Ilyich made a similar study of the life of the German, French and British workers.

Recently, just before the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution, I re-read Ilyich's speeches and articles from April to November 1917. They all reveal his power of observation. Take the speech he made at

the Party conference three weeks after his return to Russia. It shows how much he learned from his talks with soldiers and workers, with miners, how well he noticed what others did not.

If the worker and peasant correspondents, studying Ilyich's articles and speeches, paid attention to his activity as a correspondent, they would see his marvellous ability as an observer, his ability to see the shoots of the new life, the growing forces of the country, the strength and oppression of the old regime.

They would see that Ilyich's interest in the cause, his study of the working-class movement and his knowledge of Marxism had taught him foresight.

They would see that this ability to observe taught Ilyich soberly to gauge the situation (suffice it to recall the Brest peace treaty[1]), made him a man who never had a liking for bombastic phrases, who knew how to find and organize forces for the struggle and how to carry his ideas — backed by what he had heard and seen, by his own observations — into the masses.

The ability to observe is a mighty factor. We must learn from Ilyich how to be observant. And once we have mastered that, we shall be all the more capable of putting his ideas into practice in the present conditions.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Let's Learn to Work from Lenin*, Partizdat Publish-

[1] The Brest peace treaty was concluded on March 3, 1918, between Soviet Russia, on the one hand, and Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey, on the other. The terms were extremely harsh; but the treaty was necessary to consolidate the Soviet state and safeguard its independence.

ing House, 1933, pp. 156-58

LENIN'S METHOD OF SCIENTIFIC WORK

(From the *Reminiscences of Lenin* Collection, Issue No. 1, 1930)

Whatever Vladimir Ilyich did, he always did thoroughly. He did a lot of spade-work.

The more important he thought a job, the more he delved into the minutest details.

Seeing how difficult it was towards the end of the 1890's to issue an illegal newspaper in Russia and considering a national newspaper of utmost importance from the point of view of organization and propaganda — a newspaper which would give a Marxist analysis of events and developments in Russia, as well as of the growth of the young labour movement — Vladimir Ilyich chose several comrades and decided to go abroad and publish it there. It was he who conceived and got *Iskra* under way. Every issue of this newspaper was meticulously edited. Every word was weighed. And here is one extremely characteristic feature — Vladimir Ilyich personally read the proofs. He did not do this because there were not any proofreaders (I learned the job very quickly), but because he did not want any mistake to slip into the newspaper. First he would read the proofs himself, then ask me to go through them and after that scan through them again.

And that was so in everything. He did a lot of work on the zemstvo statistics. His copy-books were full of carefully written out tables. When he dealt with important figures, he would check up the totals even when those tables had already been published. A care-

ful check on every fact and every figure was characteristic of Ilyich. He based all his conclusions on facts.

This custom of backing his conclusions with facts was evident even in his early propaganda pamphlets — *On Fines*, *On Strikes* and *The New Factory Law*. Here he did not try to impose his ideas on the worker; he proved his arguments with facts. Some thought the pamphlets too long. But the workers found them exceedingly convincing. One of Lenin's main works, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, written in prison, contained a wealth of factual material. Marx's *Capital* played a tremendous role in Lenin's life and he always bore in mind that Marx used a great many facts in presenting his conclusions.

Lenin did not rely on his memory, perfect though it was. He never cited facts from memory, "approximately," as it were. His facts were scrupulously correct. He would go through heaps of material (he read and wrote very fast) and write out everything he wanted particularly to remember. His copy-books are full of extracts. One day, looking through my pamphlet *Organization of Self-Education*, he remarked that I was wrong in stressing the necessity of jotting down only what was absolutely essential. He had a different method, and would read and re-read what he had written down. That may be seen from his numerous marginal notes, underlinings, etc.

In his own books he would underline the points he wanted to remember or make marginal notes, jotting down and underscoring on the cover the number of the page — the more important he considered the point in question, the more lines he would put under the page number. Re-reading his own articles, he

would put down his remarks too and if some point gave him a new idea, he would write the page number on the cover. That is how Ilyich trained his memory. He always remembered what he had said, in what circumstances and to whom. You will see that there are very few repetitions in his books, speeches and articles. True, articles and speeches over the years we do come across the same basic thoughts, and that is why there is an imprint of consistency in his statements. At the same time we see that they are not mere repetitions. The same basic thought is given in application to new conditions or to elucidate the same issue from a different angle. I remember a talk I had with Ilyich. He was already ill. We spoke of the newly published volumes of his works, of the way they reflected the experience of the Russian Revolution, of the importance of passing on this experience to our foreign comrades. We spoke of the necessity of using these volumes to show how the changes in concrete historical conditions inevitably influenced the interpretation of the main, pivotal idea. Ilyich asked me to find a comrade who could take on this job.

That, however, has not yet been done.

Lenin carefully studied the experience accumulated by the world proletariat in its revolutionary struggle. This experience is elucidated particularly vividly by Marx and Engels. Lenin read and re-read their works, re-read them at every new stage of our Revolution.

It is well known how tremendously Marx and Engels influenced Lenin. But it would be well to see in what and how the study of their works helped him to evaluate current developments and prospects at every

stage of our Revolution. No such research work has been written so far, though it would present a graphic illustration of how much the experiences of the world revolutionary movement had helped Lenin in foreseeing events. For those who are interested in how Lenin worked, how he read Marx and Engels, what he borrowed from them in assessing our struggle, such a work would be very valuable. It would show the vast influence exerted on our Revolution by the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the industrially more developed countries. Such a work would enable us better to feel that the Russian Revolution, that our entire struggle and construction effort are part and parcel of the struggle waged by the world proletariat. It would reveal *what* and *how* Lenin borrowed from the struggle of the international proletariat, how he applied its experience. And it is precisely this that we should learn from Lenin.

Lenin studied the experience of the international proletariat with particular fervour. It would be difficult to imagine a man who disliked museums more than Lenin. The motleyness and hodge-podge of museum exhibits depressed Vladimir Ilyich to such an extent that ten minutes in a museum were usually enough to make him look exhausted. But there is one exhibition that I remember particularly vividly — the 1848 Revolution exhibition held in two little rooms in the Parisian workers' quarter famous for its revolutionary struggle. You should have seen how profoundly interested Vladimir Ilyich was, how he became absorbed in every little exhibit. For him it was a living part of the struggle. When I visited our Museum of the Revolution, I thought of Ilyich, of how he scru-

tinized every little exhibit that day in Paris.

Ilyich himself wrote time and again *how* the experience of the revolutionary struggle waged by the international proletariat should be used. I remember particularly well his comment on Kautsky's *The Motive Forces and Prospects of the Russian Revolution*, a pamphlet on the Russian Revolution of 1905. Ilyich liked it. He had it translated immediately, edited each sentence of the translation, wrote an enthusiastic preface, and told me to have it published without delay and check on all the proofs myself. I remember how our big legal printing plant took more than three days to set this little pamphlet, how I had to stay three whole days in the plant and wait for hours for the proofs. Ilyich knew how to infect others with enthusiasm. When he told me about the ideas Kautsky's pamphlet had aroused in him, when he wrote the preface, I saw clearly that I would have to chuck up all the other things I had to do and sit in the printing plant until the pamphlet was ready. And even now, more than twenty years later, my mind strangely associates the grey cover, the type and the printing errors which attended the birth of the pamphlet in the then technically chaotic Russia with Ilyich's fervent speeches and the concluding words in the preface to this pamphlet:

"Lastly, a few words about people of 'authority.' The Marxists cannot take the stand of the intellectual radical with his allegedly revolutionary abstract claim that 'there are no people of authority.'

"No. The working class, waging a difficult and stubborn liberation struggle throughout the world, needs people of authority, but only in the sense, of course, that young workers need the experience of the

old *fighters* against oppression and exploitation, fighters who have waged many a strike, participated in revolutions, who have been made wiser by revolutionary traditions and a broad political outlook. The proletarians of every country need the authority of the world struggle waged by the proletariat. We need the authority of the theoreticians of world Social-Democracy to clarify the programme and tactics of our Party. But this authority, of course, is utterly unlike the official authority of bourgeois science and police tactics. This authority is the authority of a more all-round struggle in those same ranks of the world socialist army."[1]

In his preface to *The Motive Forces and Prospects of the Russian Revolution* Vladimir Ilyich wrote that Kautsky had correctly appraised the Russian Revolution when he said: "We shall do well if we agree that we are facing completely new situations and problems, which do not follow old patterns."[2] Ilyich ardently opposed in this preface the application of old patterns to new situations. We know that in his assessment of the imperialist war and the 1917 Revolution Kautsky failed to understand the new situation and the new problems, and turned renegade.

The ability to gauge new situations and problems on the basis of the experience gained by the world proletariat in its revolutionary struggle and to apply Marxist methods in analysing new concrete situations is one of the peculiarities of Leninism. Unfortunately, this aspect has not been sufficiently illustrated by con-

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 11, pp. 374-75.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 372.

crete facts, although much has been written about it.

And there is another aspect of the Leninist approach to the assessment of revolutionary events that is even less illuminated in the press — the ability to see concrete reality and generalize the collective opinion of the struggling masses which, Lenin says (see his preface to *The Motive Forces and Prospects of the Russian Revolution*), is a decisive factor for the solution of urgent practical and concrete political problems.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Let Us Learn to Work from Lenin*, Partizdat Publishing House, 1933, pp. 9-13

HOW LENIN STUDIED MARX

Russia was an industrially backward country and for that reason her labour movement began to develop only in the 1890's — at the time when in a number of other countries. the working class, armed with the experience of the 1848 Revolution and of the Paris Commune of 1871, was already waging a bitter revolutionary struggle. Marx and Engels, the great revolutionary leaders of the international labour movement, were steeled in the crucible of the revolutionary struggle. Marxism illuminated the path of social development, revealed the inevitability of the disintegration of capitalism and its replacement by communism. It showed the path along which new social forms would develop, the path of the class struggle, the path of the socialist revolution; it explained the role of the proletariat in this struggle and pointed to its inevitable victory.

Our labour movement developed under the banner of Marxism — it did not grope its way, it did not advance blindly. The goal was clear and so was the path.

Lenin did a great deal to illuminate with Marxism the path to be taken by the Russian proletariat in its struggle. It is fifty years since Marx died, but Marxism continues to guide our Party in all its activity. Leninism is merely further development of Marxism, its extension.

The keen interest shown in how Lenin studied Marx is therefore quite understandable.

Lenin knew Marx perfectly. When he came to Petersburg in 1893, he surprised us Marxists by how well

he knew Marx's and Engels' works.

When the first Marxist circles were organized in the 1890's their members studied mainly the first volume of *Capital*, which could be obtained, though with great difficulty. As for the other works of Marx, things were altogether bad. Most of the members of our circle had not even read the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. I myself read it (in German) only in 1898, when I was in exile.

Marx and Engels were strictly banned. In *A Characterization of Economic Romanticism*, which he wrote for *Novoye Slovo*[1] in 1897, Lenin resorted to allegories to avoid using the words "Marx" and "Marxism." To do otherwise would have meant letting the magazine down.

Vladimir Ilyich knew all of Marx's and Engels' works and always tried to get them in German and French. Anna Ilyinichna[2] recalls that Vladimir Ilyich and his sister Olga read *The Poverty of Philosophy* in French. But he had to read most of Marx's and Engels' works in German, and translated the most interesting and important passages into Russian. In his first big work, *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*, published illegally in 1894, he quotes the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, *The German Ideology*, Marx's letter to Ruge in 1843, Engels' *Anti-Dühring* and *The Origin of the Family*, *Private Prop-*

[1] A journal which was taken over by the "legal Marxists" in April 1897.

[2] Lenin's sister, A.I. Ulyanova-Yelizarova.

erty and the State.

Most of the Marxists in those days did not know Marx's works. The "*Friends of the People*" explained a whole series of questions in a new way and proved extremely popular.

In Lenin's next work — *The Economic Content of Narodism and How It Is Criticized in Mr. Struve's Book* — we find quotations from *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, *The Civil War in France*, *Critique of the Gotha Programme* and the second and third volumes of *Capital*.

His years in emigration enabled Lenin to read and study all of Marx's and Engels' works.

Lenin's biography of Marx, written in 1914 for the *Granat Encyclopedical Dictionary*, is a perfect illustration of how well he knew Marx's works. That is also revealed by the innumerable excerpts he made when reading Marx. The Lenin Institute has many copybooks with his extracts from Marx.

Vladimir Ilyich used them in his works, re-read and annotated them. He not only knew Marx, but thoroughly understood him. Speaking at the Third All-Russian Congress of the Young Communist League in 1920, Vladimir Ilyich said it was necessary to have "the ability to acquire the sum of human knowledge, and to acquire it in such a way that communism shall not be something learned by rote, but something that you yourselves have thought over, that it shall embody the conclusions which are inevitable from the standpoint of modern education."[1]

Lenin studied not only what Marx had written,

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II. Part II, p. 480.

but also everything written about Marx and Marxism by his enemies in the bourgeois camp, and elucidated the fundamentals of Marxism in his polemics with them.

In his first big work, *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* (in reply to the anti-Marxist articles in *Russkoye Bogatstvo*[1]) Lenin counterposes Marx's standpoint to that of the Narodniks (Mikhailovsky, Krivenko and Yuzhakov).

In the article *The Economic Content of Narodism and How It Is Criticized in Mr. Struve's Book*, he pointed out that Struve's standpoint was diametrically different from that of Marx.

Lenin analysed the agrarian issue in *The Agrarian Question and the "Critics of Marx"* (Vol. 5, pp. 87-202 and Vol. 13, pp. 149-93, 4th Russ. ed.), in which he counterposed Marx's standpoint to the petty-bourgeois view held by German Social-Democrats (David, Hertz) and Russian critics (Chernov, Bulgakov).

"Truth is the consequence of conflicting opinions," says a French proverb. Ilyich liked to quote it. In the main questions of labour movement, he constantly resorted to bringing out and counterposing class viewpoints on the subject.

Lenin did that in a most characteristic manner.

This is reflected, for instance, by the *Lenin Miscellany XIX*, which contains his excerpts, extracts and abstracts on the *agrarian issue* prior to 1917.

---

[1] A monthly which sided with the Narodniks in the early 1890's and became their weapon in the fight against the Marxists.

He would go carefully through the allegations of the "critics," select and write out the most vivid and typical places, and then compare them with Marx's views. In his detailed analysis of the various critiques he tried to show up their class essence by underlining the most important and urgent problems.

Very often Lenin would deliberately emphasize some question. It was not a matter of tone, he held. One could speak sharply and rudely so long as one spoke to the point. In his preface to F.A. Sorge's letters he quotes Mehring and adds that "Mehring was right when he said (*Der Sorgesche Briefwechsel*) that Marx and Engels had not much of an idea of 'good manners': 'If they did not think long over every blow they dealt, neither did they whimper over every blow they received.'"[1] Sharpness was a characteristic of Lenin's: he learned it from Marx. "Marx relates," he wrote, "that he and Engels constantly fought the 'miserable' way in which the *Sozial-Democrat*[2] was conducted and often expressed their opinions *sharply* (wobei's oft scharf hergeht)."[3] Ilyich was not afraid of sharpness, but he demanded that the retorts should be to the point.

There was one word that Lenin liked very much — "nagging." When arguments were not to the point, when speakers resorted to exaggeration and to petty fault-finding, he would say: "That's plain nagging."

He was opposed even more sharply to polemics

---

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, p. 245.

[2] The organ of the Lassallean opportunist organization The General German Workers' Union, published in Berlin from 1864 to 1871.

[3] V.I. Lenin, *Ibid*., p. 241.

that aimed less at thrashing out some question than at settling some petty factional account. That, incidentally, was a favourite method with the Mensheviks. They misused recommendations by Marx and Engels exclusively for their own factional aims. In his preface to Sorge's letters Lenin wrote:

"To think that these recommendations of Marx and Engels to the British and American workers' movement can be simply and directly applied to Russian conditions is to use Marxism not in order to comprehend its *method*, not in order to *study* the concrete historical peculiarities of the labour movement in definite countries, but in order to settle petty factional, intellectualist accounts."[1]

Here we come to the question of *how Lenin studied Marx*. That may be seen partly from the above-mentioned quote: it is necessary to comprehend Marx's method, to learn from him how to study the peculiarities of the labour movement in certain countries. This is what Lenin did. For him Marxism was not a dogma but a guide to action. He once said: "He who wants to consult Marx..." A very characteristic expression, that. He himself constantly "consulted" Marx. He reread Marx again and again in the most difficult, crucial moments of the Revolution. I would drop into his office, for instance. Everyone would be worried. But Ilyich would sit engrossed in Marx, and it would be hard indeed to tear him away from the book. He did not turn to Marx to calm his nerves or reinforce his confidence in the strength of the working class or his faith in final victory — he had enough confidence

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, p. 249.

here. He turned to Marx to "consult" him, to seek answers to the urgent problems facing the labour movement. In his article "F. Mehring on the Second Duma" Lenin wrote: "Some people choose wrong quotations for their arguments: they take general principles on the support of the big bourgeoisie against the petty reactionary bourgeoisie and apply them uncritically to the Russian Constitutional Democrats, to the Russian revolution.

"Mehring gives these people a good lesson. Those who want to consult Marx on the proletariat's tasks in the bourgeois revolution should study Marx's opinion precisely about the German bourgeois revolution. It is not for nothing that our Mensheviks shy off this opinion. In that opinion we see reflected, fully and vividly, the merciless struggle that the Russian 'Bolsheviks' are waging in the Russian bourgeois revolution against the *conciliatory* bourgeoisie."[1]

Lenin's method was to take Marx's works that treated of *similar situations*, carefully analyse them, compare them with the present situation and bring out the similarity and differences. The best example of how Lenin did that is his application of this method in the 1905-07 Revolution.

In his pamphlet *What Is to Be Done?* (1902) Lenin wrote: "History has now confronted us with an immediate task which is the *most revolutionary* of all the *immediate* tasks that confront the proletariat of any country. The fulfilment of this task, the destruction of the most powerful bulwark, not only of European, but also (it may now be said) of Asiatic reaction,

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 12, p. 348.

would make the Russian proletariat the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat."[1]

We know that the revolutionary struggle of 1905 enhanced the international role of the Russian working class and that the overthrow of Tsarism in 1917 put the Russian proletariat in the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat. But that happened 15 years after *What Is to Be Done?* was written. The rise of the revolutionary wave, following the massacre of the workers in Palace Square on January 9, 1905, raised the question of where the Party should lead the masses and what *tactics* it should adopt. And here Lenin again "consulted" Marx. He thoroughly studied Marx's works on the French and German bourgeois-democratic revolutions of 1848: *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850* and the third volume of Marx's and Engels's *Literary Heritage* (touching on the German Revolution), published by F. Mehring.

In June and July 1905 Ilyich wrote the pamphlet *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, in which he counterposed the tactics of the Bolsheviks, who urged the working masses to wage a resolute, irreconcilable struggle against autocracy and to rise in arms if need be, to the tactics of the Mensheviks, who pursued a policy of conciliation with the liberal bourgeoisie. It was necessary to put an end to Tsarism, Lenin said in the pamphlet. "The Conference (of the new *Iskra*-ists. — N.K.) further forgot," he wrote, "that so long as power remained in the hands of the Tsar, all decisions passed by any repre-

[1] V.I. Lenin. *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Part II, p. 231.

sentatives whatsoever would remain empty and miserable prattle, as was the case with the 'decisions' of the Frankfurt Parliament, famous in the history of the German Revolution of 1848. In his *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Marx, the representative of the revolutionary proletariat, castigated the Frankfurt liberal *Osvobozhdentsi* with merciless sarcasm precisely because they uttered fine words, adopted all sorts of democratic 'decisions,' 'constituted' all kinds of liberties, while actually they left power in the hands of the king and failed to organize an armed struggle against the military forces at the disposal of the king. And while the Frankfurt *Osvobozhdentsi* were prattling — the king bided his time, consolidated his military forces, and the counter-revolution, relying on real force, utterly routed the Democrats with all their fine 'decisions'."[1]

And Vladimir Ilyich posed the question: would the bourgeoisie undermine the Russian revolution by concluding a deal with Tsarism, or would we, to quote Marx, settle accounts with Tsarism "in the plebeian way."

"If the revolution gains a decisive victory — then we shall settle accounts with Tsarism in the Jacobin, or, if you like, in the plebeian way. 'The terror in France,' wrote Marx in 1848 in the famous *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, 'was nothing but a plebeian way of settling accounts with the enemies of the bourgeoisie: absolutism, feudalism and philistinism' (see Marx, 'Nachlass,' Mehring's edition, Vol. III, p. 211). Have those people who, in a period of a democratic revolu-

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

tion, try to frighten the Social-Democratic workers in Russia with the bogey of 'Jacobinism' ever stopped to think of the significance of these words of Marx?"[1]

The Mensheviks claimed that their tactics was to "remain a party of extreme revolutionary opposition" and that this did not exclude partial, episodic conquest of power and establishment of revolutionary communes in certain towns. "What does the term 'revolutionary communes' mean?" Lenin asked, and replied: "Confusion of revolutionary thought leads them (the new *Iskra*-ists. — N.K.), as very often happens, to *revolutionary phrasemongering*. Yes, the use of the words 'revolutionary commune' in a resolution passed by representatives of Social-Democracy is revolutionary phrasemongering and nothing else. Marx more than once condemned such phrasemongering, when 'fascinating' terms of the *bygone past* were used to hide the tasks of the future. In such cases a fascinating term that has played its part in history becomes futile and pernicious trumpery, a child's rattle. We must give the workers and the whole people a clear and unambiguous explanation as to *why* we want a provisional revolutionary government to be set up, and *exactly what changes* we shall accomplish, if we exercise decisive influence on the government, on the very morrow of the victory of the popular insurrection which has already commenced. These are the questions that confront political leaders."[2]

And further:

"These vulgarizers of Marxism have never pon-

[1] V.I. Lenin. *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Part II, p. 59.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 83.

dered over what Marx said about the need of substituting the criticism of weapons for the weapons of criticism. Taking the name of Marx in vain, they, in actual fact, draw up resolutions on tactics wholly in the spirit of the Frankfurt bourgeois windbags, who freely criticized absolutism and rendered democratic consciousness more profound, but failed to understand that the time of revolution is the time of action, of action both from above and from below."[1]

"Revolutions are the locomotives of history," Marx said. Lenin quoted this saying of Marx's in assessing the role of the fermenting revolution.

Further analysing K. Marx's theses in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Lenin ascertained the meaning of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. But he drew an analogy between our bourgeois-democratic revolution and the German bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1848. He wrote:

"Thus, it was only in April 1849, after the revolutionary newspaper had been appearing for almost a year (the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* began publication on June 1, 1848), that Marx and Engels declared in favour of a special workers' organization! Until then they were merely running an 'organ of democracy' unconnected by any organizational ties with an independent workers' party.

"This fact, monstrous and improbable as it may appear from our present-day standpoint, clearly shows us what an enormous difference there is between the German Social-Democratic Party of those

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 102.

days and the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party of today. This fact shows how much less the proletarian features of the movement, the proletarian current within it, were in evidence in the German democratic revolution (because of the backwardness of Germany in 1848 both economically and politically — its disunity as a state)."[1]

Of particular interest are the articles Vladimir Ilyich wrote in 1907 — articles on Marx's correspondence and activity. These are "Preface to the Russian Translation of the Letters of K. Marx to L. Kugelman" (Vol. 12, pp. 343-49, in Russian), "F. Mehring on the Second Duma" (Vol. 12, pp. 343-49) and "Preface to the Russian Translation of 'Letters by J.F. Becker, J. Dietzgen, F. Engels, K. Marx and Others to F.A. Sorge and Others'" (Vol 12, pp. 319-38, 4th Russ. ed.).

These articles present a perfect picture of Lenin's method of studying Marx. The last is of exceptional interest. It was written at the time when, following his differences with Bogdanov, Lenin again seriously took up philosophy, when the questions of dialectical materialism attracted his attention with particular force.

Studying simultaneously what Marx said concerning questions analogical to those that arose in Russia following the defeat of the revolution, and questions of dialectical and historical materialism, Lenin learned from Marx how to apply the method of dialectical materialism to the study of historical development. In his "Preface to F.A. Sorge's Letters" he

[1] V.I. Lenin. *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Part II, p. 148.

wrote: "It is highly instructive to compare what Marx and Engels said of the British, American and German labour movements. The comparison acquires all the greater importance when we remember that Germany on the one hand, and England and America on the other, represent different stages of capitalist development and different forms of domination of the bourgeoisie as a class over the entire political life of these countries. From the scientific standpoint, what we observe here is a sample of materialist dialectics, of the ability to bring out and stress the various points and various sides of the question in application to the specific peculiarities of different political and economic conditions. From the standpoint of the practical policy and tactics of the workers' party, what we see here is a sample of the way in which the creators of the *Communist Manifesto* defined the tasks of the fighting proletariat in accordance with the different stages of the national labour movement in different countries."[1]

The 1905 Revolution set forth a series of new urgent questions, and in solving them Lenin studied Marx's works all the more profoundly. It was in the flames of the revolution that the Leninist (the genuinely Marxist) method of studying Marx was steeled.

It was this method of studying Marx that helped Lenin to fight against distortions of Marxism, against attempts to emasculate its revolutionary essence. We know that Lenin's book *The State and Revolution* played a tremendous role in organizing the October Revolution and Soviet government. This book is

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, p. 235.

based wholly on the profound study of Marx's teaching on the state.

Let me cite the first page of Lenin's *The State and Revolution*:

"What is now happening to Marx's teaching has, in the course of history, happened repeatedly to the teachings of revolutionary thinkers and leaders of oppressed classes struggling for emancipation. During the lifetime of great revolutionaries, the oppressing classes constantly hounded them, received their teachings with the most savage malice, the most furious hatred and the most unscrupulous campaigns of lies and slander. After their death, attempts are made to convert them into harmless icons, to canonize them, so to say, and to surround their *names* with a certain halo for the 'consolation' of the oppressed classes and with the object of duping the latter, while at the same time emasculating the *essence* of the revolutionary teaching, blunting its revolutionary edge and vulgarizing it. At the present time, the bourgeoisie and the opportunists within the working-class movement concur in this 'doctoring' of Marxism. They omit, obliterate and distort the revolutionary side of this teaching, its revolutionary soul. They push to the foreground and extol what is or seems acceptable to the bourgeoisie. All the social-chauvinists are now 'Marxists' (don't laugh!). And more and more frequently, German bourgeois scholars, but yesterday specialists in the annihilation of Marxism, are speaking of the 'national-German' Marx, who, they aver, educated the workers' unions which are so splendidly organized for the purpose of conducting a predatory war!

"In such circumstances, in view of the unprece-

dentedly widespread distortion of Marxism, our prime task is to *re-establish* what Marx really taught on the subject of the state."[1]

Comrade Stalin wrote in *Problems of Leninism*:

"Only in the subsequent period, the period of direct action by the proletariat, the period of proletarian revolution, when the question of overthrowing the bourgeoisie became a question of immediate action; when the question of the reserves of the proletariat (strategy) became one of the most burning questions; when all forms of struggle and of organization, parliamentary and extra-parliamentary (tactics), had fully manifested themselves and became well defined — only in this period could an integral strategy and elaborated tactics for the struggle of the proletariat be drawn up. It was precisely in that period that Lenin brought out into the light of day the brilliant ideas of Marx and Engels on tactics and strategy that had been immured by the opportunists of the Second International. But Lenin did not confine himself to restoring certain tactical propositions of Marx and Engels. He developed them further and supplemented them with new ideas and propositions, combining them all into a system of rules and guiding principles for the leadership of the class struggle of the proletariat."

Marx and Engels wrote that their "teaching is not a dogma but a guide to action." Lenin repeatedly reiterated that. His method of studying Marx's and Engels's works, revolutionary practice, the entire atmosphere of the era of proletarian revolutions helped Lenin to turn Marx's revolutionary theory into a gen-

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part I, pp. 202-03.

uine guide to action.

I should like to dwell on one question of decisive importance. We recently marked the fifteenth anniversary of Soviet power. And in this connection we recalled how the conquest of power in October 1917 was organized. It was not spontaneous. It had been thoroughly planned by Lenin, who was guided by Marx's directions on the organization of uprisings.

The October Revolution, which put dictatorship into the hands of the proletariat, radically changed the conditions of the struggle. But it is precisely because Lenin was guided not by the letter of Marx's and Engels' theses, but by their revolutionary spirit, that he was able to apply Marxism to socialist construction in the era of proletarian dictatorship.

I shall dwell only on certain instances. It is necessary to do a big research job to see what Lenin took from Marx, how he took it, when and in connection with what tasks of the revolutionary movement. I have not touched upon such extremely important issues as the national question, imperialism, etc. This job is facilitated by the publication of a full collection of Lenin's works, the publication of *Lenin Miscellanies*. The study of Lenin's method of working on Marx in all the phases of the revolutionary struggle, from the first to the last, will help us better to understand not only Marx, but Lenin himself, his method of studying Marx and his method of applying Marx's teachings in practice.

It is necessary to note another aspect of Lenin's study of Marx, an aspect of major significance. Lenin studied not only what Marx and Engels and the "critics" of Marx wrote, but also the path that led Marx to

his viewpoints, the works that stimulated Marx's thoughts and pushed them in a definite direction; he studied, if we may say so, the sources of the Marxist world outlook, studied what Marx took from other writers and how.

Lenin closely studied the method of dialectical materialism. In his article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism" (1922) Lenin wrote that it was necessary for the contributors to *Pod Znamenem Marxisma*[1] to arrange for the systematic study of Hegelian dialectics from a materialist standpoint. He held that without a solid philosophical background it was impossible to hold out in the struggle against the onslaught of bourgeois ideas and the restoration of the bourgeois world outlook. From his own experience he wrote of how to organize the study of Hegelian dialectics. Here is the paragraph in question:

"It must be realized that unless it stands on a solid philosophical ground no natural science and no materialism can hold its own in the struggle against the onslaught of bourgeois ideas and the restoration of the bourgeois world outlook. In order to hold his own in this struggle and carry it to a victorious finish, the natural scientist must be a modern materialist, a conscious adherent of the materialism which is represented by Marx, i.e., he must be a dialectical materialist. In order to attain this aim, the contributors to *Pod Znamenem Marxisma* must arrange for the systematic study of Hegelian dialectics from a materialist standpoint, i.e., the dialectics which Marx applied

[1] A philosophical magazine, published in Moscow from 1922 to 1944.

practically in his *Capital* and in his historical and political works... Taking as our basis Marx's method of applying the Hegelian dialectics materialistically conceived, we can and should elaborate this dialectics from all aspects, print in the magazine excerpts from Hegel's principal works, interpret them materialistically and comment on them with the help of examples of the way Marx applied dialectics, as well as of examples of dialectics in the sphere of economic and political relations, which recent history, especially modern imperialist war and revolution, is providing in unusual abundance. In my opinion, the group of editors and contributors to *Pod Znamenem Marxisma* should be a kind of 'Society of Materialist Friends of Hegelian Dialectics.' Modern natural scientists (if they know how to seek, and if we learn to help them) will find in the Hegelian dialectics materialistically interpreted a series of answers to the philosophical problems which are being raised by the revolution in natural science and which make the intellectual admirers of bourgeois fashion 'stumble' into reaction."[1]

Lenin Miscellanies IX and XII have now been published and they reveal the whole process of Lenin's thinking when he analysed Hegel's basic works, show how he applied the method of dialectical materialism in studying Hegel, how closely he linked this study with the study of Marx, with the ability to make Marxism a guide to action in the most diverse conditions.

But it was not only Hegel that Lenin studied. He

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, pp. 612-13.

read, for instance, Marx's letter to Engels of February 1, 1858, in which he sharply criticized Lassalle's book *The Philosophy of Heraclitus the Obscure of Ephesus* (Vol. II) and said it was a "raw" bit of work. At the beginning Lenin briefly formulates Marx's opinion: "Lassalle simply *repeats* Hegel, *copies* him, *chews* certain places from Heraclitus a million times, stuffing his work with an incredible amount of over-clever, scholastic arch-ballast."[1] Nevertheless Lenin studied this work of Lassalle's, made an abstract of it, wrote out excerpts, put down his remarks and came to the following conclusion: "On the whole, Marx's opinion is correct. Lassalle's book is not worth reading." The examination of this book enabled Lenin better to understand Marx, to understand why Marx did not like it.

In conclusion, I should like to point to another form of Lenin's work on Marx — his *popularization* of Marxism. The popularizer himself learns a great deal when he approaches his work "seriously" and sets himself the task of summing up the essence of some theory in the simplest and most comprehensible form.

Lenin always took this work most seriously. In a letter he wrote from exile to Plekhanov and Axelrod he said there was nothing he wanted so much as to learn to write for workers.

He wanted to make Marxism understandable to the working masses. Working in the Marxist circles in the 1890's, he tried above all to explain the first volume of *Capital*, illustrating it with examples from the

[1] *Lenin Miscellanies XII*, p. 295. Russ. ed.

lives of his listeners. In 1911, training leaders for the rising revolutionary movement at the party school in Longjumeau (near Paris), Lenin read workers lectures on political economy, doing his best to explain the fundamentals of Marxism in the simplest possible way. In his *Pravda* articles Ilyich tried to popularize various aspects of Marxism. A fine example of popularization is what Lenin said in 1921, during the debates on the trade unions, of the way to study various things and developments from a dialectical standpoint. "If one is really to know a thing," Lenin said, "one must approach it from all angles; study all its aspects, all its connections and 'intermediate links.' We shall never achieve that fully, but this comprehensive study will prevent blunders and ossification. That is point one. Point two is that dialectical logic demands that a thing should be taken in its development, 'self-motion' (as Hegel sometimes said), in its changes. Point three is that the entire human experience must be incorporated in the complete 'definition' of the thing both as a criterion of truth and as a practical determinant of the link between the thing and man's needs. Point four is that dialectical logic teaches that 'there is no abstract truth, truth is always concrete,' as the late Plekhanov liked to say, quoting Hegel."[1]

These few lines are the essence of what Lenin achieved after many years of work on questions of philosophy, always applying the method of dialectical materialism, always "consulting" Marx. These lines show in a concise way all that is essential to guide one in the study of developments.

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 32, pp. 72-73.

The way Lenin studied Marx shows us how we must study Lenin. His teachings are inseparably linked with those of Marx — they are Marxism in action, Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, 1955, pp. 554-69

HOW LENIN USED LIBRARIES FOR STUDY

Lenin spent a great deal of time in libraries. When he lived in Samara he borrowed large numbers of books from the local library. Later, in St. Petersburg, he spent days in the Public Library and borrowed books from the Free Economic Society's Library and a number of others. Even when in jail, he was supplied with library books by his sister. He made copious notes from these books. In Volume III of the second edition of Lenin's Works there is a note to the effect that in writing *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* he consulted no fewer than 583 books. There are references to these books in *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*. Could Lenin ever have bought all these books? Many of them were not even on sale, for example, the Zemstvo Statistical Abstracts, which were particularly valuable for him. Moreover, at that time he lived like a student in a garret and counted every penny. Those books would have cost every bit of a thousand rubles, which was far beyond his means; nor did he have the time to search for them in the bookshops — that would have taken away precious reading time. And in any case, had it not been for the library catalogues he would never have known of the existence of many of them. Lastly, he had no space in his small room for a library of his own. His reading enabled him not only to write such a fundamental work as *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*; it gave him, in addition, a rich understanding of the life and labour of the industrial workers and the peasantry. And without this there would not have emerged

the Lenin that we all know. *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* appeared in 1899.

While abroad, Ilyich made even more intensive use of the public libraries. He knew foreign languages and read a great many books in them. He could never have bought these books, because, living in emigration, every penny was precious — he had to save on tram fares, on food, etc. But read he must — without books, foreign newspapers and journals Ilyich could not have carried on his work, would not have had the store of knowledge with which he was so amply equipped.

A glance at his *Letters to Relatives* suffices to give an idea of the importance he attached to libraries.

He went abroad for the first time in 1895; in Berlin, where he lived for a few weeks and gained a host of new impressions, he spent much time observing working-class life and reading in the Imperial Library. Later, in the same year, in a St. Petersburg prison, he arranged, in the course of three weeks, for supplies of library books. In addition to using the prison library, he organized the receipt of books from outside. Three weeks after his arrest, he wrote from his cell:

"...Prisoners are allowed to read: I deliberately asked the prosecutor about this, although I was aware of it beforehand (even those who have received their sentences enjoy this privilege). He confirmed that there is no limit to the number of books one may have sent in. What is more, the books can be returned, consequently, they can be borrowed from libraries. In this respect things are not bad.

"Getting hold of the books is a much more serious obstacle, Many are needed, I enclose a list of those I

need now, and getting them will entail quite a bit of effort. I am not even sure that all of them are available. You can rely on the Free Economic Society's Library (I have already taken books from it and have left a deposit of 16 rubles); important books can be borrowed at this library for two months upon payment of a fee, but the collection there is none too good. If you could use (through a writer or professor) the University Library, and the Library of the Science Committee of the Ministry of Finance, then the question of getting books would be solved...

"The last, and most difficult, thing — getting the books to me. It is not simply a matter of bringing a couple of small books: it will be necessary periodically and for a fairly long time to collect them from the library and bring them here (I think once a fortnight, or even once a month, provided you bring as many as you can each time) and take back those I have read. I don't know how you will be able to arrange this. Maybe you can do the following: find a janitor or door-keeper, a messenger, or a boy, whom I could pay and who would undertake the job. Exchange of books, both from the standpoint of working conditions and lending-library rules, necessitates, of course, correct procedure and accuracy, all of which must be arranged.

"'Easier said than done'... I have a strong feeling that it will be pretty difficult to do this, that my 'plan' may remain a chimera..."[1]

Anna undertook to get the books from the library and deliver them to her brother in prison.

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Letters to Relatives*, Moscow, 1934, pp. 14-15.

En route to his place of exile, Ilyich spent the weeks between March 4 and April 30, 1897, in Krasnoyarsk. During that time he made use of the library owned by a man named Yudin. Here is what he wrote from Krasnoyarsk on March 10:

"...Yesterday I spent an evening in the locally famous Yudin library; the owner cordially welcomed me and showed me his collection. He has given me permission to use his library, and I think I will be able to avail myself of the offer. (There are two obstacles: first, the library is located outside the town, about a mile and a half distant, a pleasant walk; second, it is not properly arranged as yet, and I fear that I shall unduly worry the owner by asking for particular volumes.) We shall see how things work out. The second obstacle can, I think, be eliminated. I have not yet fully looked over the library, but from what I have seen I can say that it is a splendid collection. It contains, for example, complete files of journals (the main ones) since the end of the eighteenth century. I hope to find in them source material for my work..."[1]

Five days later, on March 15, he said in another letter: "...I go to the library every day, and since it is about a mile and a half beyond the outskirts of the town this means three miles there and back — about an hour's walk. I like the walk and although it makes me drowsy at times, I enjoy it. There are fewer books in the library on my subject than I thought there were, judging by its size. Still, it has things that I find useful and I am very glad I am not spending time in vain in this place. I visit the municipal library as well, where

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

I can read newspapers and journals eleven days late. I am finding it hard to get used to this stale 'news'."[1]

Upon arriving in the village of Shushenskoye, his place of exile, where letters and newspapers came only on the thirteenth day, Lenin, even in this remote corner of Siberia, arranged to get books from Moscow libraries.

In a letter dated May 25, 1897, he wrote to his sister Anna in Moscow:

"...I keep thinking about using Moscow libraries: have you been able to arrange anything on this score, i.e., have you approached any of the public libraries? The point is, if it is possible to borrow books for two months (as was the case in St. Petersburg with the Free Economic Society's Library, the cost of a *parcel* is not excessive — 16 kopeks per pound, plus 7 kopeks for registering it; you can send 4 pounds, costing 64 kopeks) and, probably, it would be cheaper for me to spend money on postage and have plenty of books than to spend a much bigger sum on *buying* a smaller number of books. I think that this would suit me much better; the only question is whether it is possible to get books for two months (by leaving a deposit, of course) from any of the good libraries: from the University (I think Mitya could easily arrange this through a law student, or by going direct to a professor of political economy and saying that he wants to study the subject and take books from the main library. But this will have to wait until autumn), or from the library of the Moscow Law Society (make inquiries there, ask for a catalogue and find out the

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Letters to Relatives*, Moscow, 1934, pp. 27-28.

conditions of membership, etc.), or some other place. Probably there are a few other good libraries in Moscow. Maybe you will inquire about private libraries too. If any of you are still in Moscow please find out about this.

"If you go abroad, let me know, and I will write in detail about getting books from there. Send me all kinds of catalogues of bookshops, libraries and the like.

"Yours, V.U."[1]

In a letter dated July 19, 1897, to his mother and his sister Maria, Ilyich, replying to Maria's proposal to make excerpts for him, wrote: "About the excerpts, I'm not sure that they would help. I hope that by autumn things will have been arranged with one of the Moscow or St. Petersburg libraries."[2]

Then, in the winter of 1897, he wrote a letter to his relatives which indicates that something had been done by them, but he was on the lookout for other facilities:

"Dear Maria,

"I received your postcard dated (14) 2.12 and the two books by Semyonov. *Merci.* I will return them soon, within a week at the latest (on Wednesday (5.1) the 24th. I fear that we shall not see the postman at all).

"It appears that these first two volumes contain nothing of interest. I suppose this kind of thing is inevitable in ordering books that one does not know — it was something I had anticipated.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 48.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

"I hope we shall not have to pay a fine: they'll extend the loan for another month.

"I don't understand your sentence: 'to be able to use the Law Society's Library — I asked Kablukov about this — one must be a lawyer and submit two recommendations by members of the society.' Only? Is it not necessary to be a *member* of the society? I will try to get a recommendation through St. Petersburg.

"That a non-lawyer can become a member of the society I have not the slightest doubt.

"Affectionately, V.U."[1]

However, postal difficulties made impossible any kind of satisfactory utilization of the libraries during the exile in Shushenskoye.

In September 1898 Ilyich was granted permission to visit Krasnoyarsk for dental treatment. He was overjoyed at the opportunity and planned to make use of the local library.

Upon returning from exile he settled in Pskov. In a letter to his mother, dated March 15, 1900, he wrote: "I visit the library frequently and go for walks."[2]

While in emigration, he spent much time in libraries, but this is only faintly reflected in his correspondence with the members of his family.

During our sojourn in London, 1902-03, Ilyich spent half his time in the British Museum, which contains the richest collection of books in the world and which provides excellent service. He also frequented the reading-rooms of the public libraries, as can be

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Letters to Relatives*, Moscow, 1934, p. 77.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 238.

seen from a letter to his mother on October 27, 1902.[1]

There are many reading-rooms in London — the rooms are entered directly from the street, and they are even minus chairs; there are reading-stands and the newspapers hang from pegs; upon entering you take the paper from the peg and, after reading it, you replace it. These reading-rooms are most convenient and are visited by large numbers of people in the course of the day.

During the second spell in emigration, which coincided with the dispute on philosophical questions, when Ilyich busied himself with writing his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, in May 1908 he left Geneva for London for a month of special study in the British Museum.

In Geneva, whither we arrived in 1903, Ilyich spent whole days in the Société de Lecture Library. This was a huge library with ideal conditions for study — it subscribed to many French, German and English newspapers and journals. The members of the society, mostly veteran professors, rarely visited the library; Ilyich had a room to himself, where he could write, walk up and down, give thought to his articles and take any book he needed from the shelf.

Here, too, he eagerly visited the rich Russian library, named after Kuklin, of which Comrade Karpinsky was in charge. During our residence in other Swiss cities he always borrowed books from this library.

When residing in Paris, Ilyich chiefly frequented the Bibliothèque Nationale.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 286.

Concerning his work in this library I wrote as follows to his mother in December 1909:

"For more than a week now he has been getting up at 8 a.m. to go to the library, whence he returns at 2 p.m. At first he had difficulty in getting up so early, but now he is quite pleased and goes to bed early."[1]

Ilyich tried a number of other libraries in Paris, but they were not to his liking. The Bibliothèque Nationale lacked up-to-date catalogues and there was a lot of red tape connected with borrowing books. Generally speaking, red tape was a feature of French libraries. The municipal libraries contained mostly fiction, but, before a book could be obtained it was necessary to produce a certificate from the householder, who took upon himself or herself responsibility for the book being returned in time. Our landlord delayed giving us the necessary certificate in view of our poor circumstances. Ilyich judged the level of culture in a country by the way in which its libraries were run; he regarded the state of the libraries as an indication of the general level of culture.

Here is what he wrote to his mother from Cracow on April 9, 1914:

"...Paris is not a convenient place for work, the Bibliothèque Nationale is badly run — we often recalled Geneva, where working was easier, where I had a more convenient library and lived in a quieter atmosphere. Of all the places I have visited I would choose London or Geneva, if they were not so far away. From the standpoint of general culture and comfort Geneva is a very fine place. But here, of

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Letters to Relatives*, Moscow, 1934, p. 353.

course, culture is out of the question — it is almost like Russia, the library is bad and is the acme of inconvenience, but I hardly ever visit it...”[1]

When he returned to Berne from Cracow, Ilyich wrote to his sister Maria, in a letter dated December 9, 1914:

“...There are fine libraries here, and I am not badly off where books are concerned. What a pleasure it is to read after a stretch of daily newspaper work. Nadezhda, too, has the benefit of a pedagogical library and is writing a book on education...”[2]

In another letter to Maria, written on February 7, 1916, Ilyich wrote: “Nadezhda and I are very pleased with Zurich; the libraries are good here.” Three weeks later, on February 28, he wrote to his mother: “...We are now living in Zurich, where we are making the acquaintance of the local libraries. We like the lake, and the libraries are much better than those in Berne, so we shall stay longer than we originally intended.”[3]

He returns to the subject in a letter to Maria dated October 9: “The libraries are better in Zurich and there are better facilities for work.”[4]

The Swiss libraries are excellently run. What is particularly good is the interchange of books between libraries. Scientific libraries in German Switzerland are linked with similar establishments in Germany, and even during the war Ilyich was able to get the books he needed from Germany.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 402-03.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 405.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 415-16.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 418.

Another feature is the splendid way in which they cater to readers — no red tape, fine catalogues, open shelves and the exceptional interest taken in the reader.

During the summer of 1915 we lived in the foothills of the Rot Horn, in a remote village, and received books from the library post free. The books came in a wrapper with a label: one side contained the address of the recipient, the other — the address of the library; upon returning the books all that was necessary was to reverse the label and take the parcel to the post office.

Ilyich never tired of lauding Swiss culture and he dreamed of the library system that would be arranged in Russia after the Revolution.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *What Lenin Wrote and Said about Libraries*, Moscow, 1955, pp. 15-22.

LENIN THE PROPAGANDIST AND AGITATOR

(The *RKKA Propagandist and Agitator* Magazine, No. I, 1939)

LENIN THE PROPAGANDIST

Industrial development came to Russia later than to other capitalist countries — Britain, France, Germany — and for that reason our labour movement began to develop later too, assuming a mass character only in the 1890's. By that time the international proletariat had accumulated a vast store of experience and gone through a series of revolutions. The revolutionary movement gave the world the great thinkers Marx and Engels, whose teachings illuminated for the proletariat the path it was to take. They proved that the bourgeois system was doomed, that the proletariat would inevitably win, that it would take power into its hands, rebuild life and create a new, communist society.

Lenin began studying Marx early in life. A profound study of Marx's teachings convinced him that they were a guide to action for the Russian working class, that they would help Russian workers — then ignorant, downtrodden, boundlessly exploited slaves — to develop into conscious, organized fighters for socialism, that they would help the working class of Russia to grow into a powerful force, that they would help it to assume leadership of all the working folk and put an end to all forms of exploitation.

Marx's teachings helped Lenin to see clearly the

trend of social development. Ilyich was deeply convinced that Marx's and Engels' views were correct. He considered it necessary to arm the masses with Marxism as broadly and as well as possible and devoted all his efforts to propagating it.

Marxist propaganda among the working masses was extremely successful. "It was not because we were skilled propagandists that our propaganda was so successful," Lenin used to say. "It was successful because we told the truth."

Deep conviction — that was a characteristic trait of Lenin the propagandist.

Lenin read every one of Marx's works several times and knew them perfectly. His article on Marx, written in 1914 for the *Granat Encyclopedical Dictionary* and generously supplied with bibliographical data, was excellent proof of Lenin's all-round knowledge of Marxism. There is eloquent evidence of that in all the other works of Lenin's too.

The second characteristic trait of Lenin the propagandist was his profound knowledge of the subject.

Lenin not only knew Marxist theory, he knew how to apply it in practice.

In 1894, in the early stages of the labour movement, he wrote *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*, in which he showed how Marxism should be applied in our conditions, from the very first phase of the labour movement. The book was written at the time when most of the revolutionaries held that in Russian conditions the working class could not play an important role.

In 1899, Lenin published *The Development of Cap-*

italism in Russia, in which he quoted a mass of factual data to prove that capitalism was developing in Russia too, despite her backwardness.

In his *What Is to Be Done?* (1902), Lenin showed what the working-class party should be like in our conditions to lead the working class along the right path.

In 1905, he wrote the pamphlet *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*.

In 1907, when the defeat of the 1905 Revolution became obvious (one of the reasons for the failure was insufficient unity between the worker and peasant movements), Lenin wrote *The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution 1905-1907*, in which he stressed that the experience of the revolution demanded the strengthening of the militant alliance between the working class and the peasantry.

And later too, analysing the key issues of the labour movement, Lenin linked each and every one of them with Marxist theory. The vast importance of his book on imperialism, written at the very height of the World War, and of his *The State and Revolution*, written on the eve of the October Revolution, is generally known. The characteristic thing about Lenin's works was that he knew how to link theory and practice, that he did not divorce any practical issue from theory, that he knew how to connect each theoretical question with life, with the living reality, that he knew how to make theory near and understandable to the reader. He knew how to link theory and practice both in his scientific works and in his verbal and written propa-

ganda.[1]

Thus, still another characteristic feature of Lenin the propagandist was his ability to link theory and the living reality, and that made theory perspicuous and environment sensible.

Lenin did not study theory and environment simply because they were interesting. Explaining reality in the light of Marxist theory, he always strived to draw the necessary conclusions which could serve as a guide to action. Lenin's propaganda was always tied with contemporary problems. In his report on the

[1] Here is how I.V. Babushkin, a Petersburg worker, described the method Lenin the propagandist used for his lectures: "There were seven persons in the group including the lecturer (the lecturer was V.I. Lenin — *Ed.*). We began with Marx's political economy. The lecturer explained this science to us verbally, without notes, stopping often to ask for objections or start an argument, and then encouraging us to justify our point of view on the question before us.

"Our discussions were therefore very lively and interesting and accustomed us to speaking in public; this method of study proved to be the best way to explain questions to the students. We were all very pleased with the lectures and constantly amazed at the wisdom of our lecturer; among ourselves we joked that he had such a large brain that it had pushed his hair out.

"These lectures at the same time taught us to do independent work, and to collect our own material; the lecturer gave us lists of previously prepared questions which prompted us to make a closer study and observation of factory and mill life. During working hours we found excuses to go into another shop to collect material, either by personal observation or, where possible, in conversation with the workers.

"My toolbox was always full of notes of all kinds; during the dinner hour I tried to write up the data on hours and wages in our shop." (*Recollections of Ivan Vasilyevich Babushkin*, Moscow, 1957).

Paris Commune, made in Switzerland after the February 1917 Revolution, Lenin not only spoke of how the French workers took power into their hands or of how Marx appraised the Paris Commune, but also of what the Russian workers would have to do after gaining power. Lenin was always able to turn theory into a guide to action.

And so, *a characteristic feature of Lenin the propagandist was his ability to turn theory into a guide to action*.

Although Lenin possessed vast knowledge and wide experience as a propagandist (he made a great many reports and wrote many propaganda articles), he carefully prepared each speech, each report, each lecture. We have many theses of his propaganda speeches and reports, and they show how thoroughly he worked on each. We see how sapid these speeches were, how very capably Lenin stressed the most essential points and illustrated each thought with graphic examples.

Thorough preparation for propaganda speeches was an inherent feature of Lenin the propagandist.

In his propaganda speeches Ilyich never bypassed or glossed over painful issues. On the contrary, he always put them point-blank. He was not afraid of sharp words and deliberately emphasized the issues. He was against impassive propaganda speeches, against speeches that rippled like a brook. His speeches were sharp, often somewhat rude, but they were impressive, exciting and interesting.

Lenin the propagandist put his questions point-blank and infected listeners with his passion.

Vladimir Ilyich studied the masses thoroughly,

knew how they worked and lived, what concrete issues agitated them. Addressing the masses, he always orientated himself on his audience. As he read his reports, lectured or talked he took into consideration what was agitating his listeners most at the moment, what they did not understand, what they thought was most important. The attention with which they listened to him, the questions they asked and the remarks and speeches they made were enough to show him their mood, and he knew how to arouse their interest, explain what they did not understand, win them over.

Lenin the propagandist knew how to captivate his audience and establish mutual understanding.

Lastly, it is necessary to stress how much Lenin's propaganda gained from his attitude to the masses. He did not look down upon workers, poor and middle peasants and Red Army men. He treated them as comrades, as equals. For him, they were not "objects of propaganda," but live people who had gone through a lot, thought over many things and were demanding due attention to their needs. The workers highly appreciated his simplicity and comradely attitude. "He talks seriously with us," they used to say. The audiences saw that he himself was just as much interested in the problems he explained, and that convinced them more than anything else.

Ability to explain his thoughts simply, and his comradely attitude to the audiences made Ilyich's propaganda forceful, extremely fruitful and effective.

There are no stone walls between propaganda, agitation and organization. The propagandist who knows how to infect the audience with his enthusiasm

is at the same time an agitator. A propagandist who knows how to turn theory into a guide to action undoubtedly facilitates the work of an organizer.

There were strong elements of agitation and organization in Lenin's propaganda, but they did not detract from its potency and significance.

We must learn from Lenin the propagandist.

LENIN THE AGITATOR

"Our teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action," Marx and Engels used to say. Lenin often repeated these words. All his efforts were directed at making Marxism a real guide to action for the broadest, masses of workers.

Immediately on his arrival in Petersburg in 1893, Lenin visited workers' circles to explain how Marx assessed the prevailing state of affairs, what he thought of social development, how important he considered the working class and its struggle against the capitalist class, and why he held that the victory of the working class was inevitable. Lenin tried to speak as simply as possible, citing examples from the lives of Russian workers. He saw that the workers listened to him attentively, that they were mastering the fundamentals of Marxism, but at the same time he felt that it was not enough just to say: "We must launch an all-out class struggle." It was essential, he held, to show *how* this struggle should be unleashed and around what issues. The task was to take the facts that particularly agitated the worker masses, elucidate them and show *what* had to be done to eliminate or change them. At the beginning, in the 1890's, the workers were chiefly

concerned with the long working hours, fines, deductions from wages and brutal treatment. Here is what Lenin's circle did: a comrade would visit some factory and help the workers to formulate definite demands to the employers. These demands were explained and printed in special leaflets. The latter united the workers, and they joined forces in backing the demands.

Agitation helped to activate the masses of workers.

"Inseparably connected with propaganda is *agitation* among the workers, which naturally comes to the forefront in the present political conditions in Russia and level of development of the masses of workers," Lenin wrote in *The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats* in 1897. "Agitation among the workers consists in the Social-Democrats taking part in all the spontaneous manifestations of the struggle of the working class, in all the conflicts between the workers and the capitalists over the working day, wages, conditions of labour, etc., etc. Our task is to merge our activities with the practical, everyday questions of working-class life, to help the workers to understand these questions, to draw the attention of the workers to the most important abuses, to help them to formulate their demands to the employers more precisely and practically, to develop among the workers the consciousness of their solidarity, consciousness of the common interests and common cause of all the Russian workers as a united working class that constitutes a part of the international army of the proletariat."[1]

In 1906, describing how the Social-Democrat representatives should conduct agitation among peas-

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part I, p. 179.

ants, Lenin wrote: "It is not enough merely to repeat the word 'class' to prove that the proletariat plays the role of the vanguard in *present-day* revolution. It is not enough to summarize our socialist teaching and the general theory of Marxism to prove the vanguard role of the proletariat. For this it is essential to know how to show *in practice*, when analysing the burning questions of *present-day revolution*, that the members of the workers' party defend the interests of *this* revolution, the interests of its *total* victory more consistently, more correctly, more resolutely and more skilfully than anyone else."[1]

Agitation, *Lenin teaches*, *links theory and practice*. Therein lies its power.

Agitation played a very important part in workers' economic struggle. It taught them to use strike action as a method of struggle against the capitalists and brought about victories that improved the lot of the working class.

The success of the economic struggle, however, gave rise to the "economist" trend in the ranks of Social-Democracy due to underestimation of Marxist theory, worship of spontaneity, the desire to restrict the tasks of the proletariat to a struggle for better economic conditions and hence the desire to minimize political agitation among the masses of workers.

"*Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement*," Lenin retorted to the economists in his *What Is to Be Done?* in 1902. "This thought cannot be insisted upon too strongly at a time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism goes

[1] V.I. *Lenin*, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 11, p. 261-62.

hand in hand with an infatuation for the narrowest forms of practical activity."[1]

It is not only the Marxists who resort to agitation to activate the masses. The bourgeoisie has accumulated vast experience in the sphere of agitation. But there is agitation and agitation. Only "a correct theoretical solution *can ensure* durable success in agitation," said Lenin at the Second Congress of the Party.[2]

Underestimating theory, belittling its significance "*means, quite irrespective of whether the belittler wants to or not, strengthening the influence of the bourgeois ideology over the workers.*"[3] Thus, the most important thing in agitation, according to Lenin, is its *content*.

He opposed attempts to reduce agitation to mere slogans and insisted on it being linked with explanatory work.

Lenin saw the force of agitation in well-organized explanatory work, clear and simple in form. It is necessary "to be able to speak simply and clearly in a popular language, resolutely casting aside all the heavy artillery of abstruse terminology and foreign words, slogans, definitions and conclusions that have been well mastered but are incomprehensible to the masses," Lenin wrote in 1906 in the article "Social-Democracy and Election Agreements."[4]

That, of course, does not mean that Lenin denied the usefulness of slogans. "Very often it is useful, and

---

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part I, p. 227. (The italics are Krupskaya's. — *Ed.*)

[2] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol 6, p. 449.

[3] V I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part I, p. 242.

[4] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 11, p. 262.

sometimes imperative, to round out the election platform of Social-Democracy with a brief general slogan, an election watchword, enumerating the most fundamental questions of immediate policy and giving a most convenient and best reason and material for launching an all-round socialist sermon," Vladimir Ilyich wrote in 1911.[1] He was dead set against demagogy, against playing up the evil instincts of the masses, against taking advantage of their ignorance and illiteracy. "I shall never tire of repeating that demagogues are the worst enemies of the working class," he would say.[2] Demagogy, false promises always evoked his indignation. What had the Socialist-Revolutionaries not only promised the peasants!

Lenin *never* promised the peasants anything he *himself* did not believe in. He was against hushing up our socialist aims, our distinct class position even when this was necessary for success. And the masses felt this and saw that he was talking "seriously" (to quote a worker who heard Lenin's agitational speeches in 1917).

Ilyich fought bitterly against the Economists, who strove to *belittle the significance of agitation*. In *The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats* (1897) he wrote: "Just as there is not a question affecting the economic life of the workers that must be left unused for the purpose of economic agitation, so there is not a political question that cannot serve as a subject for political agitation. These two kinds of agitation are inseparably connected in the activities of the Social-

[1] *Ibid.*, Vol. 17, p. 248.
[2] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part I, p. 334.

Democrats like the two sides of a medal. Economic and political agitation are equally necessary for the development of the class consciousness of the proletariat, and economic and political agitation are equally necessary in order to guide the class struggle of the Russian workers, for every class struggle is a political struggle."[1]

And:

"All-round political agitation is precisely the focal point in which the vital interests of political education of the proletariat coincide with the vital interests of the entire social development and entire people in the sense of all its democratic elements. Our immediate duty is to intervene in each and every liberal issue, to define our, Social-Democratic, attitude to it, and to take steps so that the proletariat will actively participate in the solution of this issue and force the solution it wants."[2]

"Can it be confined to the propaganda of working-class hostility to the autocracy? Of course not. It is not enough to *explain* to the workers that they are politically oppressed (no more than it was to *explain* to them that their interests were antagonistic to the interests of the employers). Agitation must be conducted over every concrete example of this oppression (in the same way that we have begun to conduct agitation around concrete examples of economic oppression.) And inasmuch as *this* oppression affects the most diverse classes of society, inasmuch as it manifests itself in the most varied spheres of life and activ-

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part I, p. 183.

[2] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 5, p. 314.

ity — industrial, civic, personal, family, religious, scientific, etc., etc. — is it not evident that *we shall not be fulfilling our task* of developing the political consciousness of the workers if we do not *undertake* the organization of the *political exposure* of the autocracy *in all its aspects?* In order to carry on agitation around concrete examples of oppression, these examples must be exposed (just as it was necessary to expose factory abuses in order to carry on economic agitation)."[1]

In those days political exposure was done by the illegal newspaper *Iskra*, published abroad. Ilyich meant it to be a collective propagandist, a collective agitator and a collective organizer, to help in directing the activities of the working masses into a single channel, to discuss the most vital issues. "The whole of political life is an endless chain consisting of an infinite number of links," Lenin wrote in 1902 in *What Is to Be Done?* "The whole art of politics lies in finding and gripping as strong as we can the link that is least likely to be torn out of our hands, the one that is most important at the given moment, the one that guarantees the possessor of a link the possession of the whole chain."[2]

Under Lenin's guidance *Iskra* knew how to choose the most important issues around which widespread agitation was then carried out.

Proper political organization, one embracing the broad masses of workers, enhanced the role of the agitator.

An agitator, Ilyich said, is a popular tribune who

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part I, p. 263.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 379.

knows how to address the masses, stimulate their enthusiasm, use salient, eloquent facts. A speech by such a popular tribune moves the masses; the revolutionary class catches on to it and energetically supports it. Lenin was precisely such an agitator, such a popular tribune.

In the summer of 1905, in the pamphlet *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, Lenin pointed out that "the entire work of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party has already been fully moulded into firm, immutable forms which absolutely guarantee that our main attention will be fixed on propaganda and agitation, impromptu and mass meetings, on the distribution of leaflets and pamphlets, assisting in the economic struggle and championing the slogans of that struggle."[1]

But the fact that agitation had become part of our work and assumed definite forms *does not mean that Lenin ever tolerated its being patternized.*

He insisted on a different approach to different sections of the population. "Every Social-Democrat, wherever he may be making a political speech, should always speak of the republic. But he should know how to speak of the republic: he cannot speak of it in the same manner at a factory meeting and in a Cossack village, at a student gathering and in a peasant's hut, from the tribune of the Third Duma and in the pages of a Party newspaper published abroad. The art of every propagandist and every agitator consists precisely in influencing in the best possible manner the audience he is addressing, making the truth as con-

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 110.

vincing as possible for it, as easily comprehensible as possible, as clear and deeply impressive as possible," Lenin wrote in 1911.[1] That, of course, does not mean that we must speak in one way with some people and in another with others. The question is one of approach.

I remember we then lived in Paris and frequently went to election meetings. Vladimir Ilyich was particularly interested in seeing how the Socialists addressed various meetings. I remember one day we listened to a Socialist at a workers' meeting and then heard him at a gathering of intellectuals, most of them teachers. What he said at the second meeting was absolutely different from what he had told the first. He wanted to get more votes in the elections. I remember how indignant Vladimir Ilyich was that the orator was a radical in front of workers and an opportunist in front of intellectuals.

Lenin considered it extremely important to know how to elucidate general slogans on the basis of local material. "We must do everything to use the central organ for local agitation not only by reprinting, but also by *analysing* thoughts and slogans in leaflets, *developing* or altering them to conform to local conditions, etc.,"[2] Lenin wrote in 1905 on behalf of the editorial board of *Proletary* to the newspaper *Rabochy*.[3]

---

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 17, p. 304.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. 9, p. 263.

[3] *Proletary* — illegal Bolshevik newspaper, central organ of the RSDLP. Published in Geneva from May 14 to November 12, 1905, with V.I. Lenin as editor.

Rabochy — illegal Social-Democratic newspaper published by the Central Committee of the RSDLP in Moscow from Au-

Lenin time and again reiterated the necessity of studying the masses in order to learn how properly to approach them. He himself did that continuously, knew how to listen to the masses, knew how to understand what they said, knew how to grasp the essence of what the worker or a peasant was trying to say.

Speaking of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of how the Communists everywhere should prepare for it, Lenin wrote in the *Theses on the Basic Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International* (July 1920): "The dictatorship of the proletariat is the fullest realization of the leadership of all the working people and the exploited who are oppressed, downtrodden, crushed, intimidated, split, deceived by the capitalist class, on the part of the only class prepared for this leading role by the whole course of the history of capitalism. Therefore, preparations for the dictatorship of the proletariat should be begun everywhere and immediately through the application, incidentally, of the following method." Stressing the importance of setting up communist cells, Lenin continued: "Closely linked with one another and with the Party centre, exchanging experience, doing agitational, propaganda and organizational work, adapting themselves to absolutely all the spheres of social life, to absolutely all the different professions and sections of the working masses, these cells should systematically educate themselves, the Party, the class and the masses in the process of this many-sided activity." And further: "To understand the peculiarities, the characteristics of the psychology of each section, pro-

---

gust to October 1905.

fession, etc., of the masses, one must learn to approach them with particular patience and consideration."[1]

Learning to approach the masses, Ilyich said, meant preparing the Party for the dictatorship of the proletariat. And he himself learned that with great perseverance all through his life.

Similarly, Lenin was against *patternizing the choice of slogans* which formed the subject of agitation. He regarded the choice of slogans as a matter of vast importance. Reporting on petty-bourgeois parties to a meeting of Party functionaries in November 1918, Vladimir Ilyich pointed out that "every slogan is capable of ossifying more than is necessary."[2] He attached exceptional im-portance to flexibility, to the ability of choosing — in the sphere of agitation, in every phase — from the chain of facts the very link that is necessary to pull out the whole chain, to elucidate all developments.

When I joined a student circle in the early 1890's, when I was not yet a Marxist, my comrades gave me *Historical Letters* by Mirtov (Lavrov)[3] to read. They impressed me profoundly. Several years later, when we were in exile in the village of Shushenskoye, I had a talk on the subject with Ilyich. I rather praised the *Letters*, while Ilyich criticized them from a Marxist standpoint. My last argument was: "Isn't Lavrov right when he says that 'a banner, revolutionary at

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 31, pp. 167, 168.

[2] *Ibid*., Vol. 28, p. 203.

[3] P.L. Lavrov (Mirtov) — prominent Narodnik theoretician (1823-1900).

one moment, may become reactionary the next'?" Ilyich agreed with this, but added that that did not make the whole book correct.

Ever since its inception the Party, while remaining faithful to its basic principles, had constantly had to alter its slogans to conform to the changing conditions. And conditions in which it had to work changed all the time.

In the summer of 1905, Ilyich wrote to Russia that it was important to inform the workers that the Party newspaper was being published illegally somewhere abroad, that it had a circulation of some 2,000 copies and that it was being smuggled across the border and illegally distributed. Few copies, however, reached the workers. The situation changed radically within a few months. "The broadest tribune *now* for influencing the proletariat is the Petersburg *daily* (we are capable of raising the circulation to 100,000 and reducing the price to one kopek per copy)," Lenin wrote to Plekhanov at the end of October 1905.[1]

In December 1911, Ilyich wrote of the tremendous significance of "the State Duma as an agitational tribune."[2] The importance of this was admitted even by the Liberals and the Constitutional Democrats, who had insisted all along in the Second State Duma that the Bolsheviks stop regarding it as a tribune for agitation.

The slogans, I repeat, were altered to conform to the changing conditions.

In his pamphlet *The Tasks of the Russian Social-*

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 34, p. 316.

[2] *Ibid*., Vol. 17, p. 324.

Democrats (1897) Lenin warned against squandering the Party's energies and stressed the necessity of concentrating on working among the urban proletariat. Agitating in the countryside at that time would be squandering the Party's energies. And in 1907 Ilyich wrote: "We must intensify tenfold our agitational and organizational work among the peasants — both among those who are starving in the villages and those whose sons lived through the great year of the Revolution and last autumn went into the army."[1]

The ability to assess the moment in a Marxist way, to analyse the events in all their aspects, to analyse their development, to determine what the working class needs at a given moment to achieve victory — in a word, the dialectical, Marxist approach in assessing the moment enabled the Party to choose correct slogans, to grasp the proper link. Lenin contributed much to the analysis of the Party's tasks in every phase. The correct choice of slogans was what linked theory and practice, what made agitation particularly successful. The peace and land slogans raised by the Bolsheviks on the eve of the October Revolution were slogans that ensured the victory of the working class, slogans that produced a great impression on the peasant and soldier masses. However vivid, slogans that did not take reality into account were nothing, Lenin said, but revolutionary phrasemongering.

In 1918, when it became necessary to accept Germany's humiliating peace conditions and some came out against peace and for a revolutionary war, Lenin answered them in the article "On Revolutionary

[1] *Ibid.*, Vol. 12, p. 96.

Phrasemongering":

"Revolutionary phrasemongering is repetition of revolutionary slogans without taking account of objective circumstances in the given phase of development, in the given state of affairs. Revolutionary phrasemongering means slogans that are splendid, fascinating, intoxicating, but groundless." And further: "Whoever does not want to lull himself with words, declamation and exclamation, cannot but see that the 'slogan' of revolutionary war in February 1918 is an empty phrase lacking any real, objective meaning. Feeling, desire, indignation, resentment — these are the sole *content* of this slogan at the moment. And a slogan with such a content, only is revolutionary phrasemongering."[1]

At the very height of reaction in 1908, Lenin wrote:

"*Political agitation is never conducted in vain*. Its success is measured not only by the fact whether or not we have immediately succeeded in winning over the majority or in achieving agreement on co-ordinated political action. Perhaps we shall not achieve that immediately. But then, precisely because we are an organized proletarian party, we are not daunted by temporary reverses, but *work* stubbornly, persistently and firmly however difficult conditions may be."[2]

Life has shown that Ilyich was right. A revolutionary wave rose in 1912, the *traditions* of 1905 revived and they helped the workers to stage a mass strike in

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 27, pp. 1, 2-3.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. 15, p. 195. (The italics at the beginning are Krupskaya's. — *Ed.*)

reply to the Lena events. The workers immediately picked up and enlivened these traditions.

A revolutionary mass strike, Lenin said, was a proletarian method of agitation.

"The Russian revolution," he wrote in June 1912, "first widely developed this proletarian method of agitating, stimulating, rallying and drawing the masses into the struggle. And now the proletariat is applying this method again, and more firmly. No force in the world could do what the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat is doing with the aid of this method. The huge country with a population of 150 million, scattered over its vast expanses, split, downtrodden, deprived of all rights, ignorant, isolated from 'pernicious influence' by swarms of officials, police and spies — the *entire* country is in ferment. The most backward sections of workers and peasants are coming into direct and indirect contact with the strikers. Hundreds of thousands of revolutionary agitators are appearing on the scene at one and the same time and their influence is infinitely enhanced by the fact that they are indissolubly bound to the lower classes, to the masses, remain in their ranks, fight for the most vital needs of *every* worker family, link this direct struggle for vital economic demands with political protest and struggle against the monarchy. For the counter-revolution has imbued millions and tens of millions of people with deep hatred of the monarchy, given them a rudimentary idea of its role, and now the slogan of the capital's progressive workers — 'Long Live the Democratic Republic!' — goes and goes through thousands of channels, in the wake of every strike, to the backward sections, to the remote provinces, to the

'people,' into 'the interior of Russia'."[1]

The masses may be persuaded by the facts; they believe deeds and not words. In his speech at the Third Congress of Soviets, Lenin said: "We know that another voice is now rising in the popular masses; they tell themselves: there is no need to fear the man with a gun, for he is defending working people and will fight stubbornly against dominance by exploiters. That is what the people feel, and that is why the agitation carried on by simple, illiterate people — when they tell that Red Army men are turning their might against the exploiters — is invincible."[2]

During the Civil War agitation was conducted on an unprecedentedly wide scale. There were the All-Russian Central Executive Committee agitation trains and ships. Vladimir Ilyich followed their activity very closely, issued instructions on the selection of agitators, on the character of agitation and on registration of the work done.

The decrees promulgated by the Soviet government were of vast importance, both from a propagandistic and an agitational view. Lenin wrote:

"If we had refrained from indicating in decrees the road that must be followed, we would have been traitors to socialism. These decrees, while in practice they could not be carried into effect fully and immediately, played an important part for propaganda. While formerly we carried on our propaganda by means of general truths, *we are now carrying on our propaganda by our work*. That is also preaching, but it is preaching by

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ, ed., Vol. 18, p. 88.

[2] *Ibid*., Vol. 26, pp. 420-21.

action — only not action in the sense of isolated sallies of some upstarts, at which we scoffed so much in the era of the Anarchists and the socialism of the old type. Our decree is a call, but not the old call: 'Workers, arise and overthrow the bourgeoisie!' No, it is a call to the masses, it calls them to practical work. *Decrees are instructions which call for practical work on mass scale*. That is what is important."[1]

Ilyich closely linked agitation not only with propaganda, but also with organization. Agitation helps the masses to organize — Lenin said so from the very start — rallies them, helps them to act concertedly. Agitation was of vast organizational importance in times of revolution; it is no less important for socialist construction. The forms of agitation change, but agitation continues to be organizationally important, that is, *agitation by deed, work, example*.

Vladimir Ilyich attached particular attention to *agitation by means of example*. In his article "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government," written in March-April 1918, Ilyich emphasized the importance example had for agitation in Soviet conditions. "Under the capitalist mode of production," he said, "the significance of individual example, say, the example of some co-operative workshop, was inevitably exceedingly restricted, and only those imbued with petty-bourgeois illusions could dream of 'correcting' capitalism by the influence of example of virtuous institutions. After political power has passed to the proletariat, after the expropriators have been expropriated, the situation radically changes and — as promi-

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 183.

nent Socialists have repeatedly pointed out — force of example for the first time is able to exercise influence on the masses. Model communes should and will serve as educators, teachers, helping to raise the backward communes. The press must serve as an instrument of socialist construction, give publicity to the successes achieved by the model communes in all their details, study the causes of these successes, the methods of management these communes employ, and on the other hand, put on the 'black list' those communes which persist in the 'traditions of capitalism,' i.e., anarchy, laziness, disorder and profiteering."[1]

In attaching vast importance to agitation by means of example, Ilyich attached *tremendous agitational significance to socialist emulation.*

When the Civil War was drawing to its end, Ilyich stressed the necessity of switching propaganda and agitation to new rails, and of linking them as closely as possible with the tasks of socialist construction and particularly with the tasks of economic construction, with the tasks of the planned economy.

"Propaganda of the old type," said Lenin, "describes and illustrates communism. But old propaganda is absolutely useless, for it is necessary to show in practice how socialism is to be built. All propaganda should be based on the political experience accumulated in the process of economic construction... Our main policy now should be the economic construction of the state... And this should be the basis of all agitation and all propaganda work...

"Each agitator should be a state leader, a leader of

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part I, pp. 472-73.

all the peasants and workers in economic construction."[1]

He insisted that the All-Russian Central Executive Committee agitation trains and ships improve the economic and practical side of their work by including agronomists and technicians on the staff of their political departments, by selecting technical literature and films on necessary subjects; he demanded that films on agricultural and industrial themes be produced at home and ordered abroad.

Lenin insisted that political education institutions organize industrial propaganda on a wide scale, drew up theses on this question, demanded the study of all forms of industrial propaganda and agitation abroad, notably in America, of the experience in applying these methods in our country. After the GOELRO[2] report, he insisted on drawing the broad worker masses into the work of electrification, on imparting political character to agitation for a single electrification plan, and demanded the broadening of the polytechnical outlook of the workers, without which it was impossible to understand the essence of the planned economy.

Lenin dreamed of turning the Soviet Land into an original agitation centre operating by means of example and illustration — into a torch that would illuminate the path for the world proletariat.

---

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 31, pp. 346, 347.

[2] The State Commission for the Electrification of Russia. On Lenin's instructions it drew up in 1920 a long-term plan for the country's electrification.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Lenin the Propagandist and Agitator*, Gospolitizdat Publishing House, 1956.

ACTIVITY OF CHILDREN'S ORGANIZATIONS

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WEEK

(*Pravda*, 1923)

The Executive Committee of the Young Communist International has fixed the Third International Children's Week for July 24-30. The children's movement in Russia is in its infancy and the Children's Week, therefore, is being used to propagandize it.

Some comrades may question the necessity for a children's movement or a children's organization. "Let them grow up," they may say, "become more mature, and they will join the Young Communist League. What do they understand now? Let them play and go to school."

The Young Pioneer movement — that is the way the children's communist organization calls itself — is open to all boys and girls of eleven and over.

The Young Pioneer organization instils in its members collective instincts and accustoms them to share joy and grief, teaches them to make the interests of the collective their own, to regard themselves as members of the collective. It develops collective habits, i.e., the ability to work and act collectively and in an organized manner by subordinating their will to the will of the collective, displaying their initiative through the collective and teaching them to respect the opinion of the collective. Lastly, it enhances children's communist consciousness by helping them to realize that they are members of the working class which is fighting for mankind's happiness, members of the huge army of the international proletariat.

The very formulation of these tasks proves that

the sooner children are drawn into this movement, the better. Very often one hears workers' children say: "We never see Father; he works in the day and goes to meetings in the evening." Mother, too, either works or is too busy with household chares or the baby. And so, workers' children are left to themselves — they either stay at home without seeing anything or indulge in pranks from sheer boredom or fall under the influence of street urchins. The children's organization will afford them many happy moments, promote their activity and give them food for thought.

A Young Pioneer organization, naturally, should not be run like an adult one. It would be bad indeed if it were a carbon copy of one. But it must be imbued with the spirit of communism.

First of all, it should afford entertainment. Chorus singing, games, swimming, outings, campfire talks, visits to factories, participation in proletarian holidays — all that will leave an indelible impression and give children an excellent picture of an organization, a collective. Participation in proletarian holidays and visits to workers' clubs, factories and meetings will make for closer ties between children and the working class, and these ties should be encouraged in every possible way. Young Pioneers should be patronized by women's departments, Party organizations and trade unions, which should do everything to enhance class solidarity among children.

During the children's movement week workers' organizations should take charge of Young Pioneers, arrange excursions for them and acquaint them with their work. Specially chosen men and women workers should tell them of their own childhood, of the strug-

gle they had to wage. In brief, the working class should "adopt" the Young Pioneers for the duration of the International Children's Week.

Children are children. That is why the Young Pioneer organization concentrates so much attention on games, for games, after all, are absolutely necessary for children's physique. They develop physical strength, make children's hands stronger, their bodies more flexible, their eyes sharper; they develop their ingenuity, resourcefulness and initiative. More, they promote children's organizational capacity, self-control, endurance, ability to gauge the situation, and so on. There are, of course, good games and bad. There are games that make children cruel and rude, fan hatred for other nations, affect children's nervous system, arouse gambling instincts and vanity. And there are games that are highly educational, that strengthen children's will-power, develop their feeling of justice and teach them to help people in need. There are games that make beasts out of children and there are games that make them Communists. It is this last task that the Young Pioneer organization undertakes to fulfil. And here they are assisted by the Young Communist League.

But it is not only games that the Young Pioneers indulge in. The children of today have seen and heard too much and they desire to participate in the struggle for human happiness, for the new life. Perhaps their part in this will not be very big: collecting medicinal herbs, clearing up and planting flowers in the gardens in front of factories, sewing clothes for crèches, delivering invitations to meetings, decorating workers' clubs, etc. But these collective tasks will make a

Young Pioneer realize that he is a useful member of society and will stimulate him to other creative activity. Soviet institutions should show attention to Young Pioneers and give them opportunities to be useful.

The children's movement is of special value for the school, for it develops habits which can help to promote children's "self-government," creates possibilities for applying new teaching methods and heightens children's interest in studies and their thirst for knowledge. Progressive teachers should hail the Young Pioneer organization. During the International Children's Week the schools should throw their doors wide open to Young Pioneers. The latter should wholeheartedly help teachers to build up a new school and form the core of this school.

During this week, between July 24 and 30, we should lay a solid foundation for the children's movement in the RSFSR.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *The Communist Education of Our Children*, Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing House, 1934, pp. 12-15.

FOUR LINES OF WORK AMONG YOUNG PIONEERS

(Speech at the Seventh Congress of the Young Communist League, March 21, 1926)

Comrades,

There should now be a clear programme of the work to be done among the Young Pioneers. When we speak of boy scout activity, we all understand very well, of course, that however attractive it may be, it is meant to bring up the growing generation as loyal servants of kings and capitalists. When we speak of work among children's communist groups, we also have a clear idea of what that means. Every member of a children's communist group in Germany or any other capitalist country knows that his task is to help the working class in its struggle against the capitalist system. In their time our children knew that too and though in the old days there were no Young Pioneers and no children's organizations, every time there was a strike you could see children marching at the head of processions, slinging mud at shop foremen or factory managers. They were with the workers heart and soul. And during the Civil War, too, we saw workers' children, organized and unorganized, on the side of the working class. They knew very well that it was necessary to defend themselves against the Whites, and they showed their hatred of these Whites in every way they knew and could.

But if we now ask our Young Pioneers what they should work for, I have no doubt whatever that each of them will answer: "We are ready to fight for the

workers' cause. We want to light for and build up socialism. We want to follow Lenin's path." But it is necessary to decipher what that means. In our Soviet Land, which is passing through the transition phase from capitalism to socialism, our issues are not so simple as they seem. The power is in the hands of the workers and peasants, the capitalists have been defeated, but relationships are much more complicated than they are in capitalist countries where one class opposes another and everything, therefore is clear. The question of building socialism is one that should be formulated with absolute clarity. I recall a speech Vladimir Ilyich once made. He said that when there were Kolchak, Denikin and the capitalists, the broad masses knew why and whom they were fighting, and saw the enemy in the persons of Kolchak, Denikin, etc. Now, they have little idea of the necessity of combatting the remnants of the past, of cultivating the new.

If an illiterate worker sometimes found that hard to understand at the beginning, the Young Pioneer, naturally, finds it even harder. And here we must come to his assistance and explain what building socialism means. He is quite frank and eager when he says he is ready to fight for socialism, but we cannot expect him to explain what that implies. The task of the Party and of the Young Communist League is to help the Young Pioneer.

One should know that building socialism is not just creating a new economic basis, not just setting up and consolidating Soviet rule, but also bringing up a new generation who will tackle every problem in a new way, like Communists, like Socialists; a new gen-

eration whose habits and attitude towards other people will be totally different from those in the capitalist society. Building socialism does not mean only developing industries, setting up co-operatives or consolidating Soviet rule, though all that is absolutely essential; it also means remoulding our psychology, reshaping our relationships. In this respect, the Young Pioneer movement will, of course, play a colossal part. It is very difficult for an adult who grew up in a capitalist environment to give up old habits, old customs and old relationships. Our Young Pioneers are children whose attitude to social developments is still in the process of shaping, has yet to assume a concrete form. That explains the vast significance of the Young Pioneer movement, that is why we, Party members, attach so much importance to it. This question should be made crystal clear. Engels wrote that a new world was taking shape in the old capitalist society. In his *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, he spoke of the absolutely new relationships forming between men and women and between parents and children, and of the growing feelings of fraternal solidarity which were the seed of a powerful feeling of fraternal solidarity of all the working people, a feeling that would undoubtedly constitute the distinguishing feature of the socialist society.

Looking at our Young Pioneer movement, we must say that our task is to help the Young Pioneers in developing a feeling of fraternal solidarity for all the working people and a feeling of comradeship in the Young Pioneer organizations themselves. I have had many an occasion to speak with Young Pioneers, especially on the question in which I am particularly

interested — the question of comradely relationships in Young Pioneer organizations. Very often the replies have been most curious. For instance, one Young Pioneer, and a very active one too, told me of the social work they were doing. When I asked him what this work was, he replied: "We meet very often." I tried to get more out of him about this social work, and he finally guessed what I was after and said: "I'm on the sanitary commission."

"What do you do in the sanitary commission?" 1 asked him.

"Oh, take cold showers, talk with the doctor, issue instructions."

"And how many children have you got on your sick list?"

"That I don't know. That's the doctor's job."

It is certainly bad when a member of the sanitary commission does not know whether his comrades are well or ill, whether all of them can write and read, when he does not know how they live and does not possess a feeling of comradeship.

The rapporteur to the congress pointed out that children should be regrouped, that children from one school should belong as far as possible to one and the same Young Pioneer troop. He is right, of course, because a troop should represent a well-knit body, an organization set up not merely for meetings, but to develop contacts and mutual aid among its members. The feeling of comradeship should be strengthened and consolidated in every possible way. And how are things now? Yesterday I received a letter from a Young Pioneer. Here is what he writes: "I am backward and will soon be kicked out of the Young Pio-

neers. I have read Yaroslavsky's book attentively, I have practically learned it by heart and I know all about the communist attitude to agriculture, but I am depressed by the fact that I do not pray. Please, send me books that can teach me." What does this letter reveal?

It reveals that this Young Pioneer does not feel at home in his troop, that because he has not read Yaroslavsky's book well and probably does not understand it, his comrades are calling him backward and threatening to throw him out of the Young Pioneers, and that is the reason why the lad feels lonely. Hence, he feels the need of religion. And if we want to do away with religion, we must set up collectives imbued with the spirit of comradely solidarity and not leave an adolescent all to himself.

Promotion of comradely solidarity and development and consolidation of comradely feelings constitute the main task of a Young Pioneer troop and whatever its activity — meetings, discussions or games — it must be imbued with the spirit of comradely solidarity.

Another thing: every Young Pioneer should be a social worker. I have had a very interesting conversation with a teacher who has returned to Russia from America after an absence of many years. What do you think struck him as the biggest change to have taken place in Russia while he was away? The fact that people use the pronoun "we" much oftener than "I." In the streets, he said, one repeatedly hears children say "we." That applies also to Red Army men and to girls — and that was what struck him most. And then he sees a gaudily dressed lady and hears her say: "And I

said." Everybody is saying "we" and only this bourgeois-looking woman says "I." That certainly struck him. Everything points to the fact that "I" will be replaced by "we," but that is not enough. It is also necessary to learn to approach each problem from the angle of common interest, from the point of view of the collective. And in this respect, things are not going too well. Very often, for instance, one can see electric light burning in the day and no one bothers to switch it off. "That's none of my business," they seem to think. "There are people paid to do that." Or here is another picture: a sick man lying in the street and people passing by, thinking: "That's militia's job." All this indifference to what is going on around, this non-interference where collective assistance is necessary, all this is still quite common and we should work for its elimination. There is no doubt that the socially useful work which the speaker mentioned provided, of course, it is well organized, is not beyond the powers of the Young Pioneers and yields practical results — is one of the best means of developing the spirit of collectivism and social responsibility in children.

When Vladimir Ilyich wrote about co-operation (and we always quote this article of his), he wrote not only of trade co-operation, but of labour co-operation too. This article is connected with another — "A Great Beginning" — in which he wrote about *subbotniks*.[1] He said that the task was to create some new labour relationships. During the serf days, people worked under the lash; under capitalism, for fear of starvation; now it is necessary to work consciously,

[1] Labour freely given to the State on off days or overtime.

unitedly, collectively.

It is extremely important, of course, to promote this collective, co-operative labour among Young Pioneers. There is something else I should like to draw your attention to. Our workers often say: "The sight of Young Pioneers moves one to tears." I think that members of the Party and workers could do a great deal to help in organizing labour among Young Pioneers. It is not enough for a Young Pioneer club to have a capable instructor. What is more important is that he should understand the significance of planned labour, division of labour, mutual aid in labour and proper organization of labour. Mass production and labour organization in factories teach workers to approach labour correctly. And it is this knowledge of organizing labour, which he acquires in his factory, that the worker should share with the Young Pioneer. It is essential for adult workers to help the Young Pioneer movement to organize labour.

And one last thing. Children often say: "Grandfather Lenin loved children and told us to study and study." That, of course, is a simplified version as often taught by teachers. True, Vladimir Ilyich repeatedly emphasized — and today everyone understands why — that it was necessary to acquire knowledge, that without it it would be impossible to build a new life and that it was especially important for workers' and peasants' children to acquire knowledge. But he also stressed the necessity of acquiring it in a communist way, of broadly developing mutual aid in this field.

These are the principles, I think, on which work among Young Pioneers should be based. That means developing comradely solidarity, a social approach to

each and every question, ability to work collectively and co-operatively, ability to acquire knowledge. If we define these four lines of work, we shall endow the Young Pioneer movement with the content with which it has not been endowed systematically enough so far. This is the demand of the times. It is to deepen this content — and that requires a greater effort and more independent thinking on the part of every Party member, every member of the Young Communist League and every Young Pioneer leader — that I appeal to you, comrades. Our Young Pioneer movement is a special kind of a movement. In scope and influence on the younger generation it has no equal anywhere and we should heed its demands and deepen the content of its activity. That is all I wanted to say.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *The Communist Education of Our Children*, Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing House, 1934, pp. 20-26.

THE YOUNG PIONEER MOVEMENT AS A PEDAGOGICAL PROBLEM

(*Uchitelskaya Gazeta*, No. 15, April 8, 1927)

We have said time and again that the school and the Young Pioneer movement pursue one and the same aim: to bring children up as fighters for and builders of a new system. The goal of the Young Pioneer movement is to bring up a new youth which will achieve socialist, communist construction. To build socialism does not mean to raise labour productivity or develop the economy. A highly developed social economy is only a basis, a foundation that ensures general welfare. The main points of socialist construction are reorganization of the entire social fabric, establishment of a new social order and development of new relationships among people. The life we want to build must not only be plentiful, but also happy.

In the case of adults, we have to re-educate them in the spirit of socialism; in the case of the younger generation, we have to *educate* them in that spirit. What does that imply? Vladimir Ilyich had a very simple definition for this spirit. Speaking at a non-Party conference of workers and Red Army men, he said: "In the old days people said: 'Each for himself and God for all,' and look how much grief that brought them. We shall say: 'One for all, and somehow we shall get along all right without God.'"

Although these words were not uttered in connection with education, I think they give a clear idea of how we should tackle the educational problem in our day. We should bring up our children as collectivists.

How is that to be done? Here we have a serious pedagogical problem.

Under the bourgeoisie, workers' children and the children of the landowners and capitalists are brought up differently. The bourgeoisie tries to make obedient slaves out of the workers' children and leaders out of the children of the landowners and capitalists. In the case of the first, it tries to kill their individuality and personality; all its educational methods are aimed at depriving children of their individuality, at making them passive; and if these methods fail with certain children, the bourgeoisie pushes them to the front, opposes them to others, converts them into loyal servants of its own. In the case of the children of the ruling classes, the methods of education are quite different. The bourgeoisie brings them up as individualists who oppose the masses and the collective, and teaches them to lord it over the masses.

The Soviet system of education aims at developing every child's ability, activity, consciousness, personality and individuality. That is why our educational methods differ from those in bourgeois public schools, and they are radically different from the methods employed in the education of bourgeois children. The bourgeoisie tries to bring up its children as individualists who set their ego above all else, who oppose the masses. Communist education employs other methods. We are for the all-round development of our children — we want to make them strong physically and morally, teach them to be collectivists and not individualists, bring them up not to oppose the collective but on the contrary to constitute its force and raise it to a new level. We believe that a child's person-

ality can be best and most fully developed only in a collective. For the collective does not destroy a child's personality, and it improves the quality and content of education.

In this respect, the Young Pioneer movement can do much. What path should it take in educational work? First, the Young Pioneer should be given an opportunity to share other children's experiences. A child who has no brothers or sisters and who is zealously protected by his mother from "harmful influences," will never be a collectivist.

The Young Pioneer organization should see to it that their members have every opportunity to share one another's experiences. That does not mean that they should be "entertained," that they should have special shows and matinées arranged for them. The thing is not to entertain them, but to make their organization's activities lively and emotional. There are cases, for instance, when the Pioneer leader is late for the rally and the Young Pioneers lounge about waiting for him, and when he does appear, he discusses with them such boring things as smoking and discipline, or holds a political study class. Such organizations invariably disintegrate.

The ability to organize chorus singing, interesting and clever games, collective reading, etc., is a very important factor in uniting children, while the joys and woes they share bring them still closer together. There should be less formality and more content. It is important, too, to choose the right games, for some games hamper the development of collectivist instincts, divide children instead of uniting them. Another important thing is what books the children read:

individualistic rot or really valuable works.

The second factor making for unity is close friendship, knowledge of how each lives and studies, and mutual assistance. The one who knows more should help the backward in his homework, the one who eats well should share his food with the one who does not, the one who has not got to do any household chores should help the one who has. There should be well-organized comradely mutual aid within the Young Pioneer organization.

The third factor is collective studies, reading, excursions, wall newspapers, diaries, etc., etc. Here it is especially important not to divide children into active Young Pioneers who do everything, and are therefore overburdened, and passive who are not allowed to do anything. The problem of collective endeavour, correct division of labour, properly distributed tasks, combination of children's personal interests with the aims of the collective — all that should be solved.

The fourth factor is the same problem, only in respect to labour: combination of skilful individual labour with collective labour, development of individual and collective habits in labour, proper co-ordination of labour, assessment of the work done, mutual control, co-operation in all the spheres of economic activity.

The fifth factor is voluntary discipline within the organization. "A Great Beginning," Lenin's article on the communist *subbotniks*, in which he counterposes compulsory discipline under capitalism to voluntary and conscious socialist discipline, tells us how to approach the question of discipline and punishment in school and the Young Pioneer organization.

And, lastly, social work and application of the knowledge and habits acquired through collective work for the good of all. The question of choosing social work. The voluntary and conscious character of this choice, collective decisions, collective planning, correct appraisal of capability and capacity. The greater part of Vladimir Ilyich's speech at the Third Congress of the Young Communist League was devoted to social work, to socially useful collective labour.

This question is closely connected with the question of how adult workers, men and women, should help in the collective education and self-education of children, as well as with the question of relations between the school and the Young Pioneer movement.

The above-mentioned questions touch upon a number of problems of vast importance, and the leaders of the Young Pioneer movement and pedagogues should deal with them.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Selected Pedagogical* Works, 1955, pp. 277-80.

OUR CHILDREN NEED BOOKS THAT WOULD BRING THEM UP AS GENUINE INTERNATIONALISTS

(*Literaturnaya Gazeta*, October 17, 1933)

I recall one of my visits to a Swiss school. The prospectus said it had a children's library of its own. I sat through a lesson and when it was over, I asked the teacher to take me to the library.

"We have none," she replied. "And we don't really need it. It is enough for children to study well what is in the textbooks. Look at the beautiful vellum paper they are printed on and the splendid illustrations."

So spoke the teacher of this school in a quiet backwater district of Switzerland.

A year later I saw Paris and its bubbling life. School children there were supplied with a great many books, all of them impregnated with petty-bourgeois morality, with idealization of the wealthy. That was in 1908-09. I wrote of it in my time. There are no "quiet backwater" districts in the world now. A drowning man catches at the straw. Moribund capitalism is catching at the growing generation, trying by every possible means — children's books included — to befuddle the youth. These books are written skilfully and simply; they are thrilling and at the same time delusory. Our textbooks this year are not bad, but apart from putting out more or less good textbooks, we are opening school libraries and seeing to it that our children read more. We are in desperate need of really good children's books, of books imbued with the spirit of communism, of books written excitingly,

simply and at the same time truthfully.

They must be written. And they must be written not only for our children, who play a big part in all our activities and who evoke the admiration of visitors from abroad, but for rank-and-file school children as well. We must, in fact, pay more attention to the latter than to the activists. Do we know these rank-and-file school children? I am afraid not. We forget that they represent a generation that has never seen a Tsarist policeman or a capitalist, that does not know exploitation. It has no real idea of class contradictions, no idea of class struggle, of working-class struggle against the capitalists. The adults of today knew in their childhood the meaning of such words as "boss," "labourer," "exploiter" and "exploited," and for that reason it just does not occur to them that many of present-day children do not know these words, that to many of them they are nothing but abstract concepts. And sometimes even an excellent pupil, wearing the red tie of a Young Pioneer, may blurt out such nonsense that an adult will find it hard to believe that he does not know such elementary things. The child of today knows a great deal of what the children of yesterday never knew, and yet often he does not know anything of what children from countryside and city, workers' children, knew in their early years. The teacher does not suspect that and the Young Pioneer leader does not notice it. Being ignorant of such elementary things, children interpret what they are told in their own, often very strange, way. Children must read more. We must have more books about the capitalist past, books written truthfully, thrillingly, capable of arousing hatred for the old system. But it

should be described truthfully, it should be pictured as it was, in all its complexity, and at the same time as concretely as possible. There should be more books of this sort. We must have children's books with vivid, life-like descriptions of the struggle now going on in the capitalist countries. Here is what a German comrade told me when he recently visited the USSR: "I have spoken with your Young Pioneers and they have absolutely no idea of how our Young Pioneers live, of the difficult struggle they have to wage! No idea whatsoever!"

It is indispensable to explain to children the profound significance of the slogan "Workers of All Countries, Unite!" One cannot be a real champion of the working-class cause if one does not understand this slogan, if one does not grasp its significance. This slogan is a guide to action, an earnest of the victory of the working class the world over. It must be thoroughly understood by children. And once they do, they will know what fascism is, why it is afraid of worldwide worker unity.

Teachers of social science often strive to give children as many "facts" as possible and overburden their memory with facts of transient or, at best, illustrative nature. They give their pupils low marks if they stumble over details, but it simply does not occur to them to check — if only in connection with the International Children's Week — whether the children know the fundamentals. The only guarantee that children will not acquire chauvinistic ideas is perfect understanding of the slogan "Workers of All Countries, Unite!"

At the roll call, the Young Pioneer leader carefully

sees to it that the children remember all the International Children's Week slogans, but it never strikes him that some little girl may interpret them in her own way because she does not understand their essence. And yet the "International Nickel" requires a lot of explanatory work if it is not to become simple charity. There is a lot of explanatory work to be done to make children understand what they must speak about at the International Children's Congresses, which pass very merrily, but at which some orators forget to speak of the struggle waged by the international proletariat.

We need books which will imbue children with the necessary internationalist ideas. Never mind the form. Let it be a fairy-tale. Only let it be a truthful fairy-tale, without any sympathetic lament for suffering children, one teaching them to respect youngsters fighting against the dark forces of fascism, respect parents who, though afraid for their children, tell them to go ahead and fight, one training our children to become courageous champions of freedom. That is the main thing. We need books that would speak with children seriously, without resorting to baby talk. Fairy-tales often describe far more serious things than some sweet little stories "for children." The question is not one of form, but of content.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Lenin and Culture*,
Partizdat Publishing House, 1934,
pp. 202-05

ALL-ROUND DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN

(*Vozhaty* Magazine, No. 6, 1937)

We often go into the extremes. At first people said that political consciousness should be developed in children almost from their infancy. These people spoke to children of serious things, of things they did not understand, and wanted to make them Communists even before they went to school. That was wrong. But we should neither "baby" them too much nor consider them dull. We should tell them a lot, broaden their horizons, help them to become social workers. We feed them too much with fairy-tales when life is often more interesting. And we must not forget that there are fairy-tales and fairy-tales.

There are fascinating fairy-tales that vividly describe people's characters and human relations, and there are fairy-tales that befog children's minds and prevent them from correctly understanding the environment. Life forces children to be attentive to many things and here we cannot lay down our arms. Bourgeois governments try to impregnate children with bourgeois politics and with religion, inculcate hatred for other nations. They do it quite skilfully, being well experienced in deceiving children. The Catholic Church and the bourgeoisie have lots of experience in this respect.

We have to awaken children's consciousness, and the book has to help us in that. It is indispensable to have more and better children's libraries. But that is not all. What is important is what the children are to

read. What is important is to select the right books. Now, when we face the problem of raising the cultural level of the countryside to that of the city, it is especially important for village children to have the necessary bocks, for village schools to have enough children's books, for us to have really good literature — one that children will really appreciate and understand, one that will broaden their outlook.

Children like Young Pioneer activity, they thrive on it. One day, at the time when we were conducting a contest among village libraries, I wrote children a letter about libraries. And I was quite surprised when collective farmers and state-farm workers told me that children were the most active propagandists of libraries. But there are times when children overdo things. I once received a letter from a boy who wrote that he spent every free moment to read to collective farmers, and that they were saying: "Oh, how about letting us rest a little?"

In selecting books for school libraries it is important to take into consideration children's interests, the level of their development. And once a library has been established, children must be allowed freedom of choice. I certainly get indignant when I hear people say children of such and such age should read such and such books. Children should not be babied too much. They should be allowed a certain degree of freedom of choice, an opportunity to display their initiative. When children plan something, they show a great deal of initiative, learn to organize themselves, and that enhances their discipline. And they should be given the kind of work they find attractive and interesting.

It is necessary to take into consideration the level of children's development. I recently saw a stage version of a fairy-tale. There were many interesting things in it: the blooming of a rose bush, etc. But the story, in my opinion, was too complicated for the tots who knew nothing of boyars, Tsars' emissaries or the Tsars of olden times. And so they did not understand the story. As for children of 11 or 12, they did not find the fairy-tale interesting at all.

We have somehow come to think that knowledge can be acquired only from books. But we do not know how to follow life, how to watch and study it, how to live in a new way, neither we nor the Young Pioneer leaders or teachers. Yet there are excursions and games that can teach us what life is. In our extra-school work we should take advantage of outings, etc., to study nature, people and life. We do not teach that, and our circles are more often than not either of sports or theatrical character.

Then we consider that the aim of a literary, natural science or history circle is to promote education. We are accustomed to thinking that each circle should have an instructor to tell children everything they should know. We think that all the latter have to do is open their mouths, like nestlings, and swallow what they are being given. We just cannot imagine a circle without an instructor when what we need is more initiative on the part of the children.

Unfortunately, we do not pay enough attention to children's interests and their demands. And that is something Young Pioneer leaders and teachers should know. Pedologists are rightly criticized for their indifferent, formal treatment of children, for labelling

them capable and incapable pupils, for not thinking of helping in their development and upbringing. We shall never achieve success in our work if we do not know children's demands, if we do not know what a child of such and such age is interested in, if we do not know how he interprets the things around him.

We talk a lot of palaces of culture. I got terribly angry when I learned that the premises of the Association of Old Bolsheviks had been turned into a palace for exceptionally talented children. In our country such children are pampered. One day, in this palace, I met a girl with her teacher. I waved to her. And the teacher turned to me and said: "This one is an exceptionally talented girl." We shall spoil all the children if we tell them they are talented. I remember a talk I had with Vladimir Ilyich. I told him of a remarkable boy whom the parents took to concerts. He said the boy should be taken away from his parents, for they would be the death of him. Ilyich's prediction came true. The mother took the boy abroad, exhibited him as a talented child, and the whole thing ended with the boy dying of brain fever. Of course, things do not always end so tragically, but the example is instructive.

We should not impress on talented children that they are extraordinary, or give them privileges. We should see to it that they get all-round education. That will not harm them. On the contrary, when they grow up it will help them to choose a profession that suits them in every way. Deciding for a girl that she will be a ballerina or for a boy that he will be an engineer is a bad thing.

We should show solicitude for all the children and give them everything we possibly can.

Extra-school work is extremely important, for it helps to bring up children properly and creates the conditions necessary for their all-round development. We should encourage their initiative, help them in their creative work, guide them, channel their interests in the right direction. Parents often pamper children, permit them go to cinemas and theatres too often. The cinema excites children. Just watch them, and you will notice that very frequently after a picture they speak rudely to their mothers or pick on their classmates. Children should be shown films they understand, films they can enjoy, films that broaden their horizons. Watching adult films, children often do not grasp the meaning, yet they try to imitate the actors. I was told that after seeing a nose being unscrewed in a Chaplin film, children took a screwdriver and tried to do it too. What is important is that they should understand the meaning, that we should channel their thoughts in the right direction.

We should extend the network of children's technical circles, organize excursions to factories, power plants, etc. Every palace of culture should have workrooms where children can do what they like.

Children should be brought up so that they continue the job begun by their fathers. Vladimir Ilyich wanted children to achieve what their fathers had started. He used to say that our children would learn to fight still better and that they would win.

Pay more attention to giving children the necessary training, developing their character, encouraging their desire to be useful, bringing them up as social workers and collectivists. Take good care of their all-round development...

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, 1955, pp. 686-90

HOW TO ORGANIZE YOUTH

YOUTH LEAGUE

(*Pravda*, May 27, 1917)

Bourgeois pedagogues speak and write a lot of the necessity of "civic education" for the youth. For them, civic education is respect for private property and the existing regime, it is chauvinism (or patriotism, as they call it), contempt for other nations, etc. To instil that in children, they organize all sorts of associations — boy scouts are one example — in which these feelings can be developed. As for the children they are happy they can find an outlet for their energy and ingenuity, and do not realize at all that these organizations are poisoning their minds. And it is the poison of the bourgeois outlook and morals. It is the poison that makes the youth incapable of taking part in the great liberation movement that will free the world from oppression and exploitation, abolish the classes and bring mankind a happy life. We saw the fruits of this civic education in Russia, in Petrograd, when secondary school pupils were incited to demonstrate in defence of the Provisional Government. Surrounded by a mob hostile to the working class, they marched alongside men in bowler hats and women in fine dresses, and joined those who alleged that Lenin had bribed the workers with German money, who abused Socialists and beat up orators for daring speak up their mind honestly before the hostile crowd. The young people were persuaded that in demonstrating with this mob they were doing their civic duty.

It is not every youth association that is good. There are some which afford much pleasure to chil-

dren but actually corrupt them.

There is another kind of "civic education" — the one that young workers get from life. It instils in them that great sentiment of proletarian class solidarity, makes the slogan "Workers of All Countries, Unite!" near and dear and significant to them, and places them in the ranks of the fighters "for fraternal peace, for sacred freedom." The young workers of the world set up their own proletarian youth leagues. They are united in the Youth International, which marches shoulder to shoulder with the Working class towards a common goal. The Youth International did not disintegrate during the war. In the midst of that universal carnage it called upon young workers in all countries to join its ranks and urged them on to struggle. For a long time the German section of the Youth International was headed by Karl Liebknecht, who came out so courageously against the present predatory war of aggrandizement, openly attacked his country's government and was sentenced for that to hard labour. The Russian section of the Youth International could not be properly represented at the International Conference of Working Youth, which was convoked in 1915 after the International Women's Conference. That was because under the Russian autocracy young working men and women could not set up a proper organization and also because the war had made international contacts difficult and there was no possibility of communicating with Russia. But the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party sent a delegate to this conference to announce in the name of the Russian working youth that it was wholeheartedly with the young workers of the world,

that it was marching with them under the banner of the International. And the Central Committee was not wrong — that has been proved by the apprentices of the Petrograd factories and plants whose organization already has a membership of about 50,000. They have laid the foundation of the Russian section of the Youth International and they are urging all the young workers to unite — not only those employed in factories and plants, but also apprentices in handicraft enterprises, young employees in trade establishments and newsboys; in a word, all the adolescents and youths who have to sell their labour. They are calling upon the young workers of Moscow, the Moscow Region, Yekaterinoslav, Kharkov — in other words, of all Russia — to unite with them. They are urging them to fight for a better future, for socialism. Long live the Russian section of the Youth International!

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *1917*, Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing House, 1926, pp. 18-20

THE STRUGGLE FOR YOUNG WORKERS

(*Pravda*, May 30, 1917)

The future belongs to those who have the support of the working youth. Socialists the world over know that, and they conduct their propaganda among the youth. They go to the youth with their visor up, without concealing their views or who they are. They say clearly and definitely what they are after, what they are fighting for. They tell the young workers: you are the children of the proletariat and you will have to wage a stubborn struggle. To win, you must be class-conscious and organized, you must see clearly where you are going. And the earlier you understand the tasks of the proletariat, the better. You are working in factories and plants, and life itself has drawn you, whether you will it or not, into the class struggle of the proletariat; you cannot remain outside it without betraying class solidarity. Socialist youth organizations in Western Europe are proletarian organizations, and their newspapers and magazines are of a definite political character.

Bourgeois parties would like to sever the working youth from the party of the proletariat, to weaken the class character of their organization.

But they do not dare urge that openly, for they know that if they did, the young workers would simply turn their backs on them. And that is why they approach the youth not as members of any party, but almost always under the guise of kindly, sympathetic people. Taking advantage of the trustfulness of young

people, they first try to win their favour. They do not say bluntly that the workers' party is bad, they say: "Comrades, you are not mature yet, it is too early for you to engage in politics, too early to commit yourselves to any particular trend. You must study first and acquire knowledge, and only then can you consciously decide what party you want to join. Do not let anybody influence you, safeguard your individuality and your independence." And often young comrades fall for these appeals. Realizing how little they know, how much more they must study, they believe the people who say that. They do not see the crude flattery of the words "safeguard your spiritual independence." How can an unenlightened man safeguard his spiritual independence? He is asked to give up politics and study history, literature, etc. But every historical book, every history of literature reflects the world outlook of its author. An historical book written by a bourgeois author contains his thoughts, and they exert an influence on the reader. Therefore, it is also quite possible to influence an unenlightened youth with the aid of historical and literary books.

Not knowing life, he does not even notice this influence. And it is thus that the bourgeoisie almost always tries to influence the youth — not frankly and overtly, but covertly.

That is the worst kind of influence. When people say: "It is too early for you to engage in politics, do not let anybody influence you," they really mean: "Do not let anybody influence you, except me and my party."

Russian youths are just beginning to organize. The first steps are the most important, the most responsi-

ble, for they determine to a considerable degree the path of this movement — whether the Russian youth organization will be proletarian, whether it will join the workers' organizations of its country and the Youth International and whether it will publish its own proletarian organ which will discuss economic and political questions in simple and popular language, or whether it will temporarily drop away from the workers' movement and publish a bourgeois-influenced organ of a cultural and educational nature which will deal with abstract questions. In the former case, the Petrograd working youth organizations will probably play the honourable role of rallying all the young workers of Russia. In the latter, they will commit mistakes and delay the growth of this organization. We do not doubt that the revolutionary proletarian youth of Petrograd will choose the former path.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *1917*, Molodaya
Gvardiya Publishing House, 1926,
pp. 21-23

HOW ARE YOUNG WORKERS TO ORGANIZE?

(*Pravda*, June 20, 1917)

This question is often asked in letters *Pravda* is receiving from all over Russia. Young people ardently wish to organize, but organizing is something they know nothing of. They often do not know how to go about it and set themselves tasks that are either too big — like "working out independently some party programme" — or too small — like "drawing up a programme of a purely cultural and educational character." To channel the organization along the right path, they should work out general rules, discuss them at delegates' and other youth meetings, and then scrupulously abide by them. These rules should not be adopted hastily; they should be well considered because if they are not and an organization adopt them too hastily, it will be more difficult to unite the Russian working youth in a single league. Parties adopt rules after serious consideration, at general meetings which discuss various drafts and weigh every word, every paragraph. That is a very difficult job for young people, for they lack knowledge, are not familiar with the rules of various parties and are not accustomed to expressing themselves clearly. To help young workers in drawing up general rules, I suggest that they discuss the following draft.

Par. 1. Young workers of Russia — all the boys and girls, young men and women who live by the sale of their labour — organize in the Russian Young Workers' League, irrespective of faith or native lan-

guage.

It is absolutely essential to stress that young people are admitted to the league irrespective of sex, faith and nationality, for otherwise some youth leagues may decide not to admit girls or Letts, Poles, Jews, Tatars, etc. This will harm the cause and violate the principle of working-class brotherhood.

Par. 2. The aim of the Russian Young Workers' League is to train free, class-conscious citizens, worthy participants in the struggle which they will have to wage as proletarians for the liberation from the capitalist yoke of all the oppressed and exploited.

It is necessary to stress this aim. It is this great aim that inspires the workers of the world. It cannot but inspire young people, too, for they are responsive to all that is great, honest and good. And, in particular, it cannot but inspire the youth of Russia who recently witnessed, and to some extent took part in, the revolution. No organization can be proletarian if it does not set itself this aim.

Par. 3. Since the Youth International, whose members include young workers of all countries, pursues the same aim, and since the Russian Young Workers' League is loyal to the slogan "Workers of All Countries, Unite!", it adheres to the Youth International and proclaims itself a section of this organization.

The bourgeois governments have inveigled workers into the predatory, fratricidal war, set the workers of one country against the workers of another, forced them to shoot at one another and cut one another's throat. The working youth cannot sympathize with that. Their slogan is "Brotherhood of All Nations."

Therefore, in its Rules the Russian Young Workers' League should stress its fraternal solidarity with the young workers of all countries.

Par. 4. To be useful fighters for the workers' cause, young workers should be strong and healthy.

For that they must:

a) wage a struggle already now for protection of child labour, for a six-hour working day, healthy working conditions and abolition of night shifts for adolescents, for medical aid, etc.;

b) wage a struggle for higher wages (where they are insufficient to give young working men and women nourishing and wholesome food, clean and warm living quarters, etc.);

c) send elected representatives to shop stewards' councils, join trade unions and generally wage a struggle for better living standards side by side with adult workers, for in this struggle they need the adult workers' support just as the adult workers need theirs.

Par. 5. To be class-conscious fighters for a better future, young working men and women should acquire as much knowledge as possible. Consequently:

a) the Russian Young Workers' League demands universal compulsory tuition, free education for all under the age of 16;

b) The Russian Young Workers' League demands organization of libraries, reading-rooms, study courses, educational film shows, etc.;

c) the working youth will immediately undertake organization of self-education circles, mobile libraries, clubs, excursions, etc.

All this must be made to serve the main goal: to make the youth class-conscious, enable them to un-

derstand current developments and analyse events independently, without resorting to other people's assistance.

Par. 6. Young workers need not only knowledge, but also the ability to organize themselves. This ability can be best acquired in independent young workers' leagues. Therefore, all the self-education circles, clubs, reading-rooms, etc., to say nothing of the organization itself, should be built on the basis of self-administration and in such a way as to enable the youth to develop their initiative.

Class consciousness and organizational skill are necessary if the working youth are to carry out the great tasks set by the events that are flaring up in the world.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *1917*, Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing House, 1926, pp. 27-30

FROM THE SPEECH AT THE EIGHTH ALL-UNION CONGRESS OF THE YOUNG COMMUNIST LEAGUE

(May 8, 1928)

Vladimir Ilyich spoke a lot about organization. He paid particular attention to this question when the time came to set up Soviet power. In those days he said that socialist construction meant organization, and that organization was the pith and marrow of socialism. He often repeated this thought. In Soviet power he saw the core of the organization of the entire population.

He often stressed the necessity of organizing in a new way, on a new basis. He said that when we were building our Party, pointing out that each member of the Party should consider himself part and parcel of a whole. Our Party is indeed a well-knit organization, and the Young Communist League is following in its footsteps. But if we look closely at our Party, we shall see that to a considerable degree its machine (and even more so that of the Young Communist League) is directed at rebuffing the enemy from without.

Our Party came into being in the struggle against Tsarism, in the struggle against capitalism, in the struggle against the Whiteguards. The youth followed the same path. This issue — the struggle against capitalism — has now taken on a somewhat different character, has somewhat receded.

The most important thing now is construction. Yet it is not always that our organization proves itself an organization capable of rebuffing the enemy in our

midst. Nor does it always prove itself an organization capable of building socialism. Take the Shakhti case,[1] for instance. What does it reveal? It reveals that although quite some time has already passed, our Party, the trade unions and the Young Communist League have not all been organized sufficiently well to notice this act of treason on the part of engineers. The counter-revolution was discovered when it was already too late. If we look closely at our construction effort we shall see that we often notice blunders when they have become all too obvious. For instance, very often we learn of embezzlement after it has been committed. We discover crimes after they have been perpetrated. We have not yet learned to work in such a way as to prevent major and minor Shakhti cases in the process of our work. Our organization should be such as to enable us to notice — in the very process of our work — all deviations from the right path, to correct these deviations, to make such Shakhti cases, embezzlements and all other crimes actually impossible. We have not yet learned to work in this manner and we are not yet organized as we should be. I think the Young Communist League should ponder on this, that it should thrash out the question of what it should do to be not only an organization capable of fighting capitalism and the enemy from without, but also an organization capable of working well, of organizing its work so that the machine, as Vladimir

[1] The trial in Moscow (May 18-July 5, 1928) of members of a large organization of bourgeois specialists who carried out sabotage in the Shakhti and other mine districts of the Donbas. This organization, formed in 1922-23, set itself the task of disorganizing and destroying the coal industry.

Ilyich said, operates in the right direction.

What do we need for that? First of all, a *sharp communist eye*. Comrades, each member of the Young Communist League undergoes political education, but very often political education is one thing and life another.

Members of the League, though wishing to be good Communists, very often do not know how to apply political education in life, how the two are interconnected. They know from political textbooks that our women enjoy equal rights with men, and yet some of them do not care in the least, for instance, that their little sisters do not go to school. Very often they talk of kulaks, and just as often they are blind to exploitation. At one of the conferences held by the People's Commissariat for Education on the question of homeless children, one of our welfare workers revealed that there were many cases of workers bringing home to town little village girls of nine or ten — orphans or children of the poor — to look after their own little children. When asked why they do not send these girls to school, they answered that they had not brought them from the countryside for that. "I brought her to work," they say. Very often there is a League member in *such* a family, but he pretends not to see that. He knows that the kulak is an exploiter, but he cannot believe that a worker can be one. It just can't be, it just doesn't tie up with political education, and he overlooks the fact. In life, in factories, there are many, many relics of the past that hamper our construction effort, but somehow we do not notice them.

Vladimir Ilyich used to say: "We must study, study and study." We should study in earnest. You know, I

receive many letters from Young Communist League members, lads and girls, who write: "Vladimir Ilyich said we 'must study, study and study.' Won't you please help me to get into some workers' faculty or some institute as soon as possible." It was not of such studies that Vladimir Ilyich spoke, not of studies at various institutes. He addressed that phrase to Party members and what he meant was arduous study of life itself, that one should learn to be observant, that one should study to see better, and not study merely to finish an institute or some other institution of higher learning. One should study to notice, to see more clearly what is wrong and where. That is the main task facing the Young Communist League. Its members, of course, should also study in institutes, should take every advantage to study, but they must also learn from life, study it thoroughly, follow it closely and be on the alert for anything that needs to be combatted.

Here is how some reason: the Young Communist League is *the* organization. Well, there is also the Party. But more often than not the League does not notice that there are also the Soviets and its sections. I don't remember, for instance, any League members regularly visiting the public education section; I know that delegates and a few League members do, but it has never occurred to anyone at any Young Communist League meeting to ask how this section works.

Perhaps I am not right, comrades? (Voices: "Hear! Hear!") Sections, after all, are a form of organization that permits contact with the masses, an organization that should not be made up only of members of the Soviet, but of a whole number of people interested in the given subject, and they should be made the core

around which the masses will rally. And yet when one goes to a city Soviet section and talks about this, the trade unions say: "We are afraid that might belittle the role of the trade unions." True, I have never heard of any Young Communist League member saying that this might belittle the role of his organization. But the fact that so little attention is paid to the activity of these Soviet sections, that very fact, I think, is very significant. For the question here is *one of how we should look at life and how we should build this life*.

Another question — for instance, the Shakhti case. Why did it happen? Because we did not have people who know what the engineers do. Specialization, of course, is very important and that is why our young people are clamouring so for knowledge. The next point on your agenda is professional training and education. That is of paramount importance, of course, and it is understandable why the Young Communist League is so eager about it. One of the orators here was right when he said that it was necessary to know the job one was doing.

Then take control... The question here, I think, is not just one of "light cavalry" control.[1] It is very good, of course, it also helps to watch what is going around, it is very good. But that is not the main thing. The main thing is to have a definite idea of how it is to be carried out in everyday life. It is too late to talk after a blunder has been committed, one should learn to prevent it. Recently, just a few days ago, I spoke with an inspector — inspection is quite a fad at the People's Commissariat of Education, and I found it very amus-

[1] YCL lightning inspection raids.

ing to see how it worked.

And so, I spoke with an inspector, a good comrade, a Communist, and asked him to tell me how he went about his job. He told me that he had inspected a children's home where the ceiling was collapsing, that it had cost 63,000 rubles and that this waste was inadmissible. "And did you ask how control had been organized, to whom it had been entrusted or who was responsible for the job?" I asked him. It turned out that he had not asked who was responsible for the thing. And the question is: who is responsible for the job, who should look after it to prevent such a thing from occurring? It is too late to talk when the money has been wasted or when the ceiling is collapsing. There should be control during the work and not after it has been completed.

I should like to dwell on yet another question... We must prevent anarchistic criticism that undermines work; it should help people to work. I think this is a very big question, one of the biggest, and the Young Communist League should tackle it — the question of how to organize effective friendly and mutual control, and not just control for the express purpose of finding faults or control in the form of a raid, but real comradely control that helps work.

The Eighth All-Union Congress of the Young Communist League, May 5-16, 1928. *Verbatim Report*. Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing House, 1928, pp. 152-54

THE YOUNG COMMUNIST LEAGUE'S URGENT TASKS IN THE SPHERE OF POLITICAL EDUCATION

(*Komsomolskaya Pravda*, November 26, 1932)

Headed by the Young Communist League, under the leadership of the Party, our youth is building socialism, doing it with tremendous energy and enthusiasm. But at every step it feels that it does not know enough. Socialist construction, after all, does not mean merely erecting factories and plants, huge houses and other buildings. Socialist construction is a militant task. To quote Ilyich, it is a struggle for the socialist system as a whole. That means it is a struggle for planned, socialist organization of production, a struggle for socialist distribution, for communist attitude to labour and public property, for deeper understanding of collectivism, for new relationships among people; it is a struggle on all fronts against the ideology of the petty bourgeois and petty owner, a battle for the implementation of the Marxist-Leninist principles.

It is a very complex struggle, much more complex than was the struggle against Tsarism, the struggle for the overthrow of the landlords and capitalists. It demands serious knowledge by every fighter for socialism, ability to apply this knowledge, an understanding of Marxism-Leninism, a capacity to work with the methods and in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

The Young Communist League must wage a struggle for knowledge. It must reckon, however, with the general cultural level in our country, and that level

has risen tremendously in the fifteen years since the Revolution. It must also bear in mind that at best only 90 per cent of the population are literate, that a great many people have had less than four years of schooling, and so we have to study most seriously.

The Young Communist League must wage this struggle for knowledge not only in its own midst, but among the youth in general. It is no less important to arm the entire youth with the ability to study independently, to acquire knowledge independently with the aid of books, libraries, correspondence courses and radio. One of the most urgent tasks is to draw up programmes of independent studies, programmes on subjects studied in various circles. Expansion of the library network, supply of libraries with books, establishment of reading-rooms and other mass facilities in this sphere — all that is fundamentally the Young Communist League's task. But in this it should join the nation-wide effort and not work in isolation.

I should like to draw attention to one question — to methods of general education. It is often claimed that schools for adults should have an industrial bias. That's true. The contents of the books for the semiliterate and for those who study independently should be closely linked with their work. How is this to be understood? Some say that it is enough for the books to contain such words as "plant," "blooming" or "tractor." Others hold that "industrial bias" means narrow specialization. They seem to forget that general education schools and courses must arm their adult pupils with a broad polytechnical outlook. That was especially stressed by Lenin. He spoke of the importance of polytechnical education way back in the

1890's and emphasized it with particular vigour when we approached the question of planned economy in 1920-21. The socialist economy develops according to plan and therein lies its fundamental difference from the capitalist economy which is based on competition and profit. There can be no planned economy in the capitalist countries. The national economy is built up by millions, and it is necessary for these millions to be conscious builders of the planned economy, to understand the interconnection between the mining and processing industries, between various branches of production, why such and such industry holds a leading position. It is indispensable for the masses to see how the economy develops, and know the urgent tasks facing them. Our newspapers, socialist emulation, shock brigade movement and struggle for the fulfilment of industrial and financial plans enhance the people's conscious attitude to labour, facilitate polytechnical propaganda and draw the masses into the nation-wide effort of building up a planned socialist economy. Everything must be done to arm each Young Communist League member with a definite polytechnical outlook, for then he will also have a better understanding of the economic tasks facing his factory.

Another task: in doing educational propaganda, agitational and political educational work, one must know how to link current construction tasks with the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The Young Communist League must pay special attention to this. It must master the propaganda and agitational methods, used by the Party from its very inception and fully and wholly justified by the entire

course of its struggle. The propagandist started with the worker's needs, with what agitated the worker's mind most at the time, and showed him that his plight was a direct consequence of the capitalist system. The worker was led from the struggle for boiled water at the factory to the necessity to fight for socialism. It was precisely this approach that helped the Party in 1917 to lead the broad working masses to victory. It is indispensable to apply this method today too. If, for instance, there is a meeting of peasants who are discussing the grain-procurement issue and the orator speaks only of the necessity of delivering the grain to the state, without connecting this issue with the question of socialist construction, there will be no use in his speech.

Neither will his speech at a holiday meeting reach the audience if he talks only of our achievements and cites figures, without knowing how to bridge the peasants' thoughts with his story about our achievements.

Many are surprised by this year's Central Committee decision to close a number of communist colleges and to replace them with a network of communist agricultural colleges for local functionaries with only four or five years of schooling. And yet this decision is of vast importance, for it is aimed at eliminating the gap between theory and practice. Local functionaries who have a great many practical questions which they do not know how to solve, will be able to get the necessary preliminary consultation that will help them to deal with these questions according to Marxist-Leninist principles. They will learn how to work in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, and this will enable them to work efficiently. Proper organization

of these communist agricultural colleges will bring Marxism-Leninism to the countryside and thus raise rural, collective-farm work to a new level.

The Young Communist League's political educational work should also follow this path, arm its members with Marxist-Leninist theory and show them how to apply it in practice, in solving current tasks.

Speaking at a political education conference, Lenin said that a political educational worker should display interest in everything: in wiping out illiteracy, in fighting bureaucracy, in all the tasks facing the country. This, of course, applies fully to the Young Communist League political educational workers of today. Each League member should be a political educational worker, whatever his profession may be. The question of cultural construction is an extremely acute one. The masses need knowledge. Every Soviet specialist must know how to work with the masses. Today, every session of the Academy of Sciences is attended by broad explanatory work among workers. The Academy's slogan is: "Science, knowledge, technique for the masses!" But that does not apply only to the Academy. Every educational institute, every technical college, every university should follow this line.

Young Communist League members must give this slogan their all-round support. It is not enough to welcome the initiative of the academicians. Every student of a technical college, agricultural college or university must know how to speak and write in a popular language, and learn how to pass his knowledge to others.

Every student of these educational institutions must see to it that his institution conducts wide prop-

aganda work among the masses. The Young Communist League must make this its concern.

Lastly, I should like to say this.

The Young Communist League patronizes schools.

We are witnessing considerable progress on the school front. We are witnessing the teachers' movement, started from below, for better education and upbringing. We are witnessing the growing unity of old and young teachers, with experienced teachers helping the young and the young bringing their enthusiasm into the movement. The teachers are studying intensely. The Young Communist League cannot be a passive onlooker; it must participate in this work. As the patron of the school, it must go to its aid, conduct propaganda among the masses, see to it that the school becomes genuinely polytechnical, that children are taught in the spirit of proletarian discipline, that they acquire knowledge, and that the school promotes in them a conscious attitude to work and study.

I believe the above-mentioned questions should be reflected in the political education programme contemplated by the Young Communist League: broad cultural activity, co-ordination of cultural activity with production tasks, co-ordination of production propaganda with expansion of people's polytechnical outlook, impregnation of political educational and practical work with the Marxist-Leninist theory, work among teachers, enlistment of Soviet specialists for this work, transformation of educational institutes into centres of political educational work. This work is of paramount importance now.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *On Youth*,
Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing House,
1940, pp. 76-84

LENIN ON YOUTH

(*Young Communist* Magazine, No. 1, 1935)

LENIN ON PROLETARIAN YOUTH'S PARTICIPATION IN THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT AND SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

While closely following the youth revolutionary movement in general, Vladimir Ilyich attached particular importance to the revolutionary movement of young workers who possessed both fervour and class instinct, who joined the working-class struggle to fight for their own cause, who were steeled in the crucible of this struggle.

At the trial in 1901 of the Obukhov workers, who defended themselves against the police, 18-year-old Marfa Yakovleva, a worker and a student of a Sunday women's evening school, spoke for the other young workers when she said boldly and frankly that "We are with our brothers." Here is what Vladimir Ilyich wrote in the article "Criminal Rules and Criminal Verdict":

"The memory of our heroic comrades, who were murdered or tortured in prison, will multiply the strength of the new fighters and bring to their side thousands of helpers who, like the 18-year-old Marfa Yakovleva, will openly say: 'We are with our brothers'."[1]

In an article written on August 15, 1903, Lenin

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 5, p. 228.

pointed out that the ruling circles were afraid of the youth because, according to the police, "the most disturbing elements of the industrial population" were persons between 17 and 20 years of age. These "disturbing elements" set examples of courage and heroism in the 1905 Revolution. Commenting on the heroism displayed during the Moscow uprising of December 1905, Ilyich wrote (September 11, 1906) in "The Lessons of the Moscow Uprising":

"On December 10 in the Presnya District, two working girls carrying a red flag in a crowd of 10,000 people, rushed out to meet the Cossacks, crying: 'Kill us! We will not surrender the flag alive!' And the Cossacks were disconcerted and galloped away amidst the shouts of the crowd: 'Hurrah for the Cossacks!' These examples of courage and heroism should be impressed forever in the mind of the proletariat."[1]

In his letter to Gusev and Bogdanov in February 1905, Ilyich wrote that it was necessary to treat young people with greater confidence, to draw them into the revolutionary movement. He reiterated that in "New Tasks and New Forces" (March 1905).

Young workers began to join the Party. The Mensheviks did not like that and neither did Larin, who was then a Menshevik. Here is what Lenin wrote about it in the article "The Crisis of Menshevism" on December 20, 1906:

"Larin complains, for instance, that young workers predominate in our Party, that we have few workers with families, that the latter are drifting away from the Party. The complaint of this Russian opportunist

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 167.

reminded me of something Engels had written (I think, *The Housing Question — Zur Wohnungsfrage*). Replying to some vulgar bourgeois professor, a German Constitutional Democrat, Engels wrote: is it not natural that young people should predominate in our revolutionary party? We are the party of the future, and the future belongs to the youth. We are the party of innovators, and young people always follow innovators most willingly. We are the party of selfless struggle against everything that is old and rotten, and the youth will always be in the van of selfless struggle.

"No, let us, leave it to the Constitutional Democrats to pick up 'tired' old men of 30, revolutionaries who 'have become wiser' and Social-Democratic renegades. We shall always be the party of the youth of the advanced class!"[1]

Ilyich wanted the youth to study and assimilate the experience of the old fighters against oppression and exploitation, of the fighters who had waged many a strike and participated in revolutions, who had been made wiser by revolutionary traditions and broad practical outlook. "Proletarians in every country need the authority of the worldwide struggle waged by the proletariat. We need the authority of the theoreticians of world Social-Democracy to clarify the programme and tactics of our Party."[2] Lenin wrote that in 1906 in his preface to the Russian edition of Kautsky's *The Motive Forces and Prospects of the Russian Revolution*. He also wrote that in the case of pressing practical and concrete problems of immediate policy the

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 11, p. 319.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 374.

greatest authority was that of the progressive and class-conscious workers directly engaged in the struggle in various countries. These questions could not be solved from the sidelines.

Eight years later, in 1914, in his article "Disruption of Unity Under Cover of Outcries for Unity," Lenin drew young people's attention to the necessity of taking into account the experience accumulated by the present-day labour movement in Russia and the reckoning with the decisions adopted by the Party. Having described how Trotsky changed his positions, Ilyich wrote:

"Such types are characteristic as the wreckage of past historical formations, of the time when the mass working-class movement in Russia was still latent, and when every coterie had 'sufficient room' in which to pose as a trend, group or faction, in short, as a 'power,' negotiating amalgamation with others.

"The younger generation of workers must know thoroughly whom they are dealing with when people come before them making incredibly pretentious claims, but absolutely refusing to reckon with *either* the Party decisions which since 1908 have defined and established our attitude towards Liquidatorism, *or* with the experience of the present-day working-class movement in Russia which has actually brought about the *unity* of the majority on the basis of full recognition of the aforesaid decisions."[1]

Lenin wanted young people to reflect independently on the solution of cardinal problems, to seek answers to the questions that were agitating their

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 270.

minds. He wrote of this in December 1916 in the article "The Youth International":

"It is natural that *so far* the youth organ has no theoretical clarity and firmness, and that it may never have them precisely because it is the organ of the passionate, impetuous, eager youth. But we must regard the lack of theoretical clarity in *such* people differently from the way we regard, and must regard, the theoretical hodge-podge in the heads and the lack of revolutionary consistency in the hearts of our 'Okists,' 'Social-Revolutionaries,' Tolstoians, Anarchists, the all-European Kautskyites (the 'centre'), etc. It is one thing when the proletariat is being befuddled by adults who claim the right to lead and teach others: we must wage a *merciless* struggle against them. It is quite another thing when it is *youth* organizations which admit frankly that they are still learning, that their main task is to train socialist party cadres. We should help these people in every possible way, be more tolerant of their mistakes, try to correct them gradually, chiefly by way of *persuasion* and not struggle. Not infrequently, representatives of the elder generation *do not know how* to approach the youth and the latter are willy-nilly compelled to advance to socialism *differently* from their fathers: along a *different* path, *in a different way* and *in different* conditions."[1] Lenin reposed great hopes in the youth. In his "The Working Class and Neo-Malthusianism," published in June 1913, he described this in the following few lines: "Yes, and we too, the workers and the mass of small owners, we lead a life of unbearable oppression

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 23, p. 154.

and suffering. It is harder for our generation than it was for our fathers. But in one respect we are much luckier than our fathers. *We have learned and are fast learning to fight* — and to fight not alone as the best of our fathers fought, not under the bourgeois gas-bags' slogans that are spiritually alien to us, but under our own slogans, under the slogans of our class. We are fighting better than our fathers did. Our children will fight still better, and *they will win*.

"The working class is not dying out; it is growing, becoming stronger, more mature and more solidly united, it is learning and steeling itself in struggle. We are pessimists when it comes to serfdom, capitalism and small-scale production, but we are enthusiastically optimistic when it comes to the working-class movement and its aims: We are already laying the foundation of a new edifice, and our children will complete it."[1]

Lenin firmly believed in the victory of the working class, firmly believed in its ability to rebuild life and erect a mighty socialist edifice. And that is why he regarded the growing generation as one that would continue the cause and wanted us to bring up the younger generation as fighters and builders.

The struggle, he wrote in "War Programme of the Proletarian Revolution" would be a serious one. A class-conscious woman worker would be telling her son: "You will soon be a man. You will be given a gun. Take it and learn the military art. The proletarians need this knowledge not to shoot your brothers, the workers of other countries, as they are doing in the

[1] *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 206.

present war, and as you are being told to do by the traitors to socialism, but to... put an end to exploitation, poverty and war, not by means of good intentions, but by vanquishing the bourgeoisie and by disarming it."[1]

But young people must do more than just learn to use a gun. They must participate in political life from an early age.

Vladimir Ilyich analysed the positions of all the parties on the school question during the Duma discussion on February 6, 1913. The Octobrists, Progressives and Constitutional Democrats alleged that drawing school children into politics was a harmful thing and held that guilty pupils should be punished not by the police, but by teachers; they were dissatisfied with the government for its lack of goodwill and for its sluggishness. Analysing the C.D. platform, Lenin wrote:

"They *also* condemn 'early' political activity, though in a much milder and more ambiguous way. That is an anti-democratic standpoint. Both the Octobrists and the Constitutional Democrats condemn police measures only because they are demanding *prevention* instead. The regime should prevent meetings and not disperse them. It is clear that such a reform will not alter the regime, it will only tint it... A democrat should first of all have said: the circles and the talks are *natural and desirable*. That's the point. Any condemnation of political activity, even of 'early' activity, is hypocrisy and obscurantism. A democrat should have raised not the issue of a single ministry

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 576.

but one of the whole state system."[1]

After the February Revolution, Vladimir Ilyich displayed particular interest in what socialist construction implied. His ideas on this subject were reflected with great vividness in his "Letters from Afar." Proceeding from the experience of the Paris Commune and its analysis by Marx and Engels, and from the experience of the 1905 Revolution, Vladimir Ilyich held that it would be necessary to build an organization of a new type after the old state machine had been smashed. The executive organ of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies should be the people's militia, comprising all citizens of both sexes and carrying out the functions of the army, the police and the administrative apparatus. "Such a militia," Lenin wrote, "would convert democracy from the beautiful screen behind which the capitalists enslave and humiliate the people into a real school for *training the masses* to take part in *all* state affairs. Such a militia would draw juveniles into politics and educate them not only by word, but also by deed, by *work*."[2]

Developing this idea in "The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution," written on April 10, 1917, Ilyich defined the age at which people should be drawn into the public services. He said that service in the militia should extend to all men and women between the ages of 15 and 65, if these tentatively suggested age limits may be taken as determining the participation of adolescents and old people.

Speaking at the session of the Moscow Soviet of

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol 18, pp. 539-41.
[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. 23, p. 320.

Workers' and Red Army Men's Deputies on March 6, 1920, Vladimir Ilyich stressed the indispensability of enlisting the masses to control the state. He regarded state control as a school of government where the most timid and backward workers could be taught to govern, provided there was proper guidance. The worker and peasant masses must set up state control, he said, adding: "You will get this apparatus with the assistance of the worker and peasant masses, with the assistance of the worker and peasant youth, who are displaying unprecedented desire, readiness and determination to take the reins of government into their own hands. Having accumulated experience in the course of the war, we shall have thousands of people who have gone through the Soviet school and who are capable of governing the state."[1]

LENIN ON UNIVERSAL EDUCATION AND POLYTECHNICAL WORK FOR THE GROWING GENERATION

Vladimir Ilyich tied the question of juvenile and youth labour with the question of training them and organizing their labour in a new way. In his "Gems of Narodniks' Hare-Brained Schemes," written way back in 1897, he said:

"It is impossible to picture the future society without combining training with the productive labour of the younger generation: training and education without productive labour and productive labour without parallel training and education cannot be raised to the

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 30, p. 389.

level of modern technology and science."

And further:

"To combine universal productive labour with universal education it is evidently necessary to oblige *everybody* to participate in productive labour."[1]

And so, education, school attendance should be compulsory for all, just as labour is in socialist society. The programme adopted by the Second Congress of the Party spoke, on the one hand, of universal education and vocational training for all children under the age of 16 and, on the other, prohibited employment of juveniles under 16 and limited the working day for juveniles from 16 to 18 years of age to six hours. Ilyich re-examined this question in 1917, when it became necessary to revise the old programme. Here is how he formulated the juvenile labour clauses in *Materials on the Revision of the Party Programme*:

"*Employers are forbidden to hire children of school age* (*under 16*); *the working day of young people* (*between the ages of 16 and 20*) *must be limited to four hours and they must not be made to work at night in unhealthy conditions or in mines*.

"*...Free and compulsory education and polytechnical training* (*theory and practice in all the main branches of production*) *for children of both sexes under the age of 16*: *combination of education with children's labour*."[2]

Here special attention should be paid to the last sentence. It means that the school is not only obliged to impart knowledge and training of a polytechnical

[1] *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, pp. 440-41.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. 24, pp. 437, 435.

nature, but that this knowledge and training must be organically linked with the labour of children and juveniles, that this labour is not being abolished, but, on the contrary, being made compulsory for all, and organized in such a way as to be closely linked with vocational training and with the all-round study of technology and science.

The workers must learn to manage industries — that became especially clear in 1920 when the Civil War started receding to the background, giving way to pressing economic tasks. Speaking at the Third Congress of Water Transport Workers in March 1920, Lenin said: "He who follows life closely and is rich in worldly experience knows that managing requires competence, thorough knowledge of all the processes of production, the modern technology of production and a definite level of scientific education."[1]

The questions of labour came to the fore. In April 1920, Ilyich wrote "From Destruction of the Old System to Creation of the New" in the special newspaper *Communistichesky Subbotnik* in which he explained the meaning of communist labour. In the article in connection with the all-Russian *Subbotnik* on May 1, Lenin wrote:

"We must work in such a way so as to root out the accursed rule of 'each for himself and God for all,' to root out the habit of regarding labour as an obligation and of considering rightful only that labour which is remunerated according to definite rates. We shall strive to inculcate the rule of 'one for all and all for

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 30, p. 401.

one,' the rule of 'from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs' into the minds of the masses, make them a custom and an everyday practice, and introduce communist discipline and communist labour gradually, though firmly."[1]

Lenin's speech at the Third All-Russian Congress of the Russian Young Communist League on October 2, 1920, is of exceptional importance. Ilyich spoke to the youth in whom he reposed great hopes, in whom he saw those who would continue our cause. He had carefully prepared it. He spoke of what we should teach the youth and how the youth should learn if it really wants to justify the name of communist youth, and how it should be trained so as to be able to accomplish what we had started. The youth should learn communism, but it should not be routine absorption of what is written about communism. They should learn to integrate all this knowledge into one well thought-out whole so that it may serve as a guide in their daily, all-round work. They should study Marxism, the facts elucidating the laws of development of human society, which show the path of social development, and they should study as profoundly as possible the capitalist society and present-day life. They should know how to choose from the old school what is necessary for communism.

Lenin particularly stressed the necessity for the youth to acquire what human knowledge had accumulated. The new generation must know more than the old generation, whose main task was to overthrow the bourgeoisie. The youth of today must build com-

[1] *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 103.

munism, and that requires vast knowledge. Ilyich said the younger generation should work cut a new, communist morality which would subordinate personal interests to those of society and train them to be consciously disciplined fighters and builders; he said the youth should know how to act unitedly in struggle, how to work and how to organize their collective work in a new way.

He said:

"We would not believe in teaching, training and education if they were confined only to the school and were divorced from the storm of life... Our school must impart to the youth the fundamentals of knowledge, the ability to work out communist views independently, it must make educated people of them. In the time during which people attend school, it must train them to be participants in the struggle for emancipation from the exploiters."[1]

And further:

"Being a member of the Youth League means devoting one's labour and efforts to the common cause. That is what communist training means...

"The Young Communist League must be a shock group, helping in every job and displaying initiative and enterprise... And the Young Communist League must combine its education, teaching and training with the labour of the workers and peasants, so as not to shut itself up in its schools and not to confine itself to reading communist books and pamphlets. Only by working side by side with the workers and peasants can one become a genuine Communist. And everyone

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 487.

must be made to see that all those who belong to the Youth League are literate and at the same time knew how to work... We must organize all labour, no matter how dirty and arduous it may be, in such a way that every worker and peasant may say: I am part of the great army of free labour, and I can build my life without the landlords and capitalists, I can establish the communist system. The Young Communist League must train everybody to conscious and disciplined labour from an early age. In this way we shall be sure that the problems that are now confronting us will be solved...

"And so, the generation which is now fifteen years old... must approach all their tasks in education in such a way that every day, in every village and in every town, the young people shall engage in the practical solution of some problem of common labour, even though the smallest, even though the simplest. To the extent that this is done in every village, to the extent that communist emulation develops, to the extent that the youth prove that they can unite their labour, to that extent will the success of communist construction be ensured."[1]

The Eighth Congress of Soviets in December 1920 examined the plan of electrification, drawn up by the State Commission for the Electrification of Russia, composed of the best specialists and workers of the Supreme Council of National Economy, the People's Commissariat of Communications and the People's Commissariat of Agriculture. Lenin's ardent speech in support of this plan is well known. He said that the

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 489-92.

state plan of electrification was our second Party programme. Our political programme enumerates our end aims, explains relationships between the classes and the masses. It must be supplemented by a programme of our economic construction. "Without the electrification plan," Lenin said, "we cannot pass on to real construction. We cannot speak of the rehabilitation of agriculture, industry and transport and of their harmonious interconnection without speaking of a broad economic plan. We must adopt this plan. It will naturally be adopted only as a draft. This programme of the Party will not be so unchangeable as our real programme, which can be altered only at Party congresses. No, this programme will be improved, elaborated, perfected and altered every day, in every workshop, in every district. We need it as a rough outline which will grow before the eyes of Russia into a great economic plan, to be implemented over a period of at least ten years and showing how Russia is to be switched over to a real economic basis that is necessary for communism."[1]

The phrase "Communism is Soviet rule plus the electrification of the country," which Vladimir Ilyich said at the Eighth Congress of Soviets, is well known. Less well known, however, is that he also said that the electrification plan could not be carried out without the masses, that it was indispensable for the workers, as well as for the bulk of the peasantry, to understand the tasks confronting the country. Lenin said that it was necessary to raise the cultural level of the masses, that every newly built power station should serve for

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 31, pp. 482-83.

the "electrical education of the masses." A summary of the "electrification plan should be discussed in a special textbook and studied in every school."

The draft resolution of the Eighth Congress of Soviets on the electrification report was elaborated by Lenin. This is what he said:

"The congress further instructs the government and asks the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions and the All-Russian Congress of Trade Unions to take measures to propagandize the plan in every possible way and to acquaint the broadest masses of the city and countryside with it. The plan should be studied in absolutely all the educational institutions of the republic; every power station and every more or less well-organized factory and state farm should popularize electricity, modern industry and the electrification plan, as well as arrange systematic courses on it. All those possessing sufficient scientific and practical knowledge should be mobilized to propagandize the electrification plan and impart the knowledge necessary to understand it."[1]

Ilyich was well satisfied with *Electrification of the RSFSR*, which I.I. Stepanov wrote the following year as a textbook for schools. Lenin wanted every district library to have several copies of this book, every power station; he wanted every teacher to read and study this textbook, and not only to read it, to understand and study it thoroughly, but to be able to explain it to his pupils simply and comprehensibly.

A year later, in *The Mandate on Questions of Economic Work*, which was adopted by the Ninth All-

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 499.

Russian Congress of Soviets on December 28, 1921, Lenin wrote:

"The Ninth Congress holds that the task of the People's Commissariat of Education in the new period is to train in the shortest possible time specialists of all kinds from among peasants and workers, and suggests still closer links between educational work in school and out of it and the urgent economic tasks on the republican as well as district and local scales."[1]

While the Eighth Congress of Soviets was in session, the Party held a conference on questions of education, attended by 134 delegates with voice and 29 without. It was necessary to reorganize the whole work, taking into consideration the tasks of socialist construction confronting the country. It was necessary to make the school genuinely polytechnical, to link it closely with production. It was necessary to tackle the organization of child and juvenile labour, proceeding from the principles of polytechnism and training the growing generation both for mental and physical work. It was necessary to elaborate new programmes. Vladimir Ilyich was deeply dissatisfied with this Party conference. He was discontented with the abstract formulation of questions of polytechnical training, with the arguments whether or not polytechnical education was necessary — particularly after this question had already been positively decided by the Party. Polytechnical education was a new thing. In his "On the Work of the People's Commissariat of Education," Lenin wrote: "Emphasis in this work should be laid fully on 'evaluation and verification of

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 33, p. 155.

practical experience,' on 'systematic *utilization* of this experience.'"[1]

"The conference of Party workers should have heard specialists and teachers who had done practical work for some ten years and who can tell us what has been done and what is being done in this or that sphere, for instance, in the sphere of vocational training, acquaint us with how the Soviet state is coping with it, tell us what has been achieved and describe these achievements (there are probably some, even though very few), and supply us with concrete information on the main defects and on methods of eliminating them."[2]

That was written on February 7, 1921, two days after the publication of *The Central Committee's Directives to the Communist Workers of the People's Commissariat of Education*. They spoke of the same thing — of the necessity of improving the work of the People's Commissariat of Education, re-affirmed the need for polytechnicalizing schools, stressed the indispensability of linking professional technical training with polytechnical knowledge, and emphasized the necessity for the Collegium and the People's Commissar to elaborate and approve a curriculum for educational institutions of the basic types, and then courses, lectures, readings, talks and practical studies. They further spoke of the need for mobilizing all the specialists in technology and agronomy for professional and polytechnical training at factories and agricultural institutions, etc.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, Vol. 32, p. 102.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 103.

General and polytechnical education is necessary to arm the youth for the struggle for socialism. Lenin never pictured socialism as something that could be "introduced" from above, without any struggle. Live socialism is the creation of the popular masses, he said. Organization is the pith and marrow of socialist construction. Socialism is a completely new system, built up in the process of a lengthy struggle. One needs plenty of knowledge to create it.

Youth must be trained in a business-like manner, V.I. Lenin wrote to the Communist Youth International on December 4, 1922.

Trained for what? The answer to that may be found in Lenin's greeting to the Fifth Congress of the Russian Young Communist League, held two months before the Communist Youth International Congress. "I am sure," he wrote, "that the youth will be able to develop successfully enough to tackle the next phase of the world revolution when it comes about."[1]

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *On Youth*, Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing House, 1940, pp. 135-59

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 33, p. 337.

THE MOST IMPORTANT SECTOR OF YOUNG COMMUNIST LEAGUE ACTIVITY

(*Yuny Communist* Magazine, No. 8, 1935)

Among the tasks faced by the Young Communist League one of the most important is to complete the emancipation of woman, a cause our Communist Party has been consistently advancing.

There is no need to repeat what tremendous progress we have made in this sphere, in enhancing woman's consciousness. Much has already been written and said about it.

In this article I should like to dwell on certain concrete tasks confronting the Young Communist League, and particularly its active women members, in this sphere.

It should never be forgotten that it is the job of the Young Communist League activists to lead the mass of young women both in countryside and city. We have wonderful female activists in the League, but if we look at the mass of young women as a whole, we shall see that they are still under the influence of many survivals of the past. And here it is necessary to do, and daily too, a lot of explanatory and organizational work. This work, often hardly noticeable, requires a great deal of patience and perseverance, but it is indispensable, and the job of the Young Communist League is to carry it on day in and day out.

One of the survivals of the past is women's cultural backwardness and that hampers young women and old in their work and social activity. They cannot

study properly because they are overburdened with house chores and have to take care of children. In the old days, girls as a rule were not sent to school because they were needed at home to help with the work, to nurse children. Our compulsory education law has played an exceptional role. Parents are now obliged to send their children to school. However, even now we have to watch that this law is properly implemented and prevent parents from keeping girls at home for various "good" reasons, see to it that the work they are given at home does not hamper them in their studies, etc. It must also be understood that extra-school and social activity is just as important for girls as school work.

But the question here is not only of girls — they live in infinitely better conditions than their elder sisters did. What we must do is safeguard their right to study and see to it that they really go to school, especially in certain national areas and republics. Here, systematic public control is absolutely essential.

The educational issue is very urgent insofar as young women are concerned, particularly in the countryside. The Young Communist League and the youth in general should concentrate their attention on this issue. Young women's advancement is hindered by their cultural backwardness. The main task is to wipe out illiteracy among them. But literacy as such no longer satisfies us. In the present stage of economic and social development in the Soviet Land it is necessary for working people to achieve a level of knowledge that would enable them independently to acquire further knowledge that is indispensable for productive labour, fruitful social activity and socialist

construction. Modern science and technology require of every worker, in every sector of socialist construction, a definite and comparatively high level of knowledge. And the more science and technology advance, the higher must be the level of all-round knowledge.

Socialist construction presupposes active participation of millions of working people, their collective social work. And if this work is to develop in the right direction, if it is to be channelled correctly, it is necessary for people to achieve a certain cultural level.

Our girls know Ilyich's words "every kitchen-maid must be able to rule the country." But to do that, one must study, one must know a lot.

Take, for instance, such a sector of activity as the Soviets. As a rule, young men and women play a very small part in their activities, they do not show much interest in the work of their sections, their activists do not help the delegates. We must change that. Lenin attached tremendous importance to the work of the Soviets. He insisted that young people should help them in every way and regarded this work as a school of government.

We must wage a struggle against unculture — which exerts a particularly pernicious influence on young women — through the Soviets too. Its elimination, however, requires knowledge and understanding of the tasks one confronts in this sphere. Without that, the struggle against unculture will inevitably degenerate into philistinism, into an imitation of the old culture of idlers and merchants.

One of the most pressing questions today is that of the family, of upbringing and of combining social and

family upbringing. But the communist education of the younger generation also rests on culture, on the educational level of the parents.

Wherever one turns, one sees one and the same thing: socialist construction requires of all the working people to have a definite level of knowledge. Semi-literacy acquires a broader meaning. The man who knows nothing of geography or of the fundamental stages of human development, who does not understand natural phenomena and what is taking place around, who does not know how to make use of science to change working and living conditions, or where to look for the knowledge he needs — a man like this is semi-literate.

The Young Communist League must do everything to expand the network of youth and adult schools; it must see to it that every youth goes to school. It must pay particular attention to those young people who are still illiterate or semi-literate. Our youth, especially girls and young collective farmers, must have a seven-grade education. The job is big and serious. The youth must be in the van of the struggle for expanding the network of necessary schools. Particular attention should be paid to the education of adolescents who, for one reason or another, begun going to school too late, i.e., to the education of backward children. There are very many of them among girls. This aspect of the job is very important, but it is not sufficiently widely organized and by far does not embrace all the backward children.

Self-education is of vast significance. It requires libraries, and there are not many of them. And yet they have to cater to the entire population. There is a con-

test now among village libraries and among rural districts to see which of them has the best organized library. The Young Communist League members, especially girls, should help in this contest.

Apart from striving to create the conditions necessary for education (expansion of the network of youth and adult schools in city and countryside, increase in the number of libraries, organization of assistance in self-education, etc.) we must get the trade unions to safeguard the working women's right to study. Take, for instance, the servants' trade union. What has it done to include in the contract with the employer a clause ensuring the servant definite hours off for study? Does anyone supervise or control this? Are employers fined for not letting their servants off? What is being done to safeguard the right to study for girls working in the small-scale industry, etc.? There is a lot of work to be done here.

In the present phase of development in the Soviet Union, trade-union activity should be concentrated on raising the cultural level of the masses, improving their living conditions and rebuilding their life. Young women are keenly interested in this activity. They should tackle it energetically, take as big a part as possible in trade-union work.

The new life that we are building confronts us with the task of extending the cultural revolution. Life demands that we solve such important problems as family relations between husband and wife and between parents and children, and the problem of bringing up the younger generation. These questions agitate most the minds of young people. They can be solved only on the basis of the communist world outlook, only if

one proceeds from the fundamentals of communist morality. The radical changes that have taken place require that we tackle many questions in a new way, differently from the way we did it in the past. Here, to a certain measure, one must hew new paths. Here, there are serious difficulties and the main difficulty is that very often old views prevail though under a new guise. We must be on the alert for philistine morality, philistine views on the family and upbringing.

Let us recall the past. Seventy-five years ago we had serfdom. The landlords were the masters of their serfs, sold them, married them off "for economic reasons." Family life was built on laws of slavery: children were the property of parents, the wife was the property of her husband. There was no question of mutual sympathy or love. The horrors of peasant family life are perhaps best described by Gorky. In one of his novels he wrote how, 75 years ago, the inhabitants of Kondyba Village, Kherson Gubernia, calmly watched one peasant torture his wife. Such were the morals.

In the 1860's, serfdom was abolished, giving way to the capitalist system, but it took a long time before the attitude towards the woman changed.

Under capitalism the compulsory form of marriage is less prevalent, but marriage continues to be a business deal. "Marriage of convenience" prospers — there are the advantages of marrying a rich man or a rich woman, of marrying a man of position or the daughter of a minister. Sometimes calculations are less mercenary, but still they are calculations: to get a housewife or a breadwinner, and so on and so forth.

It is only natural that such marriages — such busi-

ness deals and marriages of convenience — lead to insincere, false relations between husband and wife, and insincerity and falseness develops very easily into deception. Often a marriage of convenience is preceded by a game of love. Family life, built on such lines, is not a very happy one. Sometimes the husband and wife "get used to each other," but in most cases they have illicit affairs, men go to prostitutes, women whom poverty forces to sell themselves. Marriage of convenience is inevitably attended by deception, unfaithfulness, vulgarity, licentiousness. And the one to suffer most is naturally the woman.

The negative features of "business" marriages are particularly obvious in petty-bourgeois society.

Marx and Engels wrote that new marriage relations could be engendered only by the proletariat, that marriage then would not be one of convenience, but one of reciprocal attraction, love, trust and harmony.

Soviet legislation has freed woman from the old, unbearable forms of marriage relations.

But there are still many survivals. Petty-bourgeois psychology makes itself felt everywhere, masking, disguising and adapting itself to the new conditions.

The attitude still prevails that woman is a "plaything." Courtship, licentiousness, irresponsible attitude towards women — all these may still be found even among the Young Communist League members. "It's nice to have a good time, but it's too early to marry." And if the girl becomes pregnant, such people say: "So what? She can do an abortion." That is the old attitude — regarding the woman not as a human being, but as a plaything.

Very often philistinism infects workers. People are

eager to escape the old poverty, the crudity of old family relations on which one can still see the imprint of serfdom. They become less vigilant and do not notice vulgar philistinism which must be constantly combated.

When small individual economies prevailed, isolated from social life in the countryside, the survivals of the past persisted and took a long time to die out. Collectivization of agriculture and reorganization of labour brought freedom to woman. A woman collective farmer has become a force and that has brought about a change in morals and in relations between man and woman, a radical change in family relations.

At the present stage, when socialist construction is going apace in our country, when the consciousness of the working people is growing by the hour, when the attention of the Party, the Young Communist League, the trade unions and the Soviets is concentrated on raising the people's cultural level, when material conditions are being created for rebuilding the whole life (new housing conditions, growing network of public catering, growing number of crèches, kindergartens, clubs, parks, etc.), when a new attire — if one may say so — is being tailored for this new life, in these conditions new forms of family relations, based on profound reciprocal trust, community of ideas, harmony, natural attraction that grows into unlimited love, are bound to become stronger with each passing day.

Lastly, the question of upbringing.

Woman is either a mother or a prospective one. Maternal instincts are strong in her. These instincts are a great power and they bring joy to the mother.

We deeply respect mothers. A mother is a born educator. She exerts a deep influence on children, especially on tiny tots, and we know how much a man's character is influenced by the upbringing he gets in his very early years. It is only a matter of the sort of the upbringing he gets.

A girl can be brought up as a slave, as a petty-bourgeois individualist who is interested not in the life bubbling around her but only in her own affairs, or she can be brought up as a collectivist, as an active builder of socialism, as a person who finds joy in collective endeavour, in the struggle for great aims, as a real Communist.

It all depends on the mother herself and on her views...

Our kindergartens and schools should serve as models of how children should be brought up as new people, as builders of socialism. The combination of kindergarten and school upbringing with upbringing in families where mothers are devoted to socialism, will give us a marvellous generation of people. The female members of the Young Communist League, and the League in general, should work to this end.

N. K. KRUPSKAYA, *About Youth*,
Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing
House, 1940, pp. 182-194

SCHOOL AND POLYTECHNICAL EDUCATION

STUDYING LENIN AND LENINISM IN SCHOOL

(*Pravda*, March 21, 1925)

Should Lenin be studied in school? Of course. Lenin is so closely tied with our "yesterday," "today" and "tomorrow," with our struggle for a bright future, with the struggle of the masses, he is so much part of our life, that it would be strange and inadmissible if school children did not learn how he lived and what he did.

But should he be studied as he often is? No.

Some say in all earnest that even children of preschool age should study Leninism. But since this is contrary to common sense, attempts are being made to adapt Lenin for little tots. He is depicted as a kindly grandfather, patting children on their heads and telling them to be good. Sometimes he is shown surrounded by girls presenting him with flowers, and children get an idea that Lenin was a sort of a good-natured petty bourgeois. His portraits are put into frames made by children and decorated with flowers, and he becomes a sort of embodiment of petty-bourgeois morality: "You've torn your pants. Look how clean Lenin is in the picture. You want to be like him, don't you?" and so on, and so forth.

It is better to say nothing about Lenin than to say such rot. I know that often this is all well-meant, but it does prevent children from learning what Lenin was really like.

The same applies in the case of children of elementary schools, with the addition that Lenin always had

good marks, that his behest to children was: study, study and study. It is claimed that children are only interested in Lenin's childhood, and this childhood as a rule is painted in rather "pedagogical" hues...

Children who are a bit older are told that they should "study Leninism," that they should "carry out Lenin's behests." What Leninism is and why they should study it — that the children do not know. For them, Leninism turns into an empty, though ringing word. Neither do they have any clear idea of what Lenin's behests are, what they imply. For all they know, they may be rules of good conduct.

In senior classes, Leninism is brought to the pitch of fine art — there is a plan according to which children read abstracts on Lenin's militant materialism and on the immediate tasks of the anti-imperialist struggle, select the basic subjects and so on and so forth.

Then there are "Leninist circles," in which "handicrafts" play a big role. Their members paint, embroider and carve. "Everything about Lenin," the people in charge of these circles claim, "should strike one's eye, should be seen from afar." There are arguments whether a Leninist circle should be a library, an exhibition of quotations or photographs, or a museum.

Rarely, very rarely do the schools acquaint children with the real, live Lenin — with the man who gave all of himself to the struggle for the cause of the working people, with the man who showed deep concern for the grief and poverty of every worker and every peasant, of every woman worker and every peasant woman, of every ignorant, downtrodden man. Children know very little of the Lenin who never

stopped thinking of the liberation of the working people, who persistently and passionately sought for ways and means of arousing and organizing the masses, of leading them in struggle. They do not know Lenin the thinker, Lenin the organizer or Lenin the leader.

Lenin's biography for children is woefully lifeless.

And what children should be given is a live Lenin — Lenin the tireless worker, the irreconcilable fighter, the leader of the world proletariat, the leader of all the working people.

I think that it is only those who understand the masses, who share their woes and joys, who work for their awakening and their organization that can tell children all that is essential and important about Lenin.

There are such people.

We must see to it that the schools help children to know Lenin and do not prevent them from knowing him.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Lenin and Culture*,
Partizdat Publishing House, 1934,
pp. 43-44

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL AND POLYTECHNICAL EDUCATION

(*Our Children* Magazine, No. 5, 1930)

It is best to explain the difference between professional and polytechnical education by citing an example. Let us take the textile industry. There are many trades in it: weaving, spinning, dyeing, etc. To be a good weaver one must be able to handle a loom of the latest design, know every one of its screws, be familiar with the properties of the raw materials, possess experience. Before textile mills were mechanized, the workers had to undergo lengthy training and work for years to become proficient.

How did they attain proficiency?

The apprentice would be "tied" for months to a skilled worker, watch and help him, first by preparing yarn, run errands for him. Eventually, the skilled worker would allow the apprentice to operate the loom, and the latter gradually learned the trade. Apprentices were great helpers and that was why skilled weavers favoured this system of individual training.

The introduction of machinery changed the very nature of the work. But even now skill plays a big part, though it is a skill of a totally different character. The weaver is now required to be familiar with the mechanism of the loom, to work several looms simultaneously, to be fast in switching the levers, pressing buttons and doing other jobs that are still unmechanized.

Individual apprenticeship is of a different nature

too. Running errands and working by hand are things of the past. The weaver's job is much more responsible and cannot be entrusted to an apprentice. Individual apprenticeship is at its last breath and is being replaced by trade schools.

If the vocational school is well equipped, it trains the apprentice to operate the lathe skilfully. To justify their existence, vocational schools should be well equipped, and that costs a lot of money. There are few trade schools of this sort, and, if they are good schools, they turn out highly qualified workers.

It must be remembered, however, that technology is advancing all the time. A man puts in a big effort into acquiring skill only to see it made useless by some new invention. The machine is gradually taking over his job. His qualification is worth nothing. However, in a backward country, where manual labour still plays an important role, where industrial modernization is proceeding at a slow pace, trade schools and even individual apprenticeship are of considerable value.

A country that is fast industrializing needs another thing — it requires of apprentices knowledge of the entire production cycle and technical development, and ability to operate any machine. For that one must possess working experience, a knowledge of raw materials, etc. A man who has been taught all that can adapt himself to any technical changes and he will be a qualified worker, qualified in the new, and not the old, meaning of the word.

What will a seven-year factory training school teach?

It will not teach the youngster to spin and weave

by hand or machine, but it will teach him a lot of what he must know working at a mill. First, it will acquaint him with the role the textile industry plays in the economy of the world and in the economy of our country. It will show him how our textile industry is going to develop. He will learn where our textile centres are situated, etc. Then he will learn what raw materials are used at the mills: flax, cotton, wool, silk, artificial silk, kendyr, etc., where these raw materials are obtained and how these districts will develop in the near future. He will be acquainted with the properties of the raw materials and with the improved methods of their cultivation and storage. He will get to know the mill and its workshops, with the various branches of production and the necessary qualifications. He will learn how the machines are built, how to draw plans of these machines, how textile production has developed and how improvements can be effected. In special workshops he will see different kinds of looms, learn how to operate them, and that will show him that modern machines are better than the old. He will learn to look after them and to work any machine. Finally, he will study the various methods of putting any machine into operation — from a hand machine to a power-driven one.

The school will stimulate pupils' interest in production and their desire to raise production to the highest possible level. On the other hand, the factory training school will acquaint the pupil with labour organization in factories and plants and, for that matter, everywhere else, individual and collective. It will teach him to create the necessary hygienic working conditions, acquaint him with the fundamentals of labour

protection and industrial safety at any enterprise, particularly in a textile mill. Lastly, the factory training school will leach him the history of the labour and trade-union movement at home and abroad, and acquaint him with the struggle waged by the workers, particularly textile workers, the world over.

All that will give the pupil not a narrow profession that may prove unnecessary on the morrow, but broad polytechnical education and working habits possessing which he will come to the factory not as an inexperienced worker who is more of a hindrance than help, but as a mature and skilful worker who requires only a short-term specialization course.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Works*, Vol. IV,
Uchpedgiz Publishing House, 1934,
pp. 137-39

LENIN'S ROLE IN THE STRUGGLE FOR POLYTECHNICAL SCHOOLS

(*Kommunisticheskoye Vospitaniye* Magazine, No. 9, 1932)

Vladimir Ilyich attached particular attention to the upbringing of the growing generation. He regarded the school as an instrument for building a classless society, as an instrument for re-educating the entire growing generation in the spirit of communism. The son of an outstanding pedagogue, who had been utterly devoted to the idea of making primary school a mass institution and who had given all his time to raising it to a higher level, Vladimir Ilyich read with particular attention everything Marx and Engels had written about the school, about linking education with work. In 1897, when Marxism was just beginning to attract attention in Russia and a bitter struggle was being waged against the Narodniks who completely misconstrued socialist development, Lenin wrote an article entitled "Gems of Narodniks' Hare-Brained Schemes." The Narodnik Yuzhakov had worked out a plan for educating peasants' children. His idea was to open rural *gymnasiums* on the cost-accounting basis. They would have their own farms, and while rich peasants would pay for their offsprings' schooling, the poor peasants' children would work for their keep and education. The spirit and curriculum would be the same as in the Tsarist *gymnasiums*. The plan made Lenin terribly indignant. Yuzhakov considered that it was quite possible — without any struggle, retaining class differentiation and the autocratic regime — to

establish rural *gymnasiums*. Censorship forced Lenin to resort to subterfuges, allegories and hints, but Vladimir Ilyich said all he had intended to, proved the utterly utopian nature and hopelessness of the "scheme," showed that Yuzhakov was ignorant of Russian reality and the class character of the Russian system, and conclusively proved that the plan was imbued with the spirit of serfdom, for it bound young people to the soil, turned them into farm-hands who could not marry even at the age of 25 without the express permission of the school administration. Lenin proposed instead a plan for a universal, compulsory workers' school, which would give its pupils serious knowledge and in which all the pupils would work.

For a long time after that Lenin did not write anything on this subject, but he always paid close attention to child labour, insisted on the necessity of strictly protecting it and stressed the need to draw children into political activity.

Then came the World War. Foreseeing the tremendous changes in the history of mankind and thinking of the growing generation, Lenin turned to the question of education. In the article "Karl Marx," written for the "Socialism" section of the *Granat Encyclopedical Dictionary*, he quoted Marx on the question of linking education with work. Vladimir Ilyich advised me to write a book on how this issue stood in the industrially developed countries. The result was my *Public Education and Democracy*. Lenin read it attentively and took steps to have it published. During the war years, when we lived abroad, he stressed the necessity for young people to participate in the class struggle, in civil war, and underlined the need for

youngsters of 15 and over to help the proletarian militia in their work.

Working out the draft Party programme in 1917, Lenin formulated the school clause in the following words: it is necessary to have "free and compulsory, general and polytechnical (theoretical and practical in all the principal branches of industrial production) education for girls and boys below the age of 16, as well as close co-ordination of education with children's social productive work." He laid special stress on the indispensability of this social productive work.

From the very inception of Soviet power Ilyich insisted that the People's Commissariat of Education should establish polytechnical schools. We had to begin from scratch, in conditions of utter economic dislocation. In the beginning it was mostly experimental work. "Polytechnical" education looked rather poor and was limited mainly to self-service and working in carpenter, sewing and book-binding workshops. Lenin, on the other hand, wanted the schools to teach electrification and even drew up a plan of how it should be done. That was in December 1920.

Vladimir Ilyich thought the process of polytechnicalizing schools was too slow. In the People's Commissariat of Education there were some who wanted vocational schools for adolescents, who claimed that polytechnical education was unnecessary, that what we needed was specialized technical education; they also said that we could not have polytechnical education everywhere, that it should be instituted in big towns, that it was not needed in the countryside. In the Ukraine, the polytechnical school idea was completely distorted. Lenin insisted on calling a Party

meeting, at which I was supposed to report on polytechnicalization. I naturally showed my draft theses to Ilyich, who jotted down his remarks and then wrote: "Private. Draft. Not to be made public. I shall think it over." These theses have now been made public on my own initiative. Many years have passed, but the polytechnical school issue remains acute. And I thought that what could not be made public then, should be made so now. After all, we are studying Ilyich's draft notes. My theses were not used then. I fell ill and did not report to the Party meeting. What did Ilyich's remarks stress? The necessity to emphasize that polytechnical education was a matter of principle. Ilyich personally thought it extremely important. He believed that the polytechnical school would help to lay the foundation of the classless society. He wanted me to stress that in my theses. He further considered it necessary to say that polytechnical education should be introduced immediately. In my theses there was a concession to the vocationalists. I wrote, I think (I have not kept the text of my theses), that secondary schools should be merged with re-organized vocational schools, but Ilyich added that the merger should affect "not the entire secondary school, but pupils of 13-14 and older, *and at the discretion and decision of the teachers*." The Party meeting set the age at 15. In his article "On the Work of the People's Commissariat of Education," Lenin wrote: "While we are obliged *temporarily* to lower the age limit (in going over from general polytechnical to vocational polytechnical education) from 17 to 15, '*the Party must regard*' this reduction 'exclusively'... as a practical necessity, as a temporary measure rendered necessary by

'*the poverty and devastation of the country*'."[1]

Very often it is claimed that in writing about the merger of vocational schools with the senior classes of the secondary schools, Lenin meant the seven-class school. In speaking of vocational schools, Lenin said that they should be turned into polytechnical and not trade schools, that they should give general, polytechnical education. This applies to factory training schools and technical colleges. That should not be forgotten. Lenin further spoke of the necessity to determine concretely how schools were to be polytechnicalized in our conditions. In the Lenin Institute archives there is a note (No. 3946) of Lenin's on the issue of polytechnicalization. He wrote: "Add: 1) on polytechnical education of youths and adults; 2) children's initiative in school.

"For *adults* — promotion of vocational education with the gradual going over to polytechnical education."

The archive does not say when and why Lenin wrote this note. But for us it is very important.

Lenin's article "On the Work of the People's Commissariat of Education," published February 1921, and his Central Committee Directives to the Communist Workers of the People's Commissariat of Education are extremely revealing. The Directives said it was necessary to polytechnicalize schools and co-ordinate vocational technical education with polytechnical; that the Collegium of the People's Commissariat of Education should first work out and approve the curricula of basic-type schools and then plans of

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed Vol. 32, p. 102.

courses, lectures, reading, talks and practical work. The Directives spoke of the necessity of enlisting all suitable specialists in technology and agronomy for work in vocational technical and polytechnical schools, and of using every fairly well organized industrial or agricultural establishment for that purpose.

At the Ninth Congress of the Soviets in December 1921, Lenin insisted on linking school work with urgent economic tasks on both republican and local scale.

Lenin's pronouncements contain concrete instructions on how polytechnical schools should be built. For five years he himself guided the process; in recent years it has been going on as he had directed.

We have created a number of general prerequisites that facilitate the task. The main prerequisites are our industrial achievements, our country's industrialization and the reshaping of our agriculture. Economic planning is of tremendous import, for it broadens our polytechnical outlook and shows how the various branches of production are interlinked. The training of industrial and agricultural cadres is proceeding apace. The masses attitude to labour is growing more conscious thanks to the socialist emulation movement, and so is discipline. Primary school education has been made compulsory for all children, and we are approaching the time when seven-year schooling will be so. We have built up a vast force of Young Communist League members and Young Pioneers who help the school; our schools are patronized by factories and plants. The Party attaches particular importance to polytechnicalization of schools.

All these prerequisites facilitate the polytechnicalization problem, as does the struggle for higher quality instruction that is now being unfolded on a wide scale. Our school, however, has not yet fully carried out Lenin's precepts, there is still much to be done before they are. What we have done so far will help us to avoid many mistakes. We know that self-service, with which we began polytechnicalizing our schools, gives very little; but we also know that there is a struggle for a higher cultural level. The school cannot stand aloof from this, it must give children the knowledge and ability that are necessary to rationalize life. We know that our polytechnical school must not become an ordinary vocational school, but we know that we need a certain minimum of elementary knowledge to master modern technology. We are against all-round vocationalism which was often substituted for polytechnicalism. We are for children's productive labour, but we are against its reducing studies to the minimum. A struggle against this excess has been going on for a whole year now on the basis of the Central Committee decision of September 5, 1931.

We have learned much in building polytechnical schools. But we still have to learn much before we make them genuinely polytechnical. We are building them at a fast pace and we shall make them the kind of schools Lenin dreamed of.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, 1955, pp. 503-08

CHOICE OF PROFESSION

(*Komsomolskaya Pravda*, June 26, 1936)

Free choice of profession is of tremendous importance. When a man loves the job he is doing, he finds joy and satisfaction in it, displays a great deal of initiative and constantly raises productivity without straining himself.

Under serfdom the choice of a profession depended on what class one belonged to. Physical labour was the heavy lot of the peasant — it was labour that rested on "the discipline of the stick," labour was a curse. According to an ancient legend, God told Adam: "Thou wilt earn thy bread in the sweat of thy brow." The Middle Ages present an extremely vivid picture of how the overwhelming mass of people slaved in unbearable conditions.

The French Revolution emancipated the masses. Without this juridical emancipation capitalism would have been impossible. The revolutionaries of those days thought it was the dawn of complete emancipation of labour. Rousseau, for instance, enthusiastically sang of the freedom of choosing one's profession. But, to quote Nekrasov, "those feudal fetters man replaced with other chains as tightly braced."[1] The succession of the feudal system by the capitalist, by a system of "hired slavery," brought freedom to choose a profession only to a certain, and a rather limited, stratum,

The division of society into estates gave way to

[1] From N.A. Nekrasov's poem *Freedom*.

class differentiation that hindered free choice of profession. Legally, a man was free to choose any profession he liked; in reality, there was a whole series of barriers and one of the most formidable was the capitalist system of public education. Technical development and collective work in industry demanded a certain level of literacy. That is why in some capitalist countries there has long been compulsory primary education — education poisoned by religious superstitions and bourgeois morality, and giving a distorted picture of the past and present.

Under this system it is by no means an easy thing to pass from primary education to secondary, for there is a gap between the curricula of the primary and secondary schools. The latter train people for the state apparatus, teaching them to serve those in power. The pupils in these schools are generally the children of the petty bourgeoisie: impoverished gentry, small and middle merchants, officials, rich peasants, etc.

There are different kinds of secondary schools that give their pupils broader knowledge and prepare them for "white-collar" jobs. And since the secondary school paved the way to these so-called "white-collar" jobs, the petty bourgeoisie did everything to have their children educated there. The secondary school made it possible for one to avoid heavy physical labour and "become somebody." It also opened the doors to institutes of higher learning which graduated specialists of a higher level and, hence, better paid. For the future "tycoons" and "statesmen" there were special, privileged schools (such as lyceums, open air secondary schools, etc.).

The entire system of public education was meant

to reinforce capitalism. Free choice of profession was quite a problem. During the imperialist war, the German pedagogical press conducted a heated discussion on the necessity of encouraging and promoting the most gifted and capable people. In reality, however, it was not a matter of giving each and everyone a chance to display his abilities, but of selecting the most gifted to serve capital, of making them keepers of the capitalist system and servants of the exploiters.

The Soviet government inherited from Tsarism the same capitalist system of education, only flavoured with feudalism, ignorance and slavery.

From its very inception, the Soviet government set out on smashing the class barriers and re-organizing the entire system of public education in its all-out effort to arm workers with knowledge. In so doing, it selected from the mass of knowledge that which was most essential for the cultural advancement of the masses.

It created a unified educational system and threw all the old nonsense out of the curriculum. It organized workers' faculties. It granted all sorts of privileges to workers and peasants entering secondary schools and institutes of higher education. The re-organization of the entire system of public education was undertaken at the time when the Civil War was raging and the social structure was being radically rebuilt. It is hot hard to understand that it was tremendously difficult then to achieve the simplest things, to organize even universal primary education. The cultural sector was one of the most important in our struggle. The history of public education in the twenty years since the establishment of Soviet rule presents a

detailed picture of this struggle.

The face of our country has changed beyond recognition. The development of heavy industry and the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture have brought city and countryside closer together, opened up wide horizons for people and raised their consciousness. Life has become richer, technical and scientific development is eliminating barriers between physical labour and mental work, the old obstacles preventing the masses from acquiring knowledge have been smashed.

We have created in the USSR all the prerequisites for a free choice of profession. But this does not mean that we can slacken our efforts on the cultural front.

We must never forget that survivals of illiteracy and semi-literacy continue seriously to hamper free choice of profession.

We must never forget the necessity of broadening — from an early age, in school and out of it — the general educational and polytechnical outlook of our growing generation, bearing in mind that a narrow general educational and polytechnical outlook limits the freedom of choice of profession and makes this choice accidental.

We must continue to smash down the remnants of any barriers between primary, secondary and higher schools, closely examine their curricula and eliminate all the unnecessary little things that obscured the fundamentals of science. We must strive for closer co-ordination of theory and practice.

We must fight against the old attitude towards physical labour, against the idea that it is something like a curse to millions of people. We must fight

against the ambitious efforts of some to get into institutes of higher learning, to "become somebody," to be engineers. These ambitions sometimes reflect the old attitude towards a factory worker, the attitude of looking down on manual workers. The Stakhanovite movement will help us quickly to do away with such prejudices.

We must do everything to build up the health of our children, taking care that they eat and sleep well, spend enough time in the open air; we must look after their physical development, enhance their visual and auricular memory, help them to acquire basic habits of work.

In the days of handicrafts and artisanship, the choice of profession usually depended on the profession of one's parents. Then it was habit of work that determined the quality of labour, and to acquire it one had to start working early in life. Early choice of profession was customary. In fact, habits of narrow technical character played an important role in handicrafts. In those conditions, it took years to become skilful and for that reason apprenticeship began early in life and lasted very long. A characteristic of handicrafts and artisanship was early choice of profession, or rather absence of such choice. Children's profession was chosen by their parents.

Modern technology has radically changed the character of apprenticeship. A man learning a profession is now required to have more than just elementary technical training; he must know how to operate a lathe, make it work as efficiently as possible, be thoroughly acquainted with the production process. It is no accident that very many young Stakhanovites

come from factory schools.

Our secondary schools must arm pupils with the working habits necessary for modern technology and thus prepare them for a whole number of professions. There should be no hurry with the choice of profession, for that would mean undermining the freedom of choice. Lenin strongly warned against early choice of profession.

There is a whole number of professions that require special qualities: sharp ear and eye, a well-developed sense of touch, well-trained nervous centres, etc. Social structure is the main determinant of profession, and the socialist system alone ensures freedom of choice to the masses.

In conclusion, a few words about "gifted" children. Like any other children, they should have the right to general education. We must ensure them all-round development in the ordinary Soviet school, bearing in mind that early specialization will prevent children from making wide use of their abilities in the future. Here is an example. A child has a splendid visual memory and draws very well. He is sent to a special school where he is taught the art of drawing, but no one develops his outlook, no one shows him the communist approach to phenomena, no one brings him up as a real Communist, as a collectivist. And he grows up as a talented artist — he draws still life beautifully, but he does not know how to depict modern socialist developments simply, without any bizarrerie, to make his drawings speak more eloquently than words.

Both the secondary school and the specialized school should bring him up as a Communist, for only

as such can he make real use of his talent.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, 1955, pp. 641-46

HOW AND WHAT SCHOOL CHILDREN SHOULD BE TOLD ABOUT LENIN

(*Uchitelskaya Gazeta*, January 22, 1938)

Some think that children should be told only of Lenin's childhood, that this is the only thing that interests them. That is wrong. Our children want to know everything about Lenin. The guides of the Lenin Museum could tell them a lot.

It is necessary, of course, to tell children of Lenin's childhood. The question is how. There is nothing worse than describing Lenin, as was once the fashion, as a goody-goody, polite, quiet boy who studied well and was first in his class. Some depicted Ilyich as an exceptionally gifted child.

Ilyich's childhood should be described differently. Children should be told of his father, that he was born into a poor family, that he was Director of Primary Schools. It should be recalled that the times were hard, that the lot of the peasants was a difficult one, that ignorance reigned in the countryside, that there was a breath of serfdom in everything. Vladimir Ilyich's father, Ilya Nikolayevich, hated serfdom. He yearned for a better life. He gave all his time and devoted all his efforts to providing peasants' children with schools. Ilyich heard of the peasants' plight from his nurse, whom he deeply loved, whose spectacles he always wiped with such care. He listened attentively when his father talked with other teachers. Ilya Nikolayevich was fond of Nekrasov and the *Iskra* poets, who sharply criticized the system and the intelligentsia. Children should also be told of what was written

in those days in children's books — of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, of America, of the war the North waged against the South to put an end to Negro slavery, of how prominently the Tsarist oppression of non-Russians stood out against the background of the American Civil War. Ilya Nikolayevich was solicitous for Chuvash and Mordvinian children, for their education. In school, Ilyich treated pupils of other nationalities with sympathy. It is necessary to recall the Polish uprising, how the Tsarist government suppressed the Polish insurgents. Children should be told about the year 1881, when Alexander II was assassinated, how Ilyich listened to the talks between his elder brother and sister, how he firmly decided to become a revolutionary, how he suffered when his beloved elder brother was arrested and executed, how he realized that he must follow a different path, the path of the mass struggle of the working class.

Children should know how he worked to become a revolutionary, spending every free moment reading books about the struggle of the working class and revolution, forgetting all about skating and Latin which he liked very much. They should be told how Ilyich, the thinker and revolutionary of remarkable insight, was brought up, how he grew up.

We should tell children of Ilyich's mother, of her solicitude for her husband for whom she created the necessary conditions for work and rest, of the way she took care of her children, how very capably she built her family into a well-knit team, how music helped her in bringing up her children. It would be well to recall too her talk with gendarmes, her meeting with her beloved elder son on the eve of his execution, her cour-

age and her children's deep respect for her.

Ilyich early revealed his organizing talents: he arranged games, played with little children, helped his classmates in the *gymnasium*. We should describe the classical *gymnasium* of those days, speak of Ilyich's hatred of its "conventionalism," of his critical attitude to science divorced from life.

Against the background of Ilyich's childhood, children will understand all the more clearly his activity in later years, the way he studied Marx and Engels, the part he played in the Marxist circles in Kazan, in the student movement, in the Samara circles.

Describing Ilyich as the founder of the Social-Democratic organization in Petersburg and his work in Marxist circles, we should dwell in detail on the significance of the labour movement, on the reasons why the working class alone could head the revolutionary movement, why Marx and Engels had so much faith in it, why Ilyich was so certain of its victory. Here we should also speak of socialism.

Further we should say how Ilyich studied and did organizational work in prison. In our stories of his exile we should speak less of how he hunted and skated and more of his talks with peasants, of his correspondence with other comrades.

In describing his life abroad, it is important to explain to children the significance of the illegal nationwide Russian newspaper, which told the workers the whole truth, which wrote about the international labour movement, about the International, about Bolsheviks who believed in the victory of the labour movement and about Mensheviks who did not and who betrayed it. There is no need to enter into the de-

tails of the contradictions.

Then we should speak of 1905, of the years of reaction, of Russian émigrés, of faith in victory, of the 1914 war, of the October Revolution, of the Civil War. We should dwell on the struggle against the landlords and capitalists and on the economic and cultural development of the country, on the bonds between workers and peasants, on the winning over to the side of the Soviets of the better elements of the intelligentsia, and, finally, on Ilyich's death and the twentieth anniversary of Soviet power.

We should speak of the most essential, most important, most fundamental things. There should be fewer slogans and more stories, simple and comprehensible.

We should, of course, take into consideration children's age and knowledge. We should speak in one way with primary school pupils and in another with those in higher classes, but in both cases we should paint a vivid image of Lenin as a fighter against all forms of oppression and exploitation, as a champion of a prosperous, healthy, cultural and bright life for all working people, i.e., as a fighter for socialism. There is no doubt that the children will understand that.

We should not depict Lenin as a sort of mentor who kept on telling children that it was "necessary to study, study and study" (this phrase, incidentally, was addressed to adults). Children should not have the impression that Ilyich's love for them was limited to arranging entertainment — New Year's parties, presents, etc. He had nothing against New Year's parties, but he sent presents to a children's New Year party in

1918 because in those days children had very little to eat, because they never saw sweets and only ate "potatoes fried in water," as one little boy told me at the forest school where the party was held. The New Year party in Gorki[1] was not arranged on Ilyich's initiative; he was simply brought there, although he was sick at the time.

Lenin liked talking to children. He worried about their nourishment and their health, took care that the children of needy parents were supplied with clothes and shoes, paid particular attention to children's homes and child labour protection, to organizing public care of children. Himself the son of a teacher and Director of Primary Schools, he wanted all the children to have education, to establish a real Soviet school for children. He thoroughly studied everything Marx and Engels had written about school and upbringing, and stood for the creation of a new, socialist school. Himself a pupil of a classical *gymnasium*, of a typical old secondary school, he hated this old school with its learning by rote, its discipline, and its divorcement from life. He saw and he knew that in this old school the pupil's mind was crammed with a mass of knowledge that was nine-tenths unnecessary and one-tenth distorted. He demanded that the Soviet school should impart only the most necessary, essential and fundamental knowledge, that it should closely link theory and practice, that it should train its pupils for both mental and physical work. He insisted that the Soviet school should keep in step with life, with social-

[1] A place some 20 miles from Moscow, where V.I. Lenin worked and rested towards the end of his life.

ist construction. Ilyich wanted children to be moulded into a well-knit collective that would do social work too. He spoke of all this at the Third Young Communist League Congress in 1920. All the pupils of the higher classes, all the Young Pioneer leaders and Young Communist League functionaries should study this speech not only as something "that must be studied," but as a guide to action.

We should tell school children of all ages how much Ilyich wanted them to grow up as conscious Communists, to continue the cause of their fathers and to know how to defend it with weapon in hand...

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *Selected Pedagogical Works*, 1955, pp. 721-25

SELF-EDUCATION

ORGANIZATION OF SELF-EDUCATION

(From the pamphlet *Organization of Self-Education*, 1922)

The October Socialist Revolution presented the toilers — workers and peasants — with extremely vast opportunities to rebuild their life. The worker felt he was the master of his enterprise; the peasant received land and saw his cherished dream come true. All that awakened them to activity, stimulated their enthusiasm.

But they soon realized that they were impotent because they lacked the most elementary knowledge. The war had done away with the countryside's age-old isolation and had shown the peasant how mankind lived. He saw the achievements of science, and learned that knowledge made it possible to renovate soil and draw upon its tremendous power and riches. The worker had known that before.

By making the toiling folk masters of their own destiny, the Revolution awakened in them a desire to apply science to their own ends.

This desire revealed all the more clearly to the worker and the peasant that they had no knowledge and that they must acquire it.

The Soviet government fully sympathizes with their desire to study.

Under Tsarism, extra-school education was miserably organized. The Soviet government pays special attention to work among adults and has stinted no funds to this end.

The fight against illiteracy is going apace. We have

set up some 80,000 reading-rooms in the countryside, approximately 30,000 libraries, a whole network of Soviet Party schools, clubs, etc. The press has been utilized to the full and cultural facilities have been made use of for agitation; agitational campaigns have been conducted and diverse study courses organized.

Since the establishment of Soviet power five years ago, political educational institutions have done a big job in disseminating knowledge among the population.

The Red Army is another major centre of culture.

The two years that all young men serve in the Red Army are not spent in vain. It has schools for Red Army men of different educational levels, libraries and clubs (at present,[1] there are more than 1,200 Red Army clubs with 6,200 political, educational, agricultural and other circles, and an aggregate membership upwards of 130,000).

No less important educational work has been conducted by trade unions, women's departments[2] and the Youth League.

Special admission regulations and stipends have been instituted to enable as many peasants and workers as possible to join institutions of higher learning. Admission to secondary schools has been facilitated for workers' and peasants' children. Special schools — the workers' faculties — have been established to train workers and peasants for universities and other

[1] I.e., in 1922 — *N.K.*

[2] Departments for work among women workers and peasant women, organized in September 1919 at the Central Committee of the Communist Party; later set up at all the local Party organizations. — *Tr.*

institutions of higher learning.

All that, however, is far from enough to satisfy the working people's demand for education. Self-education in Russia will play an exceptionally important role for a long time to come.

Self-education, however, can bring fruitful results only if one knows *what* to read, *how* to read and how best to organize one's studies.

We see constantly how helpless workers and peasants, fresh from their lathes and ploughs, are when they begin to study.

They never know how to go about it, what and how to read; they lack the elementary habits that are necessary to study books. Very often a man can hardly read and yet he takes nothing less than Marx's *Capital*, only to discover that he does not understand it.

The less energetic and persevering lose heart; they consider the job of studying too difficult and drop it. And it is difficult only because the man tackles Marx without having either the skill or knowledge to master the subject, because he goes bear-hunting with bare hands, so to speak.

The more energetic and persevering achieve what they are after, but in the process they often exert their efforts fruitlessly and — that happens too — overstrain themselves.

Much is being said and written in our country about organization of labour and production propaganda. What all that implies is chiefly organization of production.

Frederick Taylor and other engineers and specialists have analysed in detail the question of organizing

physical labour. There are a great many books on how to organize labour in factories and plants, arrange lathes in workshops, distribute tools, divide labour, issue instructions and assess the work done. All these questions are discussed with the aim of avoiding waste of time and energy.

From the viewpoint of efficient organization of labour, the best and the most qualified worker is the one who does his job with expediency, speed and the least expenditure of time and energy.

But while in the case of physical work we constantly stress the vast significance of properly organizing labour, in the case of mental work this self-evident truth is ignored, although it is of tremendous import for students and for those who are compelled to improve their knowledge through self-education.

THE CHOICE OF MATERIAL FOR STUDY

The sphere of human knowledge is extremely vast. In the course of ages people have acquired an incredible amount of knowledge about nature and society. But there is no person who can absorb all that knowledge. To master it, he would have to live ten lives, and even that would not be enough. But then there is no need for man to know everything. Out of this mass of human knowledge it is enough for him to choose what is most important, i.e., knowledge that makes man strong, that gives him power over nature and developments, that teaches him how to make use of the forces and riches of nature, how to change the life of human society. It is necessary to choose what is of greatest importance to man.

We are living in the era of social revolution, at the time when the old capitalist system is disintegrating and dying, giving way to the new, communist system. The capitalist system is built on exploitation and oppression; it is a system that led to the world-shaking imperialist war. And this war and its horrors tore the idealistic mantle off capitalism and revealed to the broad masses the injustice and the shady aspects of the capitalist system. The minds of the working people are working strenuously, seeking for new forms of social life. Russia has already launched on building a new life. That process is attended by extremely difficult conditions. This, naturally, is evoking tremendous interest in contemporary problems, and people want to understand them, to grasp their meaning.

People desiring to understand current events — and they are exceptionally important — should read newspapers, and such newspapers, for instance, as *Pravda*, provide them with an opportunity to understand a lot. A newspaper, however, can compel a mind to work only in a certain direction, draw attention to a certain fact and show how to approach the problem. Briefly, it can do what a talented and well-informed lecturer or orator does: push the mind on to the right path, show how to tackle things and outline important problems. But in addition to the newspaper one must read appropriate literature to grasp the significance of a given problem. One cannot hope to understand the various phenomena of the capitalist system if one does not understand its subtle mechanism. And so, if one wants to understand current developments, one must study the capitalist system, its structure, the relationship between the capitalist economy

and the capitalist ideology. Moreover, one must have a good idea of the anti-capitalist forces that rise and develop in capitalist society. Therein lies the key to the understanding of current events.

Another and no less important question: in what direction is human society evolving? This is a cardinal, vital question. The Communists claim that, by virtue of the laws of development, capitalist society is advancing towards communism. To understand where human society is going, one must study the laws of social development. The history of primitive culture reveals these laws especially vividly and in a very simple form and it is therefore necessary to study it. But one should not study only primitive culture; one should see how society developed, how these laws governed society later in history, how they operate in capitalist society. It will become clear then in what direction society is evolving.

Alongside questions of a social character one finds questions of natural phenomena. Man is a member of both human society and the animal world, and therefore it is not only men and social life that exert an influence on him, but nature and her phenomena too.

Consequently, we must study nature and her phenomena in all their multiformity, as well as the laws of nature, inanimate and animate. Natural science has worked out a definite approach to natural phenomena: observation, conclusion, putting the conclusion to a test. Thus, using this method and gradually studying nature's phenomena and her forces, science — man-accumulated and systematized experience — has acquired a mass of vastly important knowledge in this sphere and that has enabled it to make the best use of

nature's riches and forces in the interest of mankind. It is necessary to familiarize oneself with the knowledge man has acquired in the sphere of natural science, for that will give one a clear picture of man's growing domination over nature.

There is yet another aspect of natural science that is of particular interest. We study social life in its development; that is also the way we should approach natural science. The origin of the earth, of life on the earth, of the various species of plants and animals, of man — one must know all that if one is to understand one's own role in nature, to feel oneself an offspring of the earth. It is important, of course, to familiarize oneself not only with the final achievements of science, but also with the way they were arrived at, with the instruments and the facts that made them possible. What is important is that man should not take one's word for it, but really feel that it is so. Once upon a time, in the remote past, people made up a number of legends on the origin of the earth, on the origin of the species and man. These legends prevail to this very day, although they have been refuted by observations, researches and facts. That also should be studied.

It is quite a fad with some to claim that the book is an instrument of labour and not a means for developing one's world outlook. "The book," these people say, "is for productive work and not for acquisition of knowledge, not for 'the development of a harmonious world outlook,' as it was said before. That is what should be our motto. We must," they say, "make the book serve the hammer and sickle."

These words are sweeping but senseless. What is the meaning of "the book is for productive work and

not for acquisition of knowledge"? What in the world can that signify? The book serves precisely to acquire knowledge, which makes work more productive. And further there is the claim that "the book is for productive-work and... not for 'the development of a harmonious world outlook.'" Wrong again. What is a world outlook? It is this or that solution of the fundamental questions that determine our attitude to environment and nature. Can we leave these fundamental questions unsolved? We cannot, for if we do, we shall not understand anything in life and shall be like blind kittens. What is a "harmonious" world outlook? It is one that is well considered, one that has answers to all the fundamental questions, answers that do not contradict but harmonize with each other, answers that form a sort of a whole. Is it good or bad when a man has considered all the fundamental questions and does not contradict himself? Good, especially when he has solved them correctly. Such a man knows what he must do and why, he is what we call a "class-conscious man." There is every reason to believe that the work of a class-conscious man will be more productive than that of a man who does not know what is what. Consequently, one should not think that working out a correct world outlook for oneself is something out-of-date and illegal. A Communist, at any rate, tries to be a good Marxist, a staunch exponent of the materialistic world outlook. He believes that this will help him to work and act with greater expediency, and, therefore, with greater efficiency.

HOW TO STUDY THE NECESSARY MATERIAL

For one going in for self-education it is extremely important to know what to start with and how to proceed. One must, naturally, take books one can understand, both the form and the contents. A man who does not know elementary mathematics will not understand higher mathematics, just as one who has no idea of philosophy will not master Hegel. But that is not all. If a man takes a book on a subject he has never thought of, a subject that leaves him unmoved, a subject he does not know how to connect with his store of knowledge or with life itself, reading such a book will hardly benefit him. It is different if the contents are on a familiar subject, if they provide an answer to what he is seeking for.

To illustrate, here is what happened to me a long time ago — in fact, about thirty years ago. Although I had finished a *gymnasium*, I had never heard (and in those days there was nothing extraordinary in that) that there was a science called political economy.

One day a girl-friend of mine brought me Ivanyukov's book on political economy and urged me to read it. It was one of those popular books, both in form and content. Well, I started it. I chewed it for a long time, finally finished it, but got absolutely nothing out of it. A few months later, after I had started attending circle meetings, I realized why it was necessary to know political economy. I took to reading Marx, read the first volume of his *Capital* with great interest, and rather fast too. It taught me a great deal. For me, a thin popular book proved more difficult than a thick scientific one.

A talented lecturer or a talented teacher, wrapped up in his subject, will always know how to interest

others in it, how to turn their thoughts in the necessary direction, how to arouse their interest in the given question. Sometimes a lecture is not sapid or deep, but if it sets the listener thinking and stimulates his curiosity, then it is a valuable lecture. In the old days, teachers of philology used literature to spur their pupils' thoughts. An orator can do that at a meeting. Talks with comrades, joint discussions of problems can do a lot to stimulate curiosity and evoke interest. That is why collective, class or circle activity is so valuable — it is an excellent impetus, an impulse.

Let us dwell in detail on the question of *interest*.

Different people have different interests. Some are interested in social activity, others in technology, still others in the arts, etc. There is quite a difference between forcing oneself to study something and studying something one likes, something absorbing. The results are diametrically different too. For instance, we know how difficult it is for children to learn one thing when their heads are occupied with another. "Believe it or not, believe it or not, Pushkin's earned another naught."

Why did Pushkin study badly at the lyceum? Was it because he was a pampered boy and an idler? Of course not. He studied badly because he was not taught what he wanted to learn, because his interests lay in the sphere of poetry. Here is how Pushkin describes a poet's mood when he lives outside his interests and then when his interests are aroused:

There's very little he cares indeed
For the bustle of our world.
His poet's soul is fast asleep,

His lyre remains unheard.
And of the worthless men on Earth
He's one who least displays his worth.
But as soon as the word divine
Reaches his sensitive ear,
He starts with, a movement aquiline
And of the best becomes a peer[1]

What Pushkin calls metaphorically the "word divine" is in reality interest.

The spiritual mood Pushkin describes in a poet may well apply to any man who displays a vivid, deep and unflagging interest in some definite subject. Take, for instance, a physician who is head over heels in love with his profession. Outside it, his soul is more often than not "fast asleep" — he is sluggish and indifferent to what is happening around him. But the moment one speaks of his speciality, he "starts with a movement aquiline." If you observe people closely, you will see that most of them have something in which they are particularly interested. Some are interested in very broad subjects, like the rebuilding of human society; others are interested in firefighting; still others in their children, etc. Usually, this interest is the result of some very deep impression, often remote. I know an expert fireman. When he was ten, he saw a conflagration and was tremendously impressed. He came home extremely excited and there was no one he did not describe the fire to. He had been struck by the job done by the firemen, his imagination was aroused and he painted the picture in most exaggerated colours. Then

[1] From Pushkin's *The Poet*.

followed a long life — the dull years of the *gymnasium*, the career of a minor official and his heartwarming hobby: serving as a volunteer in the fire brigade of a little town.

Pushkin's life work was determined by his old nurse's poetical fairy-tales and the deep impression they made on him.

Every time we seek for the source of our special interest, we find it in the past, often in the remote past — in some emotional experience, i.e., in some experience that captivates one's feelings.

It is interest that focuses our attention on a given subject. Attention can be induced and non-induced. Induced attention is not enduring, we have to revive it again and again. Non-induced attention does not require any efforts on the part of our will-power; moreover, it is fuller and deeper. A pupil who is not interested in history finds it difficult indeed to concentrate his attention on the teacher's explanations. His thoughts are occupied by other things, he becomes inattentive and must whip up his attention repeatedly, and that costs him no little effort.

If, on the other hand, the pupil is interested in history, he follows his teacher attentively, without exerting any effort. The longer a man can concentrate on one and the same subject, the more chance he has to master it. A man who does not possess sufficient knowledge, and who is at the same time slow to catch on, cannot concentrate long on one subject and for that reason his interest in this subject wanes. The force of intellect lies in that a man, thanks to his studies and his fresh and original approach to the problem, repeatedly reinforces his attention to the same subject,

"props up" his attention.

The facts and subjects on which one focuses one's attention are remembered much better. The famous scientist Pasteur remembered a mass of facts and trivial details connected with microbiology, but he could never remember Angelus which he recited daily with his wife. Here is what the well-known psychologist William James writes on the role of interest:

"Most men have a good memory for facts connected with their own pursuits. The college athlete who remains a dunce at his books will astonish you by his knowledge of men's 'records' in various feats and games, and will be a walking dictionary of sporting statistics. The reason is that he is constantly going over these things in his mind, and comparing and making series of them. They form for him not so many odd facts, but a concept system — so they stick. So the merchant remembers prices, the politician other politicians' speeches and votes, with a copiousness which amazes outsiders, but which the amount of thinking they bestow on these subjects easily explains.

"The great memory for facts which a Darwin and a Spencer reveal in their books is not incompatible with the possession on their part of a brain with only a middling degree of physiological retentiveness. Let a man early in life set himself the task of verifying such a theory as that of evolution, and facts will soon cluster and cling to him like grapes to their stem.

"Their relations to the theory will hold them fast; and the more of these the mind is able to discern, the greater the erudition will become. Meanwhile the theorist may have little, if any, desultory memory. Unutilizable facts may be unnoted by him and forgotten

as soon as heard. An ignorance almost as encyclopedic as his erudition may co-exist with the latter, and hide, as it were, in the interstices of its web." (*The Principles of Psychology* by William James.)

Interest arouses attention, and attention is a prerequisite for memory.

All that is reflective of the great role played by interest. That is why in choosing the material for study it is necessary to take what interests one most, what one likes best. For some it may be social activity, for others technology, still for others the arts, etc.

The choice of one or another sphere of knowledge as a basis of study, however, does not mean that a man must not pay attention to other spheres. On the contrary. The only question here is, how is he to approach the other spheres.

You have, for instance, two students: one interested in technology and the other in social sciences. Both of them have to study, say, electrification. But here each approaches the subject in his own way. The technician will study the question from the point of view of what technical facilities are required for the electrification of the RSFSR. That will be the focal point of his studies. But, in planning the network of the necessary facilities, he will also reckon with the social conditions which will help best to build this network. Here, special interest will lead him to study social conditions.

The student interested in social sciences will approach the problem from the social angle: electrification is indispensable as a material foundation for the Soviet system. But to determine whether or not it is possible to electrify the RSFSR, he will have to famil-

iarize himself with electricity, electrical equipment, etc.

It is not for nothing that in our country one of the most popular books on electrification, and one that can well serve as an excellent textbook, has been written by an ordinary social worker (I.I. Stepanov) and not by an electrical engineer. This example shows us that interest determines not so much the content of the acquired knowledge as the approach to this knowledge, the core around which all other knowledge revolves.

"Every new idea, every new piece of knowledge should be linked, 'assimilated,'" as psychologists say, "to the knowledge and ideas the student already possesses. The new must, if one may use the expression, hook up to the old."

"...Nothing is more congenial," William James affirms, "than to be able to assimilate the new to the old, to meet each threatening violator or burster of our well-known series of concepts, as it comes in, see through its unwontedness, and ticket it off as an old friend in disguise. This victorious assimilation of the new is in fact the type of all intellectual pleasure. The lust for it is curiosity. The relation of the new to the old, before the assimilation is performed, is wonder. We feel neither curiosity nor wonder concerning things so far beyond us that we have no concepts to refer them to or standards by which to measure them."

Quoting Darwin by way of illustration, James says that the Fijians were surprised by little boats, but not by big vessels.

It is only what one knows little of that stimulates

one's thirst for more knowledge. "The great maxim in pedagogy," James continues, "is to knit every new piece of knowledge on to a pre-existing curiosity, i.e., to assimilate its matter in some way to what is already known. Hence the advantage of comparing all that is far off and foreign to something that is near home, of making the unknown plain by the example of the known, and of connecting all the instruction with the personal experience of the pupil.

"If the teacher is to explain the distance of the sun from the earth, let him ask: 'If anyone there in the sun fired off a cannon straight at you, what should you do?' 'Get out of the way,' would be the answer. 'No need of that,' the teacher might reply. 'You may quietly go to sleep in your room, and get up again, you may wait till your confirmation day, you may learn a trade, and grow as old as I am — then only will the cannon-ball be getting near, then you may jump to one side! See, so great as that is the sun's distance!'" (*The Principles of Psychology* by William James.)

To link the newly acquired knowledge with what is already known, to rely on it — that is the rule one should be guided by in choosing the necessary study material. The question is not one of getting a smattering of various sciences and of becoming a walking encyclopedia, but one of gradually perfecting the knowledge one already possesses, of knitting the newly acquired knowledge on to what is already known. Hence, it is a question of taking interest as a basis and of constantly reinforcing it.

It is not only important to have knowledge; it is important to systematize it properly.

The word "education" in this case means for-

mation around the core of the concepts held by man of a whole tissue of new concepts that are closely linked with the core.

It is only too obvious that the peasant and the worker will absorb knowledge each in his own way, for their life experience and range of knowledge are different.

That is often forgotten when the curricula of various courses and adult schools are drawn up. The different level of the students is not taken into consideration. The question is not one of the volume of knowledge, but one of the order and form in which it is presented.

The book is the basic instrument for mastering any subject. It plays an exceptional role in contemporary life and in contemporary culture. "Human culture is hereditary and represents an accumulation of experience, knowledge and inventions. If it were not so, and if each generation had to begin from scratch, man would not have advanced far beyond his primitive state. Experience and knowledge are passed on with the help of the book. It is precisely the book that crystallizes the capital of knowledge that is passed on by one generation to another, that is enriched by every generation, that grows faster and faster, and that accelerates human progress." (A.A. Pokrovsky, *Library Work*.)

Therefore, it is necessary to learn how to work with a book, to form a habit of reading much and fast to oneself. It is necessary to learn to read absolutely automatically, without diverting one's thoughts.

But that is not enough. One must understand what one reads. That is much more difficult, for it demands

certain erudition, broader vision and a good store of words and concepts.

The quicker one matures, the quicker one understands what one reads. One must know, however, how to differentiate between what one understands and what one does not, and to analyse those parts which are vague. A good way is to read them again, to delve into the incomprehensible words, expressions and thoughts, and in doing that one should use political dictionaries, encyclopedias, textbooks, popular books on the subject, etc. When the meaning of the word is clarified, it is useful to write out and memorize the whole phrase in which it occurs, to think up several analogous phrases with this word. In short, one should copy children. I recall watching a six-year-old girl who had just heard the word "momentarily" for the first time in her life. In the next half an hour she repeated the word a dozen times in different contexts. She did that unconsciously, of course. An adolescent or an adult should follow the same system to learn how to use thereto unknown words automatically when the need arises. The main thing is to catch on to the proper meaning and nuance of the word and to be careful not to use it wrongly.

All this — delving into the meaning of unknown expressions and words — naturally deviates the reader's attention from the basic idea in the book. To avoid that, one must strive to master the literary language as quickly as possible and to learn how to use it automatically.

It is also indispensable fully to comprehend what one has read, and here one must follow a definite system.

First of all, when one has finished reading a book (at the beginning it is better to do so with each chapter separately), one must analyse the author's meaning, his main idea, the arguments he adduces in support of this idea. It is highly important to picture clearly how the author's thoughts work. Proper understanding is the first step towards conscious perusal of books.

It does happen that it is difficult to grasp what the author wants to say and one has to re-read the book, sometimes even twice. In trying to analyse what one has read, one should not try to remember every minor detail or every word. That will do more harm than good. What one must try to do is pick out the essential, the main points, and examine how they are backed. Sometimes the author cites facts to illustrate his ideas or adduces arguments to support them. The best thing after reading a book is to draw up its plan in writing. But all that needs a lot of practice.

Then one must digest the contents of the book. If the main idea is illustrated by facts, one must see, first, whether they are correctly presented and, secondly, whether they are typical enough. One must try to think up analogous facts, or diametrically opposite ones. When the author adduces an argument in support of his ideas, one must try to counterpose another, compare the two and decide which one is more correct. One must also try to find a different approach to the question. Having done all that, the reader must decide whether he agrees with the author and if not, in what.

In reading a book one must write down all one wants to and must remember — dates, names and figures. Very often it is useful to draw up a diagram on

the basis of these figures to provide oneself with a clearer picture of what one has read. It is also necessary to write out all the thoughts and expressions one likes. But one should avoid long extracts which it is just as difficult to understand as the book itself. One must write out only what is essential, in the form of theses and in the same order as these things occur in books — and write them out clearly and legibly.

Thick copy-books, on which one spends a lot of time and into which one writes long extracts, extracts of which even the owner of the copy-book cannot make head or tail, are of very little use. On the other hand, copy-books with terse, concise and legibly written extracts, extracts which immediately remind him of what he has read and enable him to orientate himself on figures and other material, are extremely useful. It is thus that one must learn to write out extracts. One should practise this without stinting one's time, beginning with short articles and gradually working out a habit of doing the thing in this labour-saving manner.

In certain cases, of course, it is useful to write out longer extracts. If the book is particularly interesting and important, one should not grudge the time spent in making a lengthy abstract, in writing out long quotations in full. This should be done, for instance, when one intends to quote the book in a report or an article.

Further it is helpful to write out longer extracts when one has not yet mastered the art of writing, orthography or literary language. In these cases, copying is very useful. And it is better to copy what is interesting and related to what one has read — that is more fruitful than copying anything else.

But, as a rule, it is better to write out short, terse and concise extracts.

And so, the first task is to clarify and master what one is reading.

The second is to digest what one has read.

The third is to write out the necessary extracts.

And, lastly, to decide whether the book has given you new knowledge, whether this knowledge is necessary and useful, whether it has taught you any new methods of observation, work or study, whether it has stimulated any special moods and desires.

We have thus sketched a plan or a scheme for working on a book.

This plan, of course, can be altered, the questions can be formulated differently. In studying mathematics or natural sciences, for instance, we shall probably use only part of this scheme. What is important, however, is to have a definite scheme, for then our work will be much more fruitful. System plays an extremely significant part in any work. Very often it enables man to see what others do not. For instance, we know that when he reviewed his troops, Napoleon always noticed the minutest disorders in the men's uniforms which the officers had in vain tried to discover before the parade. The answer is simple: Napoleon had a definite system of reviewing troops and that enabled him to notice all the shortcomings.

Let us see how different specialists approach one and the same object. Each has his own system of observation. For instance, an artist looks at a plant from the point of view of colours and their brightness, lighting and grace of form. When he looks at the plant, the artist more often than not completely ignores how

many stamens there are in a flower and how they are distributed — that is not part of his system of observation. The botanist, on the contrary, will first of all look at the stamens, leaves, etc., and will completely ignore how the flower is lighted at the moment and how it stands out against this or that background. It is the same in the case of reading: the most important thing is the approach. It enables one to notice what one might miss if one approached the book from a different angle. And little by little the definite approach to a book becomes a habit.

Books give us knowledge and acquaint us with the experience of others, but we can master this knowledge much better if we test it by our own experience. It is one thing to read: "During the storm the sea presents a splendid and majestic sight." It is quite another to see it with one's own eyes. We read, for instance, that machines reduce production time, but it is only those who have produced goods first with their hands and then with machines who can really appreciate the fact. Reading about some surgical operation (of the eye or the ear) is not quite the same thing as performing that operation.

That is why an experienced man, a man who has seen people, rites and customs, often knows life better than a man who may be more erudite, but who is not sufficiently observant. It is not fortuitous that we speak highly of "experienced" doctors, "experienced" teachers, etc.

In the Middle Ages there was a very interesting and instructive custom. A man did not become an artisan on finishing his apprenticeship course unless he first travelled for a definite period of time, visited

other towns, worked for various artisans, saw how his co-workers lived and worked in other places.

That is why it is extremely important for a man engaged in self-education to try to put the knowledge he has acquired from books to the test of his personal observations and experience.

Particularly effective in this respect are visits to agricultural and industrial museums and exhibitions, model farms and factories. We should make broad use of excursions, only we must see to it that they are conducted in a business-like manner and are not turned into picnics. We must jot down what we see, draw schemes (if we know how to), write down our impressions. We must take advantage of every opportunity to travel, to visit new places, see new people, see how they live and work. For even ordinary life offers rich material for observation and study. Only one must plan beforehand what one wants to see and why, then carry out this plan and draw the necessary conclusions.

This work will be livelier and more fruitful if an entire collective is drawn into it. That will enable the participants to discuss their observations and since each approaches things in his own way, from a different angle, the result will be an all-round study of the subject in question. All the more so, since the collective sees many things that individual observers may miss.

ECONOMIZE TIME AND ENERGY

Americans are a practical people and they always say: "Time is money." They have a whole branch of

literature — unfortunately, we Russians know very little of it — dealing with the organization of studies in high schools and colleges, showing young Americans how to save energy and take a shortcut to success. The latter are taught all that very well, and we should learn it too.

At present we cannot permit ourselves the luxury of wasting time and energy.

We live on the borderline of two social systems: the old, capitalist system is dying, and the new, communist system is rising. In these days we cannot live as did our fathers and grandfathers. Every day brings something new, and we should be able to see it with our own eyes, to judge and decide on it. But to do that correctly, we must know a lot.

That applies to the working class in general and to every worker in particular. There is no time to work leisurely, with one's sleeves down. We must study as economically, i.e., as fast as possible.

History had fated Russia — a comparatively backward country — to be the first to raise the banner of social revolution and to hold it aloft for five years now; she must fortify her material foundation if she is to continue as the stronghold of the world revolution. To do that she must study feverishly, without let-up, with the maximum economy of time and energy.

Life itself is telling young workers and peasants to economize on that. The worker and the peasant spend most of their time toiling. It is only their free time that they can devote to self-education, and there is very little of it to spare.

And so, the historical hour in which we live, Russia's special position and the living conditions of the

greater part of the students, demand stringent economy of time and energy.

To achieve that it is indispensable:

a) properly to regulate one's time;

b) to create the most favourable working conditions possible;

c) to acquire the habits necessary to study books;

d) to choose the appropriate material for study;

e) properly to distribute one's work;

f) to work out forms of collective work with a view to saving time and energy;

g) to have at one's disposal the necessary aids and instructions.

A. Let us start with *regulating time*.

It is clear that if we are to spend our time fruitfully, we must know how properly to regulate it. How do we spend it as a rule?

We work regular hours only in factories or offices. The rest of the time we spend anyhow: chatting with friends, lying in bed and reading silly novels, etc. Then in the evening you realize how much time you have wasted, grab some useful book — and find that you are exhausted. To keep awake you smoke one cigarette after another, put the book aside and talk and argue with some friend almost until dawn. And in the morning you wake up jaded.

Foreigners know the value of time. Scientists, writers and professors go to bed and rise early, work when they feel fresh, go visiting as rarely as possible and order their time strictly. They keep regular hours for rising, working, dining and resting. This routine greatly increases their capacity for work.

It is quite interesting to see how famous scientists

and writers regulated their time.

Let us take Lev Tolstoi, for example. He wrote novels and stories — things that depend wholly on one's mood, and yet his time was strictly regulated. He worked hard in the mornings, writing and rewriting one and the same thing over and over again. A writer cannot live like a hermit: he must associate with people, see how they live. Tolstoi, too, allotted time to this end, to reading, etc.

This side of his life is well described by Sergeyenko in his book *How Lev Tolstoi Lives and Works*.

This system was also followed by Emile Zola, who wrote a great many novels describing the various classes in capitalist society. Zola used to get up at six a.m. and, like Tolstoi, wrote in the mornings and spent the rest of the time studying the social strata he was writing of.

Take the life stories of the great musicians, say, Beethoven's, and you will see how much time he spent playing on the piano and how stringently he regulated his time.

Even more strict with their time are the naturalists, doctors and scientists who work with microscopes in their laboratories or do anatomic research. It would be well, for instance, to read about Edison, Pasteur and other scholars.

The well-known surgeon Kocher followed a definite schedule day in and day out, even when he became old: he went to bed at the same hour, played tennis to exercise his hands for operations, etc.

There are thousands of similar examples. He who wants to achieve success must carefully regulate and save his time.

B. Another prerequisite for smooth work, without any wastage of time and energy, is creation of *the most favourable working conditions possible*.

The most important thing is to be fresh and fit. A tired man works slowly and badly. The most suitable hours for work are, of course, in the morning and it is then that a normal man works best. Naturally, if one has to go to work very early, it is difficult to eke out time to study in the morning, but if one starts working at ten or eleven a.m., then the morning hours should be made use of. Going to bed too late often spoils everything, and that should be rectified. Evening studies are much more tiresome. To keep from sleeping man drinks strong tea, smokes cigarettes, argues — and the result is rapid exhaustion and decline of working capacity.

Another condition is fresh air. The brain works well and energetically only if the heart does so, and for that fresh air is indispensable. The room should not be too hot or stuffy. Before beginning work it is necessary to open the window and air the room. A room full of cigarette smoke or fumes makes work extremely difficult.

Another favourable condition is absence during worktime of everything that may divert one's attention. You cannot study when it is noisy, when people talk and when you are continually bothered with trifling questions. It is necessary to learn to respect other people's peace, not to make noise, whistle or talk when another man is studying. One must also learn how to study in a library or club. There is nothing to distract one in a library. Besides, libraries have encyclopedias, reference books, atlases, textbooks and

such other aids as one needs for serious reading.

True, there are people who can study even when there is a lot of noise, but only when they are so engrossed that they do not care about what is going on around. The Greek geometrician Archimedes, it is said, was so absorbed in his sketches when an enemy soldier burst into his house that all he said was: "Don't touch my circles." But it is not everyone who can be so engrossed in his studies as not to see what is going on around, and for that reason it is better if he is not disturbed. Incidentally, to be successful, a student must not let other thoughts disturb him, or he will be like Yevgeny Onegin of whom Pushkin wrote:

Although his eyes were reading,
His thoughts were far away...

That is why it is better to study in the morning: the impressions of the preceding day wear off and there are no new impressions to disturb one's peace. If that peace is lacking and one does not feel like studying, it is necessary to work up one's mood: walk fast up and down the room, whistle some tune, reminisce, read a couple of pages from a favourite author or do something of the same sort.

C. If one's work is to be successful, one must *acquire the habits* necessary to study books.

Among these habits is the ability to read and write, to calculate, to understand maps, etc.

One must learn to read fast and much to oneself, to jot down terse and concise notes and to approach a book with a definite aim. Why work out these habits? To work without wasting time and energy.

Habit frees the mind for meditation. In animals most of the performances are automatic. Man is born with a tendency to do more things than he has ready-made arrangements for in his nerve centres. In adults, the number of automatic performances is so enormous that most of them must be the fruit of painful study. If practice did not make them perfect, nor habit economize nervous and muscular energy, man would be in a sorry plight indeed. As Henry Maudsley says: "If an act became no easier after being done several times, if the careful direction of consciousness were necessary to its accomplishment on each occasion, it is evident that the whole activity of a lifetime might be confined to one or two deeds — that no progress could take place in development. A man might be occupied all day in dressing and undressing himself; the attitude of his body would absorb all his attention and energy; the washing of his hands or the fastening of a button would be as difficult to him on each occasion as to the child on its first trial; and he would, furthermore, be completely exhausted by his exertions... For while secondary automatic acts are accomplished with comparatively little weariness — in this regard approaching the organic movements, or the original reflex — the conscious effort of the will soon produces exhaustion." (*The Principles of Psychology* by William James)

We know how hard it is for an illiterate adult to spell and how difficult it is sometimes for a semi-literate person to sign his name, how long and how much effort it takes him to do it. It is clear that all these processes absorb all his attention and that he cannot concentrate on what he is reading. All his en-

ergy goes into mastering technique. That is why one should develop habits and make them automatic. Without that, serious study is impossible.

D. We have already spoken of the *choice of material* from the viewpoint of economizing time and energy. What is necessary here is to repeat in a few words what we have already said.

We must tackle the subject we can handle: read books written in a popular language and not special books that require special training. If we must read the latter, we must first acquire the necessary knowledge. Tackling something we cannot cope with is a plain waste of energy and time.

Of all the vast mass of human knowledge one should choose what is of special importance, what is essential for understanding the environment and learning to transform it. The worker and the peasant have no time or energy to spare for unimportant knowledge.

Of course, in studying a subject, one must select the best books possible, books that illustrate this subject most fully, profoundly and correctly. And, lastly, one must begin with something one is most interested in, gradually expanding the sphere of one's knowledge, mastering the most important of its branches and thus building up the original core of one's knowledge.

E. One must learn *to work according to a definite, prearranged plan.* An inexperienced man usually tries to do too many things at one time: he grabs one book, drops it to take another, shifts from subject to subject without mastering any one of them. Such method of studying is unproductive and uneconomical. One

should not jump from one thing to another; one should set oneself a definite target — and not too far-reaching or broad, but concrete and definite. Say, a man wants to study capitalism. That is a very comprehensive subject. To master it, one must break it up into a series of limited themes, and then choose one of them — say, modern capitalism. After that, one should break up this theme too: for instance, start studying modern capitalism in just one country — England. One should continue along this path and choose, say, the position of the British working class in the present stage of capitalism. Only when one has mastered this definite task should one proceed to the next concrete theme, and so on. This is the most economical way of fully mastering the subject. But to draw up such a plan, one must have some idea, even a general will do, of the theme as a whole.

Speaking of organization of labour, the well-known American engineer Frederick Taylor says that each employee, each worker, should be assigned a definite task. "The more elementary the mind and character of the individual," he writes, "the more necessary does it become that each task shall extend over a short period of time only. No school-teacher would think of telling children in a general way to study a certain book or subject. It is practically universal to assign each day a definite lesson beginning on one specified page and line and ending on another; and the best progress is made when the conditions are such that a definite study hour or period can be assigned in which the lesson must be learned."

Taylor is absolutely right. In studying for the first time, one must assign oneself easy, simple tasks. Only

then can one fulfil them.

Plan-drawing is quite difficult for a beginner because he usually has no clear idea of how much he should learn or how to break up the subject into separate themes. In this he should either ask comrades who are better acquainted with the general theme to assist him or take recourse to available manuals and aids. People attending courses are much better off in this respect. As our peasants say, "they live by other people's brains." Their plans are drawn up by their instructors. At the beginning that, of course, is simpler and to a certain degree better for an inexperienced man: there is no risk of his taking the wrong path. But, left to himself to work out plans and tasks, he will eventually find himself in a much more favourable position than the student attending courses, for he will learn how to draw up plans that suit best his individuality and his knowledge.

F. Let us dwell on the next question: *does one save more time and energy* studying individually or in a circle? That depends on how studies are arranged in a circle. If its members study conscientiously, if they attend meetings regularly and fulfil the obligations they take upon themselves and, moreover, if the circle is headed by an experienced instructor, then one saves more time and energy studying in it. Collective work can save time. For that it is necessary to introduce division of labour and distribute tasks rationally, to each according to his abilities. An exchange of opinion helps people to clarify and understand things. More, discussion stimulates interest and ideas. And yet another thing. Collective work pulls people up and makes them study more steadily. For these reasons,

circle study is valuable, provided, of course, the above-mentioned conditions are abided by. But if the members of a circle come late for the meetings or miss them, if they do not study at home and consider circle discussion sufficient, i.e., if they do not do any serious, independent work, then it is better to resign from such a circle and study by oneself.

But whether one studies in a circle or independently, one must have all the necessary manuals and aids if one is to save time and energy and take the right path. One must have a popular political dictionary, a popular encyclopedia, a guide catalogue of the most important books one has to read with annotations and instructions on what one must know to read them, etc. It is also indispensable to have a collection of study plans to include a series of plans on various branches of knowledge drawn up for people of different educational levels. There should be handbooks for the most important branches of knowledge, manuals on self-education with instructions on how to work independently on this or that subject. All these aids, manuals and handbooks make independent study more fruitful.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *On Self-Education*, Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing House, 1936, pp. 18-50

INSTRUCTIONS TO ONE STUDYING INDEPENDENTLY

(*Povysim Gramotnost* Magazine, No. 3, 1934)

GENERAL RULES

1. If self-education is to be successful, it is necessary to develop a number of habits: to read to oneself, not to read too slowly, to know how to use books, newspapers, manuals and library catalogues, what to extract and how to write down notes. In other words, to study well by oneself, *one must possess a self-educational technical minimum*.

2. Successful study requires observation of certain rules.

It is best to study when one is not too tired, when one's head, so to speak, is "fresh." Therefore, *it is best to study in the morning or after one has rested.*

Not to tire very fast when studying *one should not study in a poorly-lighted*, *semi-dark*, *stuffy*, *overheated room*. It is difficult to study when there is too much talk around, when one is constantly distracted.

It is best to study when one has the necessary manuals, encyclopedic dictionaries, etc., at one's disposal.

That is why *it is best to study in a reading-room or at a library*.

3. It is necessary to make up one's mind *what one wants to study*. Sometimes a person wants to study, but does not know what. Things go well at a collective farm or a factory because there is a plan. So does self-education if there is a plan, if the man does not skip from book to book — if he does not jump from his-

tory to literature and from literature to physics. It is no use studying like that. One wants to learn about the Party, another about collective farms, a third about technology, a fourth about children's upbringing, etc. There are some who want to complete a seven-year school course, others who want to acquire secondary-school or technical-school education.

4. It is not enough to make up one's mind what one wants to study; it is necessary to elaborate a *study plan*. And that is the most difficult thing of all. The beginner usually knows neither the volume of knowledge he wants to acquire *nor the system*, that is, the order in which he should study, read books, etc.

In this he can be helped a lot by the lists of recommended literature, self-education manuals, curricula, textbooks. *But it is best if he first talks with a specialist*, *consults* him. He can consult teachers, librarians or the consultants who are usually engaged by libraries to help people that study independently. Good advice may also be obtained from agronomists, engineers, physicians, etc.

Consultations before one starts studying are of vast importance and often decisively influence further study.

5. How is one to study?

a) One should not hurry or, as people used to say, one should "hurry slowly." In self-education, hastiness is very harmful.

b) One should take care *to clarify all incomprehensible places*. To do that one should resort to encyclopedic dictionaries, ask people who know, consultants.

c) *One should re-read the material one has studied*; that applies particularly to what one learned on the

previous occasion.

d) *One should not study with long intervals*, particularly at the beginning, when what one has studied has not yet been engraved in his memory. One should study regularly.

e) *Extracts help to remember*. It is necessary to write down in one's copy-book the most important parts of what one has read, explanations of incomprehensible words and expressions, the names of towns and people, figures. One should re-read one's notes more frequently. One should write legibly, so as not to waste time in deciphering what one has written.

6. It is very good to use, if that is possible, correspondence course textbooks which provide advice and help in mastering the subjects studied.

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *On Self-Education*, Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing House, 1936, pp. 15-17

ON SELF-EDUCATION

(*Yuny Communist* Magazine, No. 4, 1935)

It was for *Yuny Communist* in 1919 that I wrote my first article on self-education. It pointed out correctly that it was not "by sitting in an office, but by participating in collective activity that one could best educate oneself." That is true. But then, the article was written in 1919, at the very height of the Civil War, when we were fighting for Soviet power, when the country was by and large illiterate and economically dislocated, when there was not enough paper for textbooks and newspaper circulation had to be limited, when there were extremely few schools. And for that reason the main theme of my article then was the question of mutual aid in education.

There was a tremendous thirst for knowledge but very limited opportunities.

Since then, the face of the country has changed: we now have universal compulsory education, mass-circulation newspapers, textbooks in huge editions, all sorts of courses and a growing radio network. The country is in the main literate and people have become more conscious. But what I said about mutual aid in 1919 applies to the present too. The country is in the main literate, but cultural demands have grown considerably too, and the fight against illiteracy must be achieved, for there are still places like the Semyonovsky District in the Gorky Region where handicrafts had been flourishing for centuries and where children had been exploited to the utmost. There are still many illiterates there. Neither is there 100 per cent

literacy in the national areas where until recently the predominant mode of life was nomadic, where villages were lost in the endless steppes and where publication of books in national languages is still badly organized. The literacy campaign initiated by the Young Communist League helped towards widespread mutual aid in primary education and contributed tremendously to wiping out illiteracy in our country. The whole thing, however, was done in such haste that all too little attention was paid to the qualitative aspect of education, and the very conception of literacy was narrowed down. We should never slacken attention to elementary forms of education, we should remember that there are still many semi-literates in our country, even among the youth. Collectivity and mutual aid are indispensable in every phase of education. What I said in 1919 holds good today too.

But in this article I should like *to draw attention to another question — to the question of self-education, to the question of how one is to acquire knowledge independently*. In the first years of Soviet government, our schools paid much more attention to children's general development than to studies. Education, on the whole, was very badly organized. There were no good teaching cadres, we had to reorganize the entire teaching system, and it was that that mainly occupied our attention. In the past few years we have concentrated our attention on studies, on passing knowledge to others, on reading lectures, on helping pupils to master the knowledge passed on to them by teachers, on mastering the materials contained in textbooks. Education has become the No. 1 concern. In his pamphlet *Knowledge Is Power*, Wilhelm Liebknecht, a close col-

laborator of Marx and Engels, wrote that slave-owners, landlords and capitalists were trying to make knowledge serve their ends, turning it into a privilege, doing everything they could to prevent the masses from acquiring it.

Lenin wrote of the same thing in 1895 for the illegal newspaper *Rabocheye Delo*. The manuscript was confiscated in a police raid and Lenin was arrested. It was found in the police archives after the establishment of Soviet rule and first saw light in 1924, after Lenin's death. The article was called "What Are Our Ministers Thinking of?" and ended with the following words: "Workers, you see yourselves how mortally afraid our ministers are that you will acquire knowledge! Show everybody that no power can deprive workers of class-consciousness. Without knowledge workers are helpless, with it they are a force."[1] The seizure of this manuscript did not prevent the comrades at large from propounding this idea in their agitational activity. In 1896, six months after his arrest, Ilyich wrote a May Day leaflet in which he developed this thesis, and had it smuggled out of the prison. "We workers are held in darkness," said the mimeographed leaflet, "we are denied knowledge because they do not want us to learn how to fight for better conditions." Since then, the necessity of acquiring knowledge for struggle has been the principle underlying all the propaganda and agitational activity of Party workers. And how could it have been otherwise? The teachings of Marx and Engels, which have armed the working class for its struggle, are no revelation or

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, p. 76.

invention; they are scientific works showing in what direction society is developing and how victory is to be achieved.

In the speech he made in 1920 on the tasks facing the Youth League, Lenin said: "And if you were to ask why the teachings of Marx were able to capture the hearts of millions and tens of millions of the most revolutionary class, you would receive only one answer: it was because Marx took his stand on the firm foundation of the human knowledge acquired under capitalism. Having studied the laws of development of human society, Marx realized the inevitability of the development of capitalism, which was leading to communism. And the principal thing is that he proved this only on the basis of the most exact, most detailed and most profound study of this capitalist society, by fully assimilating all that earlier science had produced."[1]

The opportunists have all along been trying to prove that there is no scientific basis to Marx's and Engels' teachings.

At a party congress in Breslau, Germany, in 1895, i.e., forty years ago, that arrant opportunist David claimed that the party of the working class (it was then called Social-Democratic Party) was one of will and not of knowledge. He was rebuffed by Clara Zetkin, who said: "In my opinion, the Social-Democratic Party is a party of purposeful will, for it is a party of purposeful knowledge."

At the 1908 party congress, she returned to this question. The opportunist Mauerbrecher had written in an article for the bourgeois press that "the realiza-

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 478.

tion of the socialist mode of production will not be a consequence of historical experience; it is a purely 'regulative idea,' it is a case of faith and hope." Commenting on this assertion, Klara Zetkin indignantly said:

"That is nothing less than negation of the standpoint that the so-called socialist state of the future is an historical inevitability, a result of the natural development of society. To put it more simply, it is more than just hurling socialism back to the theories of Utopian Socialists; it is plain conversion of socialism into clerical obscurantism. It is absolutely necessary, I think, to declare with all firmness that people so utterly ignorant and confused about the theoretical foundations of Marxism are the least fit to teach socialism to the proletariat, to be its teachers and leaders. (*Loud applause*.) Whoever approves such views, views that are in fact a blow at the lucid, deep-rooted scientific knowledge which Social-Democracy is striving to bring into the masses and make the basis of its practical activity, must sit quietly and modestly in a corner and master socialist theory before daring advocate revision of the socialist world outlook. (*Prolonged applause*.)"

The German opportunists have now ended toy siding with fascism which hates scientific socialism more than anything else. The fascists burn the books of Marxist classics, but it is beyond their power to stop the historical process elucidated by the founders of Marxism, the process that will inevitably end in the world-wide victory of socialism.

The history of our Party shows that it has consistently waged a struggle for Marxist theory, against its

distortion.

Take, for instance, Lenin's first big work *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* (Vol. I), written in 1894 to combat the Narodniks' misunderstanding of the scientific value of Marxism.

In the article "Frederick Engels," written on the occasion of his death in 1895 for an illegal workers' newspaper, Lenin stressed in a popular form the tremendous importance of scientific Marxism.

There have been attempts to minimize the significance of theory in the Russian labour movement too. Towards the end of the 1890's, the illegal newspaper *Rabochaya Mysl* tried to reduce the activity of the labour movement to a struggle for minor demands. The paper went so far as to declare in the name of the workers that "we don't need any Marxes or Engelses, we workers know ourselves what we have to do."

At the turn of the century, there emerged an opportunist trend in Russian Social-Democracy, the so-called "economism." The "Economists" alleged that the workers should not busy themselves with theories or engage in political struggle, that they should wage only an economic struggle, a struggle for better material conditions.

The Leninists persistently combatted this trend.

Later — in the years of reaction and ideological vacillation that followed the 1905 Revolution — there appeared a trend among the Bolsheviks which challenged the validity of dialectical- materialism — the scientific basis of Marxism — and attempted to prove that the latest discoveries in natural science contradicted the materialistic interpretation of phenomena

and that it was, therefore, "necessary" to create a new theory. Ilyich engaged them in a scientific battle, and exposed their conclusions as incorrect and lacking a scientific basis. That was in 1908 and 1909, and the book in which Lenin gave them battle was *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (Vol. 14). He attached particular importance to Marxist propaganda and wanted all the members of the Party and Young-Communist League to study Marxism.

How young people should study Marxism was best explained in Lenin's speech on the tasks of the youth leagues. He spoke of what and how they should study, of the purpose of studying, of the selection of necessary study materials, of the indispensability to study if one were to become a conscious Communist. He explained how the study material should be digested, how to work so that "Communism shall not be something learned by rote, but something that you yourselves have thought over."

"We do need," he said, "to develop and perfect the mind of every student by a knowledge of the fundamental facts. For communism would become a void, a mere signboard, and a Communist would become a mere braggart, if all the knowledge he has obtained were not digested in his mind. You must not only assimilate this knowledge, you must assimilate it critically, so as not to cram your mind with useless lumber, but enrich it with all those facts that are indispensable to the modern man of education. If a Communist took it into his head to boast about his communism because of the ready-made conclusions he had acquired, without putting in a great deal of serious and hard work, without understanding the facts

which he must examine critically, he would be a very deplorable Communist. Such superficiality would be decidedly fatal. If I know that I know little, I shall strive to learn more; but if a man says that he is a Communist and that he need know nothing thoroughly, he will never be anything like a Communist."[1]

It is self-evident that if one must select the necessary material and pick out the most important parts of it, one must think it over, draw the necessary conclusions and not just assimilate it mechanically. In other words, one must learn to work independently, and for that it is essential to have some idea of how to do it.

The second question that Lenin discussed in that Speech was that of linking theory and practice. "One of the greatest evils and misfortunes left to us by the old capitalist society," he said, "is the complete divorcement of books from practical life; for we have had books in which everything was described in the best possible manner, yet these books in the majority of cases were most disgusting and hypocritical lies that described capitalist society falsely.

"That is why it would be extremely wrong merely to absorb what is written in books about communism. In our speeches and articles we do not now merely repeat what was formerly said about communism, because our speeches and articles are connected with our daily work in every branch. Without work, without struggle, an abstract knowledge of communism obtained from communist pamphlets and books would be absolutely worthless, for it would continue the old

[1] V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 479.

divorcement of theory from practice, that old divorcement which constituted the most disgusting feature of the old bourgeois society."[1] To learn to combine theory with practice, with everyday work in every field of endeavour for the common good, one must study much and independently. In practical work there arise many questions that can be solved only when one has sufficient knowledge. One must know how to acquire it independently, and to do that one must have a definite minimum of knowledge and a habit of studying independently.

We now have a tremendous record of achievement, the face of our country has changed radically, people have become conscious and organized. But further progress requires much more knowledge. More, the broad working masses must be armed not with scraps or bits of knowledge, but with knowledge that forms an integrated whole, knowledge that is essential to raise our practical work to a higher level.

We need knowledge to strengthen our influence over the working people of other countries, we need it to make our country infinitely richer, more organized and powerful, to make our achievements still more convincing for all.

We need knowledge to defend our socialist Motherland, we need it for the struggle for the world socialist revolution.

And more now than ever before...

N.K. KRUPSKAYA, *On Self-Education*, Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 476.

House, 1940, pp. 92-100