

Education in the USSR: Russian or Soviet?

By: [Jonathan Tudge](#)

Tudge, J. (1975). Education in the USSR: Russian or Soviet? *Comparative Education*, 11(2), 127-136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006750110203>

**This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Comparative Education* in June 1975, available online 06 July 2006:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/0305006750110203>.**

*****Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from Taylor & Francis. This version of the document is not the version of record. Figures and/or pictures may be missing from this format of the document. *****

Abstract:

Works on the history of Russian education often point out and emphasize the similarities between the Tsarist and Soviet systems. Nicholas Hans has coined an aphorism which summarizes this line of thought; he maintains that Soviet education is not, strictly speaking, 'Soviet' at all: "Russian it was and Russian it remains". [1] William Johnson, another major writer on the history of Russian and Soviet education, while recognizing that the Soviet educational system departs from the Russian tradition in certain respects, [2] also concentrates his attention upon the similarities between the two systems, arguing that the Soviet system was built upon the established foundations of a popular interest in education and the existing network of schools. [3] He maintains, moreover, that the relationship extends further than this, and that the scientific, secular nature of Soviet education and its use as a major socializing agency can be traced back to the eighteenth century. Peter the Great gave Russian education its practical bent, he argues, by opening in 1701 the first school in the world with a non-classical curriculum, [4] while Catherine, whose "influence on present-day education in Russia is great indeed", [5] first appreciated the importance of education as a primary socializing instrument. Besides being the first of the Tsars to allow women to be educated, she drew up a set of rules for moral conduct in schools. Johnson also believes that even the religious orthodoxy required in Tsarist times can be likened to the political orthodoxy of the present, and indeed that Uvarov's trinity of Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality "have their somewhat different counterparts in the Soviet Union today". [6]

Keywords: Russian education | Soviet Union | polytechnical education | Soviet education

Article:

Works on the history of Russian education often point out and emphasize the similarities between the Tsarist and Soviet systems. Nicholas Hans has coined an aphorism which summarizes this line of thought; he maintains that Soviet education is not, strictly speaking, 'Soviet' at all: "Russian it was and Russian it remains". [1] William Johnson, another major writer on the history of Russian and Soviet education, while recognizing that the Soviet

educational system departs from the Russian tradition in certain respects, [2] also concentrates his attention upon the similarities between the two systems, arguing that the Soviet system was built upon the established foundations of a popular interest in education and the existing network of schools. [3] He maintains, moreover, that the relationship extends further than this, and that the scientific, secular nature of Soviet education and its use as a major socializing agency can be traced back to the eighteenth century. Peter the Great gave Russian education its practical bent, he argues, by opening in 1701 the first school in the world with a non-classical curriculum, [4] while Catherine, whose "influence on present-day education in Russia is great indeed", [5] first appreciated the importance of education as a primary socializing instrument. Besides being the first of the Tsars to allow women to be educated, she drew up a set of rules for moral conduct in schools. Johnson also believes that even the religious orthodoxy required in Tsarist times can be likened to the political orthodoxy of the present, and indeed that Uvarov's trinity of Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality "have their somewhat different counterparts in the Soviet Union today". [6]

Seymour Rosen, although he recognizes the importance of Marxist-Leninist ideology for the present system, also stresses the continuity between the Tsarist and Soviet periods. [7] In particular, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, "a long line of noted Russian scholars, many of them under Western influence, built the basis of ideas, inventions, discoveries, and institutions on which education and modernization in the USSR rests today." [8] Rosen includes among the foundations of the present system the centralized nature of the Tsarist educational system, the view that the education system should serve the state, and the traditional classroom environment. [9]

The most categorical statement of this line of thought, however, came from Hans, who acknowledged no fundamental differences between the Russian and Soviet states at all. In 1930 he wrote that the USSR "is far more the result of the whole history of the Russian state than the product of Marxist ideology", [10] and in a more recent work concluded that "the structure of the whole school system, the curriculum and the whole atmosphere of school life is modelled on Russian tradition The change from a Russian Empire to an international Soviet state was a change of title, but not of substance." [11]

It is hardly surprising that historians should espouse a developmental view, stressing prior causes and earlier manifestations, and it is certainly true that the Revolution of 1917 did not uproot and sweep away all that had gone before. Indeed, in Lenin's view this was neither desirable nor possible; he made it clear that communism could only be built "on the basis of the totality of knowledge, organization and institutions, only by using the stock of human forces and means that have been left us by the old society" [12] and in order to educate future members of a communist society it was necessary to open their minds to "the wealth of knowledge amassed by mankind". [13] The practicalities of life in 1917 could permit no other course.

A stress upon continuity may be a useful counterweight to the earlier, mistaken, view that 1917 witnessed a complete break with the past, but one must be careful to look beyond the most unsubtle of similarities. Once a school system has been established, no matter how many changes are made, society will be accustomed to some form of organized education. Similarly, the fact that some Tsarist schools had a partly scientific and secular curriculum should not be

overstressed, as some scientific or technical education *is* a necessary prerequisite to modernization in any industrially backward society.

Nevertheless, throughout the nineteenth century the Tsars and their ministers favoured a religious and classical education, while the scope and size of the school system organized and maintained by the Russian Orthodox Church was considerable-only in the last few years of the Tsarist period were Orthodox schools outnumbered by Ministry schools.

The concept of continuity is completely devalued if one can use the term when only one feature of a situation obtains at a later stage. If a Right-wing coup in 1917 had brought about a strengthening of the power of the Church Synod and a continued emphasis upon classical education for a favoured section of society, a claim for 'continuity' would have been equally justified. Some elements of the past are bound to survive any change-but this fact alone is insufficient to support Hans' thesis.

There may seem to be some justification for his case in that the Russians themselves are proud of their debts to the past. Professor Medinsky, for example, has spoken highly of Herzen, Belinsky and the less well-known K. D. Ushinsky, who was, "in the fullest sense of the word, the founder 'of the Russian primary school and of pedagogical training for the teacher.'" [14] N. N. Razumovsky, in his introduction to the educational works of Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov, begins by stating that they "are the great precursors of the Russian social democracy, they are the national pride of our people." He concludes: "The Soviet people accept with gratitude everything valuable bequeathed to it by those great sons of the Russian people, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov." [15]

Not only do the Russians praise these theorists, but, according to Widmayer, they have elevated their views into a part of the official educational system. [16] Thus, part of Lev Tolstoy's thought has been accepted by Soviet writers "as the formation of new methods and a new theory of education". [17] Similarly, an eminent Soviet psychologist has written that "Ushinsky managed to arrive at that very conception of the psychological development, which, in our day, has received a firm new grounding and development in Soviet psychology." [18] But this does not mean to say that Tsarist educational thought and practice has been adopted *in toto*. The fact is that in the nineteenth century two broad strands of thought on education were discernible-one espoused by the Tsars and their Ministers and the other expressed by various shades of radical opinion, and the two must be viewed separately.

Despite brief interludes of reform, the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries can only be called a period of official reaction. Nevertheless there is one parallel between the views of the Tsarist Ministers and one aspect of Soviet education, namely the relation between education and morality, although, of course, the *content* of that morality is different. Shishkov, for example, declared: "The general aim of all schools is to give a moral education ... " [19] In 1900 official support for moral education was no less evident; Bogolepov's Commission of Enquiry was requested to consider means of instilling "genuine religious feeling ... sincere attachments and devotion to the Emperor and country, of the sense of duty, honour, truthfulness, respect for authority, and the like, having in view not a mere system of formal precepts but also measures which shall permeate the every-day life of the school." [20] In tone this is not far removed from

Soviet statements about the education of the 'new men', who will be endowed with "spiritual wealth, moral purity, and physical perfection ... " [21] They will be created by fostering in all children a "communist world view, loyalty to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, and boundless dedication to their Motherland ... " [22] A "sense of good and bad behaviour", "collectivism, duty, honour and conscience", truthfulness, honesty and kindness should also be inculcated. [23]

This is, however, the only major point of similarity. The prevalent view of the various Ministers of Public Education is exemplified by Shishkov, who declared in 1824: "To instruct all the people, or even a disproportionate number of them, in literacy would do more harm than good." [24] Education was primarily reserved for the sons of the gentry. Count Lambert, for example, wrote that "children of different social origins should not be educated together The education of the gentry should be completely different and kept apart from the education of other groups." [25] This elitist spirit was as much in evidence fifty years later, in the 1880s, when, with education in the hands of T. D. Delianov and D. A. Tolstoy, all but the most exceptional of the children of the lower classes were deliberately excluded from secondary education. [26]

The curriculum in most elementary schools was also fairly limited. Children in the parish schools were educated in Divine Law, church singing, reading of church and lay journals and letters, and elementary maths. [27] This is perhaps to be expected, but even in the 'classical' secondary schools, the only means of access to the University for much of the nineteenth century, Divine Law (14 hours a week), Latin (34), and Greek (24) far outweighed Maths (22 hours a week), Geography (8), Natural History (6) and Physics (6). [28]

If there are few points of contact between Soviet educational practice and reactionary Tsarist policies, some of the views of the left-wing elements in Russia (referred to above as the second strand of thought) are very similar to those currently expressed in the Soviet Union. Although 'left-wing element' encompassed both those who at times had the confidence of the Tsars and radicals such as Chernyshevsky, they can be grouped together by virtue of their opposition to the dominant 'official' view of education.

Ushinsky, who held several posts under Alexander II during one of the less reactionary periods, maintained that education should encompass various aspects of human activity, being mental, physical and social, but, above all, moral. [29] For character formation, serious physical work was essential. [30] N. I. Pirogov, a surgeon with an interest in education, was another who only received official favour during the early years of Alexander II's reign. He felt that education should "develop the inner man" and argued that everybody should at least have a general humanitarian education, with specialization to follow. [31]

The more radical thinkers held very similar views, particularly on the subject of specialization. Belinsky, for example, emphasized that "elementary education should see in the child not a future civil servant, not a poet, not a craftsman, but a human being, which in the future may develop into any of these, without ceasing to be a 'man'." [32] Chernyshevsky believed that in the future individuals would be educated to perform a wide variety of jobs. Specialization should only take place after the "human being in the true sense of the word" had been formed in the course of general education. [33] As might be expected, the 'general' education favoured by the radicals would consist of arts and science subjects.

There were differences even within the radical spectrum, however, notably on the question of methodology. Belinsky and Pisarev, for example, called for 'free education', assisting nature, "but nothing more". [34] Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov, on the other hand, while wanting no compulsion, did not object to instilling into pupils certain modes of behaviour. "If we want them to do anything, we have to induce them to do it so often that they acquire a habit of doing it." [35] Whatever the methods, however, the aim of them all was to produce moral beings, who had been widely educated.

As has been shown, the ideas and policies of the Tsars and their Ministers bear little relation to those current in the Soviet Union; this cannot be said of the ideas of the left wing thinkers. This does not mean, however, that Soviet educators have blindly taken over the views of their predecessors. Any similarity can rather be explained by the fact that these thinkers were all influenced by the mid-nineteenth century philosophers, notably Hegel and Feuerbach, from whom Marx derived his world view. The more similar their intellectual background was to Marx's, the nearer their views came to his and the more favoured they are in the Soviet Union. Only certain aspects of the work of these left-wing theorists are considered acceptable as educational theory—namely those which best fit into the Marxist-Leninist view of education. As mentioned earlier, writers in the Soviet Union are proud of their debt to the past, but only insofar as past thinkers approximated to the thought of Marx and Lenin. Thus they only accept 'part' of Tolstoy's thought, what is 'valuable' in Chernyshevsky, and so on.

By way of example, the introduction to Tolstoy's *Pedagogical Works* states: "Following Lenin, it is necessary to distinguish clearly in Tolstoy's heritage between his prejudices and his reason." [36] The more anarchistic aspects of his writings, like those of Pisarev, are not acceptable; nor are the statements of Herzen and Belinsky, which are derived from French socialism with its individualistic bent. [37]

On the other hand, the radicals' view on the use of moral and polytechnical education to create complete human beings, could have been taken from the pages of Marx.

Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov approached a Marxist position to a greater extent than the rest of their contemporaries who wrote about education. Chernyshevsky has been said to come very close to scientific socialism and historical materialism, although his brand of materialistic socialism was not Marxist. [38] Both Marx and Lenin were full of praise for him, Lenin writing that he was "the only really great Russian writer who, from the fifties up to 1888, succeeded in keeping to the level of an integral philosophical materialism But, due to the backwardness of Russian life, Chernyshevsky was unable to, or rather could not, rise to the heights of the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels." [39]

In sum, then, although it is true that some of the educational ideas of nineteenth century Russians are acknowledged in the Soviet Union today, it is not the case that education can be described as Hans does: "Russian it was and Russian it remains". To say this is to discount the whole of nineteenth century official thought and action on education. Moreover, to use the term 'Russian' to refer to the ideas of the left-wing thinkers (the only discernible link between the educational thought and practice of the Tsarist and Soviet eras), is to misuse the term, as these ideas,

although obviously a part of the Russian tradition of education, were largely imported from Europe, and owed much to French utopian socialism and German materialism. Any resemblances between the Tsarist and Soviet educational systems can only be explained by reference to a common intellectual tradition, and the acceptance of some of the pre-revolutionary ideas is due only to their concurrence with Marxist-Leninist ideology. To discount the views of Hans it is not sufficient to say that the system in 1971 is different to that of 1917-some changes would be expected due merely to the passage of time. The point is that the changes have been introduced primarily in order to make a *Soviet* system based on Marxist-Leninist principles. The very nature of the Soviet educational system has been determined by the ideology. This will now be shown by reference to two important aspects of that system.

As neither Marx nor Lenin wrote at length on education in general it is not possible to evaluate the present-day educational system in the light of doctrinal prescriptions. On the other hand, both did write about polytechnical education; [40] this makes it possible to assess how much importance is attached to their views in the Soviet Union today in the field of education.

With the exception of the Stalinist period, polytechnical education has been an ever-present feature of the Soviet educational system, although there has often been doubt as to whether it truly follows Marxist-Leninist principles, primarily because there is some uncertainty about the nature of these principles. This has arisen to a large extent because there are two aspects of polytechnical education as expounded by Marx and Lenin.

The first is that polytechnical education is necessary for the creation of the truly communist man. It is thus an essential feature of moral education, and is integral to the system of socialization. To Marx, the combination of mental and labour education was vital, "not only as a means for increasing social production, but as the only way of producing fully developed human beings." [41] Lenin extended this thought: "Only by working side by side with the workers and peasants can one become a genuine communist." [42] Throughout the history of the Soviet regime the same sentiments have been expressed. Professor Markushevich, for example, has declared: "Labour is basic to moral development. Education in a collective and labour in a collective are both necessary conditions for the moral upbringing of children. Polytechnical training fosters the collective habits and skills." [43]

The other aspects of polytechnical education is concerned less with the moral growth of the individual than with economic and social development and progress. Both Marx and Lenin were concerned about moral development not solely for the sake of the individual, but for society as a whole; only by becoming a '*social being*' can one be truly emancipated. The welfare of society cannot be considered apart from the economic conditions of that society. Lenin, moreover, while stressing the importance of polytechnical education for moral reasons, held that the "training of children [should] be closely integrated with socially productive work". [44] This signified work which is both economically and socially useful to society, which by no means conflicts with Marx's linking of the production of "fully developed human beings" to the needs of society.

Charlton [45] sees polytechnical education as intended only for the moral development of the individual, and thus ignores Marx's and Lenin's concern with the development and progress (both social and economic) of society as a whole. Charlton's limited view leads him to mis-state the

problem-namely "how to defend Marxist-Leninist principles of polytechnical education and at the same time produce the future scholar-scientists and technologists which the race with the West requires." [46] Marxism-Leninism in fact is concerned with the well-being of society from all points of view. Thus, the child should grow up to believe in a particular moral code, but this is meant to benefit not only the individual but the whole society. Similarly, from the point of view of the individual it would be pointless, and possibly harmful, to be trained for a job that he enjoyed if there were no demand for it. The economic and social needs of society and the moral development of the individual are considered to be two sides of the same coin.

The major obstacle to the development of polytechnical education as Marx and Lenin would have wished it is rather a question of balance-initially between the economic and moral aspects, and more recently between the relative weight of theory and practice in the polytechnical curriculum.

Immediately after 1917, of course, the economic situation caused the major difficulty. Lenin, for example, wrote that because of "current, present-day deplorable reality ... [only] a number of steps to polytechnical education, feasible at present", could be taken. [47] Equipment, money and trained personnel were severely lacking. Nevertheless, although technical expertise was desperately needed, Lenin, Krupskaya and Lunacharsky (head of the Commissariat of Public Enlightenment) resisted the pressure to begin specialist training from the first years of secondary education. Even so, by the late 1920s, it was possible for Krupskaya to declare that "about polytechnical education one may speak only conditionally". [48]

The 1920s and early 1930s was a period of experimentation in education, and Krupskaya, after Lenin's death, continued to try to institute a truly polytechnical system. The rise of Stalin, however, meant both a decline in concern for the moral aspect of polytechnical education, and an increasing division between labour education in the factory schools and an academic education in the general secondary schools. In 1937 Stalin abolished polytechnical education altogether. [49]

After the war there were several demands for a reintroduction of polytechnical education on the grounds that a too academic education could in no way be said to be 'allied to life' as Lenin had wanted; nor was it sufficient for use in industry or agriculture. [50] But it is only since the death of Stalin that the issue has come to life.

During the 1958 Party Congress, Khrushchev declared that the educational reform of that year "is fully in the spirit of Marxist-Leninist teachings on the education and upbringing of the young and opens the way to the further expansion of polytechnical education in the schools"; [51] the reform was designed to end the "divorce of school and life". Although the 1958 Law was concerned with both the economic and moral aspects of polytechnical education the arguments continued, partly because it was felt that the reform had too vocational a cast. The 1964 Decree, however, went too far in the opposite direction, with productive work reduced to a mere two hours of obligatory industrial or agricultural training a week during the final two years at school. [52] During the late 1960s and early 1970s, therefore, there have again been complaints that theory and practice are not sufficiently balanced. In 1971 M. A. Prokofiev, the Minister of Education, declared that there should be more concern with the practical aspects of polytechnical

education, and since then there has been much greater emphasis upon practical polytechnical work experience to complement the theoretical study. [53]

It is clear that, except during the Stalinist era, the intention has been to construct a system of polytechnical education upon Marxist-Leninist lines, although there have been differences of opinion about the nature of polytechnical education. A balance both between the moral and economic aspects and between theory and practice has proved difficult to achieve, but whenever one has been emphasized at the expense of the other a countervailing change has followed.

Although polytechnical education is only one aspect of the educational system, it has been covered in some detail because it was one with which Marx and Lenin were most concerned. But an examination of the various institutions of education in the Soviet Union again illustrates the importance of Marxist-Leninist theories.

In the Soviet Union education is considered in much broader terms than is the case in England, encompassing, besides the normal schools, the family, pre-school institutions and many extracurricular activities. It is clear that, insofar as is possible, these have all been designed in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist ethos. Again this cannot be shown by direct reference to the writings of Marx and Lenin, who never concerned themselves with the details of a future communist system of education. Instead it will be shown by an examination of the principles upon which the various educational institutions are based. As will be seen, these principles are clearly rooted in Marxism-Leninism.

As has been mentioned, the main aim of the system is to produce a man who subscribes to a particular type of morality-communist morality. This basically involves any view or behaviour which assists the advent of communism, [54] and features devotion to the motherland, having the good of society at heart, and a love of labour. [55] All the various socializing institutions are committed to this aim. It is natural, therefore, for the state to take a great interest in educating the young from an early age in as uniform a manner as possible. Parents are encouraged to send their children to creches, nurseries and kindergartens before school begins at seven, and there is a wealth of information at the disposal of parents who wish to keep their children at home. The family has a specific duty to complement the work of the state, and children can actually be removed from the home if this is not done. [56] Once in any institution, the children are treated from the earliest age in such a way as to ensure that they develop a love of communal work. Everything is designed with the future communist man firmly in sight. Co-operation with others in play and work, early responsibility and the performance of various 'socially useful activities' are encouraged. The children come to learn to evaluate activity in terms of the group, and are expected to take an ever-increasing part in the acceptance of communal responsibilities. [57] The emphasis remains the same both in school, and in the various extracurricular activities. A child is not judged individually; he is always praised or criticized with reference to the group. Collectively oriented activity is considered fundamental to both moral and academic progress.

This belief can only be understood by reference to the main tenets of Soviet educational psychology, which are quite clearly rooted in the Marxist-Leninist tradition. Although derived from materialist psychology, the distinctive feature of Soviet educational psychology is that it is specifically dialectically-materialist. By means of language and labour, Marx held, man changes

his external circumstances while also changing himself. And, with changed activity, both character and ability will be altered. [58]

An examination of the changes in educational psychology during the Soviet period show that political and economic forces played a part and that its early development was dogged by a lack of understanding of Marx. Nevertheless, with the exception of the Stalinist period, educational psychology in the Soviet Union based itself firmly on the Marxist-Leninist position, once that position had been understood. This was greatly helped by the publication, in the 1920s, of Engels' work on dialectics and Lenin's epistemology, based on the Marxist theory of knowledge. It became clear that emphasis should be laid upon the consciousness of the individual, as opposed to the vulgar materialist view that the individual is merely moulded by his environment. It is true that Stalin attempted briefly to revert to a vulgar materialist form of psychology for political reasons, [59] but only a year after his death this non-Marxist approach was denounced as untenable and the concept of consciousness, essential to dialectical-materialist psychology, was reintroduced. [60]

The researches of Pavlov were also valuable in reinforcing the dialectical-materialist bent of Soviet educational psychology. Apart from his early work, his studies are written from this standpoint, and his research, particularly in the field of language, has been continued in this vein, along with work on the internalization of action as the basis of learning. [61]

The *type* of action is naturally considered important. As Luria has expressed it, Soviet psychology regards all mental processes as stemming from the "concrete forms of interaction between the organism and its environment". [62] Prozorov develops this thought: "... one must actively help the child's development through a purposeful education rather than by depending upon his native, inherited qualities." [63] These abilities are merely the foundation upon which to build, while mental processes "depend upon what is done, the purpose, the character, and the structure of the activity". [64] These statements are made all the more significant by the fact that to a very large extent the work of the educational psychologist is quickly implemented in the school. Bereday and his associates state, for example: "It would appear that there is little lag between educational theory and educational practice in the Soviet Union." [65] And writing specifically about child socialization techniques, Bronfenbrenner wrote: "In general, the field notes indicate considerable correspondence between practice and precept ... " [66] In Soviet books and articles, also, there are many indications that the work of the psychologists is quite conscientiously followed.

Not only is the theory Marxist-Leninist, so also is the methodology that has developed—in particular the emphasis upon bringing children up in the collective spirit and style. In this regard the work and theories of Makarenko are of the utmost importance. Others have also been aware of the possibilities of the collective for the formation of the young personality. Krupskaya, for example, declared in 1927: "We believe that a child's personality can be best and most fully developed only in a collective." [67] The impetus for serious research into the value of the collective, however, came from Makarenko, who, from the early 1920s, wanted to develop a Marxist psychology. According to Bowen, he "accepted some of the widest, most general of the Marxist ideals as fundamental postulates, and he worked unflinchingly to implement them." [68] In his 'colonies', the methods were based on a belief in the all-importance of collective action and

thought, and, since the 1950s, psychologists have made increasing use of his work, in order to find ways of best inculcating communist morality. It has been found, for example, that competition is a useful means to that end, provided that it is between groups, rather than individuals, and has a socially significant goal. [69] Group pressure is found to be valuable, but only if the opinions of the collective have been developed by the children themselves, in the course of joint activity [70] rather than imposed upon them by others. If some members of the group do not behave in the approved manner, it is not felt that compulsion can achieve the required result, but if the whole group is encouraged to help ensure the correct behaviour of the deviants (especially in competition between other groups), success is often achieved. [71]

The psychology of the individual is not neglected, however, and it is also realized that different children will react to situations and activities differently, depending upon their stage of development and their attitudes to their peers and teachers. [72] Bozhovich, moreover, while agreeing that the child's personality is formed while he acts, held that a particular activity could elicit various mental states, depending on the needs and motives which stimulated the activity. [73] It is of great importance to consider, and then instil, common needs and motives, so that the child can be helped to reach the approved goal that he has been led to establish for himself. [74]

Although no specific requirements were laid down by Marx and Lenin, their influence is paramount in the development of Soviet educational psychology, not only in the attitudes towards testing and academic failure, but, more basically, in the Soviet conception of human nature.

This article was designed to assess the view that Soviet education differs little in essentials from that of the Tsarist era, in that the theoretical and practical foundations of the present system stemmed from pre-Revolutionary Russia. In effect, according to Hans, the education system in the USSR should be termed 'Russian' rather than 'Soviet'. It is true that there was no complete break with the past in 1917, while the educational views of a small section of Tsarist society became highly regarded in the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, the views of these theorists are not specifically 'Russian', but derived from a European heritage, and their acceptability in the Soviet Union is due solely to their similarity to some of the basic tenets of Marxist-Leninist ideology. The ideology permeates the whole educational system, and the educational system cannot be understood without reference to the ideology. In schools, both the nature of the subject matter taught, and, more significantly, the manner of teaching, is determined by it. It is hardly surprising that 30% of all teachers and pre-school workers are members of the Communist Party, [75] while virtually all are members of the Trade Union of Educational and Scientific Workers, which holds that "all teachers, no matter what their subjects, are obliged to make their contribution to instilling a Communist world outlook in the youth Success depends, above all, on the teachers themselves having Communist ideological integrity and profound Communist convictions." [76]

All states wish to educate their young into the values and beliefs current in their society. The more autocratic the state, the more this is necessary, which helps to explain the emphasis upon moral education in schools in Tsarist Russia. A stable totalitarian state cannot exist without a system of socialization that is both well-designed and all-encompassing. In the Soviet Union ideology has helped to create the monolithic system, and all its socializing institutions aim at a single goal—the creation of communist men.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] HANS, NICHOLAS (1963), *The Russian Tradition in Education*, p. 189 (London).

[2] JOHNSON, WILLIAM H. E. (1969), *Russia's Educational Heritage*, 2nd ed., p. 257 (New York).

[3] *ibid.*, pp. 250-51. George Counts, in his Introduction to this edition, wrote: "Many students of the Soviet Union have made the mistake of concentrating on the ideas and doctrines of Karl Marx. It is becoming increasingly evident that Bolshevism and the teachings of Lenin were deeply rooted in the autocratic tradition, the messianic vision, and the revolutionary movements of imperial Russia. This basic truth is supported in scholarly detail in *Russia's Educational Heritage*." *ibid.*, p. vii.

[4] The School of Mathematical and Navigation Sciences. *ibid.*, p. 27.

[5] *ibid.*, p. 252.

[6] *ibid.*, pp. 257-59.

[7] ROSEN, SEYMOUR M. (1971), *Education and Modernization in the U.S.S.R.*, p. xii (Reading, Mass.).

[8] *ibid.*, p. 165.

[9] *ibid.*, p. 28.

[10] HANS, NICHOLAS & HESSEN, SERGIUS (1930), *Educational Policy in Soviet Russia*, p. xvii (London).

[11] HANS (1963), p. 189.

[12] LENIN, V. I. (1970), The tasks of the Youth Leagues, in Lenin, *On Youth*, 2nd ed., p. 236 (Moscow).

[13] *ibid.*, pp. 238-39.

[14] MEDINSKY, E. N. (3rd March 1944), Development of education ideas in Russia, *Soviet War News*, 4.

[15] Quoted in HANS (1963), p. 108.

[16] WIDMAYER, RUTH (1954), The evolution of Soviet educational policy, *Harvard Educational Review*, 24, 161.

[17] HANS (1963), p. 92, note.

[18] RUBINSHTEIN, S. L. (1948), Psychological science and education, *Harvard Educational Review*, 18, pp. 159-60.

[19] *Collection of Decrees of the Ministry of Public Education* (St. Petersburg, 1864-65), II (1), articles 272 and 11, quoted in Johnson, pp. 91-92.

[20] Quoted in Darlington (1909), *Education in Russia* (London), p. 157, quoted in Johnson, p. 218. The Commission was set up to study the structure, aims and curriculum of the secondary school, and recommend improvements. *ibid.*, p. 185.

[21] *The Theses of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Council of Ministers*, quoted in HANS (1963), p. 152.

[22] BALIASNAYA, L. K. (March 1972), On improving the leadership of upbringing work, *Soviet Education*, 14, p. 5.

[23] BOLDYREV, N. I. (1960), *The Program of the Upbringing Work in the School* (Moscow), pp. 20-25 and 110-18, cited in URIE BRONFENBRENNER, *Two Worlds of Childhood: US and USSR* (Penguin, 1974), p. 30.

[24] *Collection of Edicts of the Ministry of Public Education* (St. Petersburg, 1866-67), I, 527-30, quoted in JOHNSON, p. 88.

[25] HANS (1963), p. 27.

[26] JOHNSON, pp. 154-55. Delianov was Minister of Education from 1882, while Tolstoy, who had previously occupied that post as well as being Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, was Minister of the Interior.

[27] *ibid.*, p. 156.

[28] *ibid.*, p. 277. These figures are from 1864, when Real-Gymnasia were also set up which taught no classics but gave, for example, 23 hours a week of Natural History. In 1871, however, science was completely banished, and a classical education was once more a necessary requirement for higher education. *ibid.*, pp. 149-50.

[29] *ibid.*, p. 240.

[30] Labour and its psychological and educational significance (1945), in *Selected Pedagogical Works* (Moscow), pp. 204-17, quoted in JOHNSON, p. 242.

[31] HANS (1963), pp. 47-52.

[32] BELINSKY, V. G. (1948), *Collected Works in Three Volumes* (Moscow), quoted in HANS (1963), pp. 35-36.

[33] Quoted in HANS (1963), p. 110.

[34] Quoted in HANS (1963), p. 35.

[35] DOBROLYUBOV, N. A., On Children's Training, quoted in HANS (1963), p. 113.

[36] VEIKSHAN, V. A., Introduction to the *Selected Pedagogical Works*, quoted in HANS (1963), p. 105.

[37] MASARYK, THOMAS G. (1955), *The Spirit of Russia*, 2nd ed., I, pp. 418 and 363, note (London).

[38] *ibid.*, pp. 28 and 30.

[39] LENIN, V. I. (1960-70), Materialism and Empirico-Criticism, in *Collected Works*, XIV, p. 361 (Moscow).

[40] Defined briefly, polytechnical education is a type of education which involves teaching pupils the general bases of industrial and agricultural work, by means of both theory and practice.

[41] MARX, KARL (1930), *Capital*, I, p. 527 (London).

[42] Materials relating to the revision of the party programme, in *On Youth*, p. 58.

[43] Quoted in GEORGE Z. F. BEREDAY *et al.* (1960), *The Changing Soviet School*, p. 251 (London).

[42] LENIN, The tasks of the Youth Leagues, in *On Youth*, p. 250.

[44] LENIN, Materials relating to the revision of the party programme, in *On Youth*, p. 58.

[45] CHARLTON, KENNETH (1968), Polytechnical education: an idea in motion, *International Review of Education*, 14, pp. 43-61.

[46] *ibid.*, p. 57.

[47] On polytechnical education, in *On Youth*, pp. 253-54.

[48] KRUPSKAYA, N. K. (1928), *Problems of Public Education*, p. 5 (Moscow), quoted in MAURICE SHORE (1947), *Soviet Education: Its Psychology and Philosophy*, p. 165 (New York).

[49] SHORE, pp. 192-93.

[50] SHABALOV, S. M. (1945), Concerning the content of polytechnical education, *Soviet Pedagogy*, 8, pp. 14-23, cited in SHORE, pp. 229-30. See also SHORE, pp. 232-40.

[51] Quoted in I. A. KAIROV, The reorganization of General Secondary Education, in *Polytechnical Education in the USSR*, ed. S. G. Shapovalenko, p. 69 (Paris, 1963).

[52] ROSEN, p. 70.

[53] VASILEV, Iu. K. & CHEPELEV, V. I. (April 1974), Labor training and polytechnical education in the School, *Soviet Education*, 16, pp. 79-96. In this article, the fact that labour training is separated from polytechnical education undoubtedly stems from the overemphasis upon the theoretical aspect of polytechnical education over the last decade. The term 'labor training' here refers to work experiences and to the inculcation of respect for labour. In effect, however, this reunion of theory and practice has restored the balance, at least for the moment, and is in accord with Marxist-Leninist requirements.

[54] LENIN, The tasks of the Youth Leagues, in *On Youth*, p. 246.

[55] A more specific definition is not possible, given the Marxist view that morality is a part of the superstructure, and is therefore subject to change.

[56] LAW on 'Marriage and the family' (1968), quoted in ALEXEI KALININ (1969), *Preschool Education in the U.S.S.R.*, p. 44 (Moscow).

[57] BRONFENBRENNER, pp. 21 and 23.

[58] SIMON, BRIAN, Karl Marx and Education, in BRIAN SIMON (1971), *Intelligence, Psychology and Education: A Marxist Critique*, pp. 190-85 (London); JEFFREY A. GRAY (1966), Attention, consciousness and voluntary behaviour in Soviet psychology: philosophical roots and research branches, in *Present-day Russian Psychology*, ed. NEIL O'CONNOR, p. 35 (Oxford).

[59] TUCKER, ROBERT C. (1963), Stalin and the uses of psychology, in *The Soviet Political Mind: Studies in Stalinism and Post-Stalin Change*, p. 101 (London).

[60] *ibid.*, p. 115.

[61] O'CONNOR, NEIL (1963), Soviet educational psychology, in *Communist Education*, ed. EDMUND J. KING, pp. 39-42 (London).

[62] LURIA, A. R. & YUDOVICH, F. IA. (1959), *Speech and the Development of Mental Processes in the Child*, p. 9 (London).

[63] PROZOROV, G. S. (1964), Heredity and upbringing, in HELEN B. REDL (ed.), *Soviet Educators on Soviet Education*, p. 15 (Glencoe).

[64] SMIRNOV, A. A., in conversation, quoted in BEREDAY *et al.*, pp. 422-23.

[65] *ibid.*, p. 138.

[66] BRONFENBRENNER, p. 14.

[67] KRUPSKAYA, *On Education* (Moscow, n.d.), p. 122, quoted in JAMES BOWEN (1962), *Soviet Education, Anton Makarenko and the Years of Experiment*, p. 142 (Madison).

[68] BOWEN, p. 59. See also HANS (1963), p. 164.

[69] BOZHOVICH, L. I. & SLAVINA, L. S. (November 1968), Soviet psychology of character training, in *Soviet Education*, 11, p. 14.

[70] *ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

[71] BOZHOVICH, L. I. (1969), The personality of schoolchildren, in *A Handbook of Contemporary Soviet Psychology*, Ed. MICHAEL COLE & IRVING MALTZMAN, pp. 230-31 (New York).

[72] *ibid.*, pp. 211-12 and 219; G. S. KOSTIUK (1963), Some aspects of the interrelation between education, and the development of personality, in *Educational Psychology in the Soviet Union*, Ed. BRIAN & JOAN SIMON, p. 42 (London).

[73] BOZHOVICH, p. 238.

[74] *ibid.*, pp. 234-35.

[75] PROKOFIEV, M. A. (1972), The school and its problems, *Soviet Education*, 14, p. 49.

[76] ROSEN, pp. 107 and 109.