CASUISTRY IN THE EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY OF THE SOVIET UNION

By

Nora Neli Klabik

Submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements
of the Degree of Master of Arts in the
Department of Education
of the American University of Beirut
Beirut, Lebanon

June, 1963

CASUISTRY IN THE EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY OF THE SOVIET UNION

Acknowledgements

The writer is indebted to Professors Joseph Malone and John Nystrom for their guidance and interest throughout the course of the preparation of this thesis. The writer would like also to acknowledge the valuable suggestions made by Professor Roland Puccetti concerning especially the second chapter of this work, and Professor Habib Kurani, as a member of the Comprehensive Board.

Preface

The educational system of the Soviet Union has been a great source of pride to the regime. This may be why so much information about its plans and programs is made available to the West. Many people in the West have praised the Soviet educational system and criticized Western methods of education. In the eyes of many Westerners Soviet education seems to be the ideal form of education; an education where every individual has the free choice and possibility to develop his talents and abilities. According to Soviet educational journals, periodicals and newspapers, education in the Soviet Union is free and all citizens have an equal right to choose their vocation. The claim is also made that Soviet education is the application of the Marxist educational theory.

The reason for making this study is to show that Soviet education is not what it claims to be, that it has failed and has gone through as many changes and permutations as Western education. And above all that, not truth but casuistry, a refinement of its medieval form is used in Soviet education, as in other fields, to carry out the whims of the Party.

It should be mentioned that this thesis is mainly a study of ideas and methods rather than a study of the reforms. The reader who may be interested in actual statistics concerning the different reforms may refer to the following works: Nicholas DeWitt, Education

and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R., (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1961), Alexander Korol, Soviet Education For Science and Technology, (London: Chapman & Hall, Ltd., 1957), and Education in the U.S.S.R., (U.S. Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, 1957).

Abstract

Education in the U.S.S.R. is the most powerful instrument possessed by the Communist Party for the indoctrination of the people with the Marxist and Communist ideology. The claim is made for Soviet education that it is true to the Marxian spirit and its principles. Like Marxism it is materialistic, openly anti-religious and anti-spiritualistic; but in many instances it contradicts the Marxist theory of education and is completely different from it. It is important to observe how each ideological turn creates the necessity for Soviet ideologists to explain and re-explain the new theory in terms of Marxism or Marxism-Leninism.

The first chapter of this thesis deals with the Marxist philosophy, the Marxist philosophy of education and especially with the "Great Principles" of this philosophy - polytechnical education. From this chapter it will be seen that the Marxist educational philosophy on the whole is rather flexible.

Marxist educational theory being rather flexible and inconsistent it had not been difficult for the Party to find any number of supporting and seemingly valid arguments to explain the correctness of changes whether political, social, economic or educational. Marxist educational theory, it must be admitted, is not so completely flexible as to support glaringly contradictory statements. It has

been necessary to call on other means of support, including the long-forgotten weapon of casuistry.

In chapter two casuistry is defined. An attempt is made to show that Soviet Marxism is really a form of Scholasticism rather than a philosophy. There is a certain parallelism between the methods of the Catholic Church of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries - the so called period of decline of Scholasticism - and Soviet Marxism and its methods. Both provide examples of casuistic methods.

The Party's use of these casuistic methods will be illustrated in the third chapter of this thesis. The three principal reforms provide ample evidence of such practices. At the present time there is evidence that yet a fourth main turn in educational philosophy is being made within the Communist Party. What is most striking is the fact that each reform brings up new ideals and theories of education, new methods of teaching, more often than not directly opposed to the former ones. The new ones, just like the ones before are backed by and are based upon Marxist philosophy of education. How is this possible? How can one ideology be used to support and interpret contradictory philosophies of education? How could the Communist Party find each time valuable arguments in favour of the "new course"? For it is definitely true that the Communist Party invariably provides explanations for any changes made.

The aim of this thesis is two-fold. The writer will first try to isolate and define a Marxist theory of education and attempt to show when and how this theory has been interpreted in contradictory ways. Furthermore the writer will try to show that it is not so much the flexibility of Marxist philosophy as the skillful manipulation of this theory by the Communist "Casuists" that makes these twists of theories and ideologies possible.

Table of Contents

"Marxism a science? Well, its taking a risk, to say the least, to argue about that with a man one hardly knows, but all the same. . . Marxism is not sufficiently master of itself to be a science. Science is more balanced. You talk about Marxism and objectivity. I don't know any teaching more self-centered and further from the facts than Marxism. Ordinarily, people are anxious to test their theories in practice, to learn from experience, but those who wield power are so anxious to establish the myth of their own infallibility that they turn back on truth as squarely as they can."

Boris Pasternak,
Doctor Zhivago, (London:
W. Collins Sons and Co., Ltd.,
1958), pp. 255-256.

CHAPTER I

THE MARXIST PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

The educational system in the U.S.S.R. is the most powerful instrument possessed by the Communist Party for the indoctrination of the people with Marxist and Communist ideology. Soviet education is claimed to be consistent with the Marxian spirit and its principles. Like Marxism, it is materialistic, openly anti-spiritualistic and anti-religious. In many instances, however, it contradicts the Marxist ideals of education and in many instances is foreign to it. It is interesting to note that whenever a sharp ideological or administrative turn occurs, the Soviet ideologists explain and re-explain the new educational policies, practices, beliefs and theories in terms of the same Marxism or Marxism-Leninism.

Since 1917 there have been three major turns in the educational philosophy and practice of the Communist Party.[1] What is most striking is that each reform brings with it new theories and practices, and new methods of teaching, usually directly opposed to the former ones. And though the new theories and practices may be the direct negation of the former ones which were based on and supported by Marxist ideals, the new ones, too, are backed by and based on Marxism.

---

[1] See N. DeWitt, Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R., (Washington: U.S. Government printing office, 1961), pp. 78-153.

How is this possible? How can one ideology be used to support and interpret contradictory philosophies of education? Is the Marxist theory such that it could be interpreted in several ways?

Although Marxist theory is very flexible and often vague and inconsistent, it could not be misinterpreted to such an extent.[1] It should be admitted though, that misinterpretation may have taken place for another reason - that of an absence of an adequately developed educational theory.

In fact, Marx did not directly concern himself with a "theory of education", he paid little attention to education in a Socialistic state. His main concern was the socialistic revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. But Marx could afford to leave aside the question of education, for the educational philosophy and practice follow logically from his beliefs. Thus whatever educational theory may follow, it should be derived from the Marxian social, economic and political philosophy.

Marx's dialectic materialism represents mainly a synthesis of Hegelian idealism and the materialism of Feuerbach. Hegel as an idealist believed in the absolute reality. He believed that at the basis, the foundation of each Being there is a definite Idea, a Spirit.

---

[1] Max Eastman has shown some discrepancies between the statements of Marx and Engels in his book, Marx, Lenin and the Science of Revolution. The same issue has been discussed in Sidney Hook, Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx and Edmund Wilson, To the Finland Station.

Plato, also affirmed the existence of the Absolute, but between Plato and Hegel there was an essential difference. Plato considered the dynamic phenomena of sensory experience as illusionary appearances; as the mobile images of the eternal Ideas. To Plato Ideas only were eternal and all that was moving, changing was an illusion.

Hegel on the other hand believed that the Idea, the Absolute Spirit, which is the essence of the being, revealed itself through the history of the universe and of men. Although an idealist, Hegel did not turn away from the idea of change - of "becoming". To him the Spirit developed and through successive stages realized itself till finally it became fully conscious of itself.

At the beginning there were only stones, rocks, and minerals on earth, then came the plants, and then the animals and man. The impression is easily gained that more complex, organized and independent beings are coming into the universe. The Spirit, at first dormant and alien to itself and the universe, manifests itself more and more as order, liberty and finally as the conscience. The Spirit progresses and develops through the history of men. Each people, each civilization, has in some way the mission to realize a stage in the progress of the spirit.

Hegel believed that the Absolute Spirit found its expression in the Prussian State of his time. To Hegel, the Spirit revealed itself at the end of history, but in any case the Absolute was only

at the end that what it was in reality.[1]

Since the Idea is history, there can be no opposition between that which is intelligible and that which is real, or that which is intelligible and that which is temporal. All that is real is then rational and all which is rational must be real. Universal history is nothing but the manifestation of Reason. Real logic then is not that which deals with identities but that which can reason in terms of becoming. Thought then follows through contradictions - from thesis to antithesis to synthesis. It is not unlike a dialogue in which truth is derived out of a discussion and argumentation.

Such is the dialectical process of thought and real history develops like this, and not otherwise, since history is nothing but a Thought which is realized. The dialectic, according to Hegel, is the movement of things themselves.

To Hegel, for example, the history of art is dialectic. Ancient Egypt's contribution is symbolic art, an art of strange shapes and gigantic proportion-less figures. Classical Greek art represents the anti-thesis of the proportionate and gigantic Egyptian forms. The gods of the Greeks are no more monsters, but handsome athletes of harmonious forms. To this art, human form is the model, it is graceful, serene, in equilibrium. Then we have Romantic art - which

---

[1] Dennis Huisman and André Vergez, Métaphysique, (Paris: Fernand Nathan, 1960), pp. 119-120.

started with the rise of Christianity and triumphed in the 19th century. This art is the synthesis: it preserves the humane values of the preceeding stage, but it refutes its coldness; the Greek serenity is abandoned and architecture, painting and music as well as poetry express the struggle and the suffering of the human soul and spirit. Throughout history we can find this triple combination of the thesis, antithesis and synthesis process.[1]

To Feuerbach, on the contrary, it was not the Ideas which made the world turn round. Ideas, to him, were nothing but the products of the human conscience. All ideas, even the idea of God could be explained through man as the first entity. Human conscience, too, was nothing but the product of the human brain. "It is the Phosphorus that thinks in us", claimed Feuerbach. It is evident then, that to Feuerbach the Spirit had no own proper activity; it was just the passive reflection of material conditions. It was the product of material conditions and man was just the product of heredity and education.

"Man is what he eats", claimed Feuerbach. The capacity of experiencing sensations, pleasure, pain and emotion as well as passion is the reality which makes man what he is. Thus, truth, reality, sensitivity are identical. Only the sensitive being is a true, real being.

---

[1]Carl J. Friedrich (ed.), The Philosophy of Hegel, (New York: The Modern Library, 1954), pp. 1-161.

Marx was greatly influenced by Feuerbach's materialism and later by Bauer and Strauss.[1,2] But he did not fully agree with Feuerbach's materialism. He claimed that:

> "All social life is essentially practical. The highest point reached by observational materialism is the consideration of the individuals and civil society. The position of old materialism is civil society, the view-point of the new is the human society or the social humanity."[3]

Leaning on Feuerbach's materialism, Marx rejected Hegelian idealism. To Marx it was not the Idea which from the beginning animated history, but on the contrary, it was the conscience. Ideas were thus the latter product of matter in movement. It was matter which was the first given. Life itself was nothing but the product of human thought, and human thought in turn was the product of historical conditions in which man lived and of the brain.

Marx claimed that: "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary their social being that determines their consciousness."[4] Since man is the product of a

---

[1] Edmund Wilson, To the Finland Station, (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1953), pp. 126-130.

[2] Leon B. Pousson, The Totalitarian Philosophy of Education, (Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1944), pp. 68-72.

[3] Karl Marx, "Marx Uber Feuerbach", Marx-Engels-Historisch Kritische, Gesamtausgabe, vol. 5, p. 535 (1929).

[4] Pravda, January 15, 1956.

material universe, he in his turn can know this universe. Human thought thus is capable of knowing and reflecting upon this Hegelian "becoming" and its necessary laws. Thus the movement of thought is nothing but the "reflection" of the real movement transferred into and transposed in the human brain.[1]

Although Marx rejected Hegelian idealism, he profoundly transformed Feuerbach's materialism through the Hegelian dialectic. Feuerbach claimed that man is the product of the material conditions in which he lives. Marx agreed with the above statement; but he claimed that man in his turn acts upon matter and can transform through his will the conditions of his existence. Man is not only an effect of material nature, but he is also a cause which reacts with the world, the product of which he is.

And because man himself is a product of the universe, he can transform the universe. Thus to Marx, both, classical idealism and classical materialism were wrong. For materialism saw man as a passive reflection of the world. Idealism had developed the active side, but it saw nothing but the activity of the Spirit and did not recognize the real, concrete activity. Being a product of nature, man can learn and tame nature through technology. Marx accused

---

[1] Garaudy, La Théorie Matérialists de la Connaissance, (P.U.F.)n.d.

traditional materialism as well as traditional idealism of having separated man from society. To Marx man had always been social, even his religious feelings were related to the environment and time.[1]

Marx believed that the entire political, social, moral and ideological structure of the society is expressed and depends on the prevailing system of production and exchange.[2] To Marx, then, the key to the evolution of the society was furnished by the development of technology and conditions of production. These Marx called productive forces. A certain state of the productive forces (in the Middle Ages the mill, in the 19th century the steam engine) explain the social regime of production, the division and the role of the social classes, - these Marx called the "relations of production", (in the Middle Ages the Feudal system of the serf - overlord relationship, in the 19th century, the capitalist, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat).[3]

The productive forces and the relations of production constitute the infrastructure of the society as seen by Marx. From these one can explain juristic ideas as well as political, philosophical,

---

[1] Karl Marx, Thesis on Feuerbach, II in appendix to the U.S. edition of The German Ideology, (New York: International Publishers Co., 1939), p. 197.

[2] Karl Marx, Selected Works, (New York: International Publishers Co., 1939), Vol. I., pp. 356-578.

[3] Ibid.

religious ideas; through them one can explain artistic creation, through which (all of these) the society reflects consciousness of itself. In fact the conflicts of classes, are relative at certain moments of technical development, they always change and become dissimulated through the diverse manifestations of the human spirit which constitutes the super-structure.

Ideas are not just epiphenomena, but in their turn they react with economic structure out of which they are born. Thus in dialectic materialism, history is not the monologue of economic forces but the dialogue of economic forces and ideas formed by the human conscience. Thus ideologies and objective conceptions made by science from the social reality act upon the infrastructure and modify it. Marx claimed that theories also change into material forces and this is how scientific discoveries transform productive forces and political ideas can bring forth altered relations of production.[1]

The intellectual and social history of mankind can be explained then, through the process of historical materialism. Marx explained

---

[1]The Marxist system gives an impression of coherence and power. But like all "systems" it is open to well-justified criticism. First of all the development of knowledge does not necessarily follow the dialectic process in the Marxian sense. It would be ridiculous and simplest to bring it always to the process of the thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Science for example, more often proceeds through successive modifications and progressive generalizations rather than sharp turns. Brunschvicg claimed that there where Marx and Hegel overturned, a Descartes corrected. Furthermore, untrue to their own program, many Marxist thinkers content themselves simply by briefly explaining the "ideologies" through economic factors. They dismiss or ignore the complex interaction between the infrastructure and the superstructure.

historical materialism as follows:

> "In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of the society - the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the social, political, and intellectual life-process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or - what is but a legal expression for the same thing - with the property relations within which they have been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change in the economic foundation, the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations a distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic - in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself, so can we not judge of such a period of transformation by its own consciousness; on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained rather from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have been developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society itself. Therefore, mankind always sets itself only such tasks as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely we will

> always find that the task itself arises only when the material conditions necessary for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation."[1]

From the above statement it can be seen that to Marx social relations were the product of and depended on productive forces. Man discovered new productive methods, they changed the mode of production, they changed the way they lived and worked - they also changed their social relations. According to historical materialism then, primitive society was classless; when class division arose, special institutions of coercion (the state) were created by the ruling classes to prevent the exploited to regain the control over the society. Class struggle has ever since been the primitive force in history. Marx had incorporated Hegel's idea of inherent change. He claimed that he had put Hegel on his feet, by grounding the change not in the world of ideas, but on the terrain of social and physical environment.

Marx claimed that:

> "The mystification which dialectic suffers in Hegel's hands, by no means prevents him from being the first to present its general form of working in a comprehensive and conscious manner. With him it is standing on its head. It must be turned right side up again, if you would discover the rational kernel within the mystical shell.

---

[1] Karl Marx, Selected Works, (New York: International Publishers Co., 1939), Vol. I., pp. 356-578; or from the preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 1904), pp. 11-13.

> In its mystified form, dialectic became the fashion in Germany, because it seemed to transfigure and to glorify the existing state of things. In its rational form it is a scandal and abomination to bourgeoisdom and its doctrinaire professors, because it includes in its comprehension and affirmative recognition of the existing state of things, at the same time also, the recognition of the negation of that state, of its inevitable breaking up; because it regards every historically developed social form as in fluid movement, and therefore takes into account its transient nature not less than its momentary existence; because it lets nothing impose upon it, and is in its essence critical and revolutionary."[1]

In the Communist Manifesto Marx wrote:

> "Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views and conceptions, in one work man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life?"[2]

Revolution then is an inevitable occurrance in history, appearing when the existing mode of production and distribution no longer satisfy the needs of the society - i.e. a change has to take place, and it does. This change could be evolutionary as well as revolutionary. The revolution really would be a rebellion of the people or of the exploited class against the oppression of the state or the society. This will happen each time the production becomes centralized as regards the tools of production. As a result of the selfishness of the owners, the misery of the exploited class will grow and the tension between the classes will increase leading to a revolution.

---

[1] Karl Marx, Capital, (Chicago: Charles Kerr & Co., 1915), Vol. I., pp. 25-26.

[2] Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Manifesto of the Communist Party, (New York: International Publishers, n.d., 1955), p. 28.

When the existing order is destroyed by revolution, another order will take its place. The ultimate end of all revolution will be the emergence of a perfect Communist society. This society will be characterized by the total absence of all private ownership of the means of production. Thus exploitation of men by men will have withered away. Furthermore, this society will be free of all class distinctions; it will be stateless and there will be an absence of any distinction between the mental or physical labor.

It is not difficult then to deduce that to Marx, education was primarily a social process. He denied that man is a passive product of environment and education. He claimed that there existed a mutual relationship between the environment and education on one hand and man on the other.[1]

> "In fact the changing man changes the changing environment and the educational process that changes with him, and thereby becomes the changed man - a process ad infinitum."[2]

Thus man's ideas and consciousness are interwoven with material activity and material relations, it is "not the consciousness (that) defines life, but it is life which defines consciousness."[3]

---

[1] Karl Marx, "Marx uber Feuerbach", p. 534.

[2] Maurice Shore, Soviet Education, (New York: Philosophical Library, 1947), p. 25.

[3] "Pedagogica", Bolshava Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia, (Moskva: lrst. ed., 1939), Vol. 44, p. 428. (Engels cited).

Ideas are formed then as a product of material activity and practice. Furthermore, ideas cannot make fundamental changes in the course of historical developments, and therefore changes in education cannot be made by the criticism of educational ideas; only an actual revolution can effect changes - only revolutionary changes can bring about educational changes.

Since the modes of production determine the entire social organization, education, an expression of social organization, will also be affected. Thus each change in the modes of production will necessarily affect the educational system. Since the social and intellectual history of man are explained in terms of historical materialism, education in each historical period must also be in terms of the material changes and the changing social order.

Marx believed that the state existed only to protect the ruling class. The function of the capitalist state was to control the oppressed and to suppress class conflicts. The state was therefore inevitable for a society which is based upon class conflicts. When the society becomes classless, there will be no class-conflicts, and no state will be needed. Then the state will be the instrument of a given class - of any given class. Its interest will be to provide the kind of education that will help the class to stay in power and rule; "In the capitalist society, the bourgeoisie gives the worker as much education as is in its own interest. And that indeed is not

much."[1]

Thus real, genuine education could only be realized in a stateless society. In any other society it would be the instrument of the ruling class.

In 1845 Engels proposed some measures for producing a real social order based upon the Communist theory.[2] As the first step he proposed to provide free, universal education for all children, without exception at the expense of the state. It was evident that he considered education the most influential factor in the reconstruction of society.

This seems to be in contradiction with Marxian educational views expressed before, namely that education is an expression of prevailing social relations which in turn are a product of the prevailing modes of production. In accordance with this view, economic reforms should precede the educational ones. On the other hand, with the knowledge of facts and the objective conditions for communism established, the subjective factor becomes the leading issue. Education, then, planned and executed by the human will, may become a measure of first importance toward the goal of practical communism.

---

[1] "Pedagogica", Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia, (Moskva: lrst. ed., 1939), Vol. 44, p. 428. (Engels cited).

[2] Maurice Shore, loc.cit., p. 55.

Two years later Engels put forth the educational goals of Marxism more fully:

"a. Universal education.

b. Education to begin at the earliest period, as soon as the child can dispense with motherly care, such as nursing, etc.

c. Education administered in national institutions at national expense.

d. Combination of education with industrial labor."[1]

Polytechnical education or the basis of education for industrial man - was discussed by Marx very briefly:

"Paltry as the education clauses of the Act (British Factory Act of 1864) appear on the whole, yet they proclaim elementary education to be an indispensable condition to the employment of children. The success of those clauses proved for the first time the possibility of combining education and gymnastics with manual labour, and, consequently, of combining manual labour with education and gymnastics. The factory inspectors soon found out by questioning the schoolmasters, that the factory children, although receiving only one-half the education of the regular day scholars, yet learnt quite as much and often more ..... From the Factory system budded, as Robert Owen has shown us in detail, the germ of the education of the future, an education that will, in the case of every child over a given age, combine productive labour with instruction and gymnastics, not only as one of the methods of adding to the efficiency of production, but as the only method of producing fully developed human beings.

The varied, apparently unconnected, and petrified forms of the industrial process now resolved themselves into

---

[1] I. Nikodimov, O Polytechnicheskom Obrazovanii v S.S.S.R., (Polytechnical Education in U.S.S.R.), (Munich: Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., 1957), p. 7.

so many conscious and systematic applications of natural science to the attainment of given useful effects. Technology also discovered the few main fundamental forms of motion, which, despite the diversity of the instruments used, are necessarily taken by every productive action of the human body; just as the science of mechanics sees in the most complicated machinery nothing but the continual repetition of the simple mechanical powers.

Modern Industry never looks upon and treats the existing form of a process as final. The technical basis of that industry is therefore revolutionary, while all earlier modes of production were essentially conservative.

Modern Industry ..... through its catastrophes imposes the necessity of recognising, as a fundamental law of production, variation of work, consequently fitness of the labourer for varied work, consequently the greatest possible development of his varied aptitudes. It becomes a question of life and death for society to adapt the mode of production to the normal functioning of this law. Modern Industry, indeed, compels society, under penalty of death, to replace the detail-worker of to-day, crippled by lifelong repetition of one and the same trivial operation, and thus reduced to the mere fragment of a man, by the fully developed individual, fit for a variety of labours, ready to face any change of production, and to whom the different social functions he performs, are but so many modes of giving free scope to his own natural acquired powers.

One step already spontaneously taken towards effecting this revolution is the establishment of technical and agricultural schools, and of "écoles d'enseignement professionnel", in which the children of the working-men receive some little instruction in technology and in the practical handling of the various implements of labour. Though the Factory Act, that first and meagre concession wrung from capital, is limited to combining elementary education with work in the factory, there can be no doubt that when the working class comes into power, as inevitably it must, technical instruction, both theoretical and practical, will take its proper place in the working-class schools. There is also no doubt that such revolutionary ferments, the final result of which is the abolition of the old division of labour, are diametrically opposed to the capitalistic form of production, and to the

> economic status of the labourer corresponding to that form. But the historical development of the antagonisms, immanent in a given form of production, is the only way in which that form of production can be dissolved and a new form established. "Let the cobbler stick to his last" - this germ of handicraft wisdom became sheer nonsense, from the moment the watch-maker Watt invented the steam-engine, the barber Arkwright, the throstle, and the working-Jeweller, Fulton, the Steamship."[1]

In the Communist Manifesto (1848), Marx and Engels expressed the essentials of their theory. In it they discussed the measures which must be taken to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the proletarian-organized state. In discussing the tenth, ultimate measure Marx claimed:

> "Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc., etc."[2]

This last point is of great importance to educational philosophy and practice. For, it became known as Marx's "Great Principle" in education of the future - the link between education and material production - the basis of the future Societ education; the source of much controversy, educational reforms, instability and upheaval.

The vehicle for the implementation of this "Great Principle" became polytechnical education.

---

[1] Karl Marx, Capital, (New York: International Publishers Co., 1939), Vol.I., pp. 488-489 and 492-495. Quoted in Robert S. Cohen, "On the Marxist Philosophy of Education", The fifty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the study of Education, Part I., (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), pp. 199-200.

[2] Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Manifesto of Communist Party, (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1955), p. 94.

To Marx and Engels the polytechnical system of education meant the freeing of men from the chains of narrow specialization. They thought that polytechnical education would help in making an all-round man, a man who would be "a jack-of-all-trades" - a man with a wide cultural horizon. Through polytechnical education they intended to prepare men and women who would be able to deal efficiently with all the problems of life. Men, who would be formed for labor, men who would be educated in the principles and the practice of Communist ethics, men who would not look for a difference between mental and physical labor. Briefly, a new man, Homo Sovieticus.

In developing the concept of polytechnical education, Marx was greatly influenced by the British factory system and the ideas of Utopian socialists. Marx had strongly criticized education in a capitalist society. From this criticism one can learn what education should not be. These views are interesting and significant.[1]

Naturally, the aim of capitalist education, according to Marx, is to maintain the status quo. But with the rise of technology and the introduction of machinary into the industry, skilled workers were needed. This is why the capitalists were trying to educate the workers. they did it out of purely selfish interests. Education was not only used to train in skills but also to cultivate attitudes and inculcate the necessary ideas to maintain the status quo.

---

[1] For further detail see R. Cohen, op. cit., 199-201.

Marx supported universal education. He, as well as Engels, Robert Owen and Lenin by universal education understood a system of general education, which would educate the new members of the socialist society. Such an education would then necessarily offer knowledge in the humanities as well as sciences and technical (or practical) training. Such an education would then train men in both, practice and theory.

Marx, above all attacked in very bitter terms the division of labor or specialization. In Das Kapital he wrote:

> "It is not the place here to go on to show how division of labour seizes upon, not only economical, but every other system of society, and everywhere lays the foundations of that all engrossing system of specialization and sorting men, that development in a man of one single faculty at the expense of all other faculties which caused A. Furgeson, the master of Adam Smith to exclaim: 'We make a nation of Helots, and have no free citizens'."[1]

> "The division of labour in the workshop", Marx goes on, "implies concentration of the means of production in the hands of one capitalist; the division of labour in society implies their dispersion among many independent producers of commodities."[2]

> "Division of labour within the workshop implies the undisputed authority of the capitalist over men, that are but facts of a mechanism that belongs to him."[3]

---

[1] Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I., pp. 388-389.

[2] Ibid., p. 390.

[3] Ibid., p. 391.

In the same volume of Das Kapital, Marx quotes Adam Smith:

> "The understandings of the greater part of men are formed by their ordinary employment. The man whose whole life is spent in performing a few simple operations. . . has no occasion to exert his understanding. . . . He generally becomes as stupid and ignorant as it is possible for a human creature to become."

After describing the stupidity of the detail labourer, he goes on:

> "The uniformity of his stationary life naturally corrupts the courage of the mind . . . It corrupts even the activity of his body and renders him incapable of exerting his strength with vigour and perseverance in any other employment than that to which he has been bred. His dexterity at his own particular trade seems in this manner to be acquired at the expense of his intellectual, social, and martial virtues. But in every improved and civilized society, this is the state into which the labouring poor, that is, the great body of the people, must necessarily fall."[1]

Marx also quotes with enthusiasm D. Urquhart:

> "To subdivide a man is to execute him, if he deserves the sentence, to assassinate him if he does not. . . The subdivision of labour is the assassination of a people."[2]

It is obvious that division of labour and specialization in any trade or field was against Marxian principles for it crippled people and handicapped their growth and free development. In the future Communist state such things would not exist. In the Communist state the society was supposed to give men full possibilities of the general

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 347-398.

[2] Ibid., p. 398.

development of all his talents - in such a state, work instead of being a burden would become pleasure. What was necessary - was an all sided development of the individual. Only through universality can the individual develop.[1]

Engels claimed that once there are men who are educated in all fields, there will be a new generation, a generation able to cope with any difficulties.[2] He described a future in which the young would be educated in the following manner: a planned society would need people with an all around education and developed talents, it would need people capable of orienting themselves in all fields of production. Such an education would allow the young to get to know all the system of production, it would allow them to go from one field into another and work in each equally well. Such people then can be used when needed or as their interest may allow. This kind of education would free men from the boring, enslaving uniformity of the present division of labour.[3]

To Marx and Engels human labour was evidently the source of all value, and in a society (The Communist society) in which work was to be honoured, in which none would live without labour, and where

---

[1] I. Nikodimov, op. cit., p. 7.

[2] Friedrich Engels, Anti-Düring (Moscow: Gos., Izd., 1931), pp. 265-270. (Russian ed.,)

[3] Friedrich Engels, Principles of Communism (Moscow: Gos. Izd., 1931), pp. 318-320. (Russian ed.,).

education would imply the actual mastery of the material environment, the germs of the education in such a society would only be found in the factory system; such education then, in the case of every child over a given age, would combine . . .

> ". . . productive labour with instruction and gymnastics, not only as one of the methods adding to the efficiency of production, but as the only method of producing fully developed human beings."[1]

Marx believed that it was possible to combine education with manual labour. He greatly emphasized this possibility and suggested that education should include not only intellectual education and physical education, but also technicial education which would acquaint the child with the basic principles of all processes of production and at the same time give the child and the adolescent the skill and habit of dealing with the most simple instruments of production.[2]

Such kind of education, Marx insisted, will raise the working class above the level of other social classes. The "Great Principle", the labour education combination, the technological instruction, both theoretical and practical were most essential to Marx.

Polytechnical education, the type of education defined by Marx and Engels was an education which:

---

[1] Education in the U.S.S.R., (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1947), No. 14, p. 12 (quoted in).

[2] Karl Marx, "Instrukzii delegatam Vremennavo Tzentralnovo Sovieta po otdielnym voprosam", Sochineniya (Works) (Moscow: IMEL, 1936), Vol.13, Part 1, p. 199.

"Familiarizes one with the basic principles of all productive processes and at the same time gives the child or the adolescent the skill of using the simplest tools in every branch of production."[1]

But Marx never specified the scope of technological instruction - whether it should be applied to all schools, to all age levels, or when should it be started, for in only a few instances Marx and Engels superficially discuss Polytechnical education.

Thus Engels in Anti-Düring refers to Owen's education and his experiments as the foundations of the future education. He claims that Robert Owen started with a kindergarden where children at the age of two and above went and were so happy that they did not want to return home. In such a school Engels saw the possibility of giving the child a general all-round education - physical as well as spiritual.[2]

Marx, in the Instructions to the delegates of the Central Soviet of the Geneva Congress in 1866 wrote on the question of "Child and adolescent labour". He claimed that each child from the age of nine should become a factory worker, for each man must not only work with his head, but also with his hands. This is a law of nature. Thus according to Marx all children must be divided into three major groups.

---

[1] Karl Marx, Sochineniya, Vol. 13, Part 1, p. 199 (Russian ed.,)

[2] Friedrich Engels, Anti-Düring, pp. 237-257.

To the first group belong children between the age of 9-12. These should work at home or in a workshop for two hours a day. The second group consisted of children between the ages of thirteen and fifteen. These, too, were supposed to work four hours instead of two. The third group - of sixteen till seventeen years old were expected to furnish serious work for six hours a day. The beginning of instructions was supposed to take place before the age of nine, for learning is linked with useful work. But, Marx stresses, work should never stand in the way of learning and the young should not be made to work if their work cannot be linked and interwoven with education.[1]

In 1871 Marx worked out some educational ideas based on the Paris Commune. He approved of the educational reforms introduced by the Communards during their (62) days of rule. To Marx, their educational reforms established a system of education highly desirable in a Communist state. He stated that all of the educational institutions were free and open to the people, and at the same time all interference of Church and state was removed. Thus not only was education made available to all, but science, itself was freed from the fetters which class prejudice and governmental force had imposed upon it.[2]

---

[1] Instruktsii delegatam vremennovo tzentralnovo Soveta (dlia Genevskovo Kongressa 3-8 sent. Chapter 4. (Truda detei i podrostkov), 1866.

[2] Maurice Shore, op. cit., p. 59.

The Commune, according to Marx, provided the following educational reforms:

"a. Free education for all, free school implements.

b. Education freed from ecclesiastical and state interference.

c. Education freed of class prejudice.

d. Freedom of science; freedom of learning."[1]

Furthermore, the Commune guaranteed to each locality, i.e. local Commune, full freedom of educational organization and development. It guaranteed complete, universal education and the creation of educational opportunities to facilitate the unfolding and the growth of the abilities of each individual member of the new France.

The Commune government introduced a number of new subjects into the curriculum - subjects which demanded secular and rational instructions, based on reason and scientific experimentation, freedom from superstition, ethics stressing solidarity, social-political instruction aiming at revolutionary activity, instruction in the arts; and an attempt to link education with industry, - "industrial design."[2]

This kind of education fulfilled Marx's demands, it was open to all people - freed from the chains of class, governments, church.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 59 (quoted in).

[2] Arkhivi Marksa i Engelsa, III (VIII), Moscow, 1934, (An address, Russian ed.)

It was committed to the ideals of intellectual freedom. It was

> "devoted to the full development of the talents of each individual, dedicated to the fostering of the 'eternal principles of justice and liberty' basis of all true equality: 'He who does not work must not eat.'"[1]

This future education in a Communist state was supposed to unite productive work with learning and gymnastics. And this according to Marx would not only be a method of raising the standards of general production, but also it will be the only method how to get a generally universally cultured man. The fundamental conception of Marxist theory of education was the combination of "work with mind" and "work with hands".

The view of polytechnical education as seen by Marx and Engels is evidently Utopian - the system is Romantic. Furthermore, we cannot really claim that Marxist educational philosophy is systematized. In fact Marx and Engels did not really give any specific attention the question of polytechnical education, or education on the whole. There is no chapter or part of their writings devoted only to education. Citations, notes, or suggestions on education can be found all over their works.[2]

---

[1] Edward S. Mason, The Paris Commune, (New York: 1930), p. 270.

[2] For further details on the issue see:
N.V. Shulgin, Marx i Engels v ikh pedagogicheskikh vizkazivniakh, (Marx and Engels in their pedagogical citations) (Moskva: Rabotnik Prosveshchenia, 1925).

It is not surprising that authorities on Marx - or his critics - seldom mention anything about Marxian views on polytechnical education or even education in general. Even Lenin mentioned the subject only in passing and any of his views on polytechnical education were mainly the result of his wife's influence, Krupskaya.

Together with Krupskaya, Makarenko, Bubnov, Shulgin, Shatsky and other educational philosophers of the early years of the Soviet Union helped to interpret Marx and formulate a Marxist educational philosophy. Unfortunately, many of the early philosophers' works are not available in English as well as in Russian, for most of them except for Krupskaya and Makarenko have fallen long ago into disgrace.

Makarenko has been considered as "the great teacher of the Marxist tradition, the creator of perhaps the most impressive demostration of the Marxist view of human nature."[1] Unfortunately his works, too, have not been available for the present study.[2] As far as Krupskaya is considered, for years after the Revolution, she was considered as the leading Marxist pedagogue. She had passed

---

[1] Cohen, op. cit., p. 208.

[2] The interested reader may refer to Cohen, op. cit., pp. 207-212.
Makarenko, Pedagogicheskaya Poema (The Pedagogical Poem);
Russkii uchitel (The Russian Teacher);
Kniga dlia roditelei (A book for Parents)

through the numerous purges untouched mainly because of the memory of her husband, Lenin. Here again sources are not available. Just to illustrate Krupskaya's view on polytechnical education the following excerpts are self-explanatory:

> "Usually it is thought that the term is used only to denote a certain sum of habits - a poly-professional field or the study of actual techniques. Polytechnism - this is a whole system, at the foundation of which lies the study of technique in its different forms, taken in its development and use. To this field belongs also the study of 'aesthetic technology' - as Marx called living nature, and the technology of metals and the study of machine production - their mechanisms; and the study of energy changes and their use. To this also belongs the study of geography and economic relations; the influence of the ways of production on the general forms of work and the influence of the latter on general social structures."[1]

About polytechnical schools Krupskaya claimed that:

> "In polytechnical schools the students, except for general work habits, must also know the aims and goals of their work; they must know how to plan their work, how to calculate it out, how to draw, how to work together and divide the work among themselves, they must learn to like work, to use instruments, ... Polytechnical education is not a certain subject to be taught. It must be assimilated into everything, all disciplines... A mutual bond between these disciplines and practice and especially learned trade is necessary. Only such a bond would help to add to labour training its polytechnical character."[2]

---

[1] N. Krupskaya, Trudovaya i polytechnicheskaya shkola i proizvodstvennaya propaganda, (Labour and Polytechnical education and industrial propaganda), cited in Nikodimov, op. cit., p. 15.

[2] I. Nikodimov, op. cit., p. 25.

Krupskaya had faithfully enough interpreted Marx. She believed sincerely in the polytechnical principle and its success. Its workability and possibility was left to the Soviet educationists to establish by trial and error. This is where the issue of polytechnical education arises, for polytechnical education does not only mean simple technical training. The principal idea was that every student would learn the important basic skills in mechanics, electricity, agriculture, carpentry, and other related fields. The purpose was to create a bond of unity and understanding between various elements -- the agricultural, industrial, commercial and intellectual. Its aim was to emphasize the Marxist principle which seeks to destroy the distinction between manual labour and intellectual labour.

Thus the struggle that Communism was to wage was

> "a struggle for the abolition of the division of labour and for the bringing up of education and training of harmoniously developed human beings, capable of doing everything."[1]

---

[1] Karl Marx, Sochineniya, Vol. 13, Part I., p. 29.

CHAPTER II

CASUISTRY, SCHOLASTICISM AND SOVIET MARXISM

The Language of Casuistry

In the Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology casuistry is defined as:

> "(1) The systematic discussion of the application of moral law to particular cases (called "cases of conscience") in which such application is not clear and certain."
>
> " (2) The over-subtle or verbal discussion of the moral quality of particular acts or sentiments, especially when tending toward greater moral laxity than is permitted by the dominant moral opinion of the time or by the unsophisticated individual conscience."[1]

Casuistry is also defined as the

> "(1) Development of moral principles through their application to special cases."
>
> "(2) Applied morality which has for its purpose the justification of questionable activities and which proceeds by discovering subtle and hypocritical exceptions to general rules of conduct."[2]

André Lalande has divided casuistry into subjective and objective. After having defined casuistry as the "study of cases of conscience; of detailed problems which are the result of the application of ethical rules to particular circumstances"; he claims that regardless

---

[1] James Mark Baldwin (ed.), "Casuistry", Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, (Gloucester, Mass., 1957), Vol. I., p. 157.

[2] Felix S. Cohen, "Casuistry", Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1930), Vol. III., pp. 265-266.

of the intimate state of some conscience, objective casuistry is the study of any conflicts of duty of accidental origin in the abstract. Subjective casuistry is the direction of the conscience, whereas objective or real casuistry is a science. Subjective casuistry thus deals with obligation, duty and such exigencies of a certain dogma which are in agreement with the soul.[1]

It is of some interest to see how casuistry is defined in the Soviet Encyclopedia:

"Casuist: '(1) The person who uses casuistry.

(2) The adjective used for people who possess the ability of the subtle use of words and who use this ability to prove usually untrue and disputable facts.'

Casuistry: '(1) In law - the adaptation of the given clause of the law to particular cases (there is nothing worse than solving the problems of the State and government through casuistry) ... In the Middle Ages, in Scholastic Philosophy - a special act of finding useful and needed answers to all possible questions of religious dogma.'

'(2) In medicine - a collection of some concrete clinical cases (Kasus) used in the observation of certain patients useful in the explanation of the desease or deseases which the patient may have.'

---

[1] André Lalande, "Casuistique", Vocabulaire Technique et Critique de la Philosophie, (Paris: Press Universitaire de France, 1947), p. 120.

(3) In the Middle Age - Law and Scholastic religion the adaptation of practical cases to universal dogmatic propositions."[1]

Casuistry, therefore, is the method followed by moral theologians in order to explain moral principles through the presentation and solution of concrete cases. Casuistry is in reality the development of the moral principles through their application to special cases. It is the study of cases of conscience and the detailed problems which are the result of the application of ethical rules to particular circumstances. Discussions of this type flourished at the time when a generally accepted system of ethics demanded development along new lines because of changing economic, political and intellectual conditions. Casuistical arguments became prominent when new ideas entered an established social order and when new arguments were necessary to maintain this order. Casuistry, in such cases becomes applied morality having as its purpose the justification of questionable activities and proceeding by discovering subtle, hypocritical and even untrue exceptions to general laws and rules.

In its primary sense, as the particularization of moral rules, casuistry, has become the natural culmination of ethics. It not only

---

[1] "Casuistika", Slovar Sovremennovo Ruskovo Yazika, (Dictionary of Contemporary Russian Language), (Moscow: Academy of the Sciences, Soviet Encyclopedia, 1956), p. 670. (translation mine).

treats the application of ethical judgement to individual cases, but it also deals with general or universal propositions, and such judgements which can be distinguished from those of general ethics only by a comparative narrowness of scope.

Thus the proposition that lying is bad would be regarded as an ethical proposition. But lying to save a friend's life would also be regarded as ethical and as an outcome of a casuistical argument.

> "Casuistry then stands in the same relation to ethics or moral philosophy as astronomy does to physics. In the absence of an adequate general doctrine of ethics it must naturally find itself more akin to pre-Ptolemaic astrology then modern astronomy. To this internal dependence upon a discipline which has scarcely emerged from the pre-scientific stage, one may attribute a good deal of the dishonour into which the word casuistry has fallen today."[1]

The Catholics, especially the Jesuits, look at casuistry from a totally different point of view. In the Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique Natural casuistry is defined as the practical application of moral knowledge by all. But this natural casuistry is not real casuistry, it is just that part of Common sense used by anyone. Real casuistry, the casuistry which Catholics are interested in, has as its aim and object the applications of Theological Conclusions to determined cases in order to decide what can be and what should not be.

---

[1] Cohen, op. cit., p. 265.

Scientific casuistry, therefore, is applied in moral theology and especially to Cases of Conscience - the most habitual and the most difficult ones - for ethics itself and even the knowledge of the supernatural is not enough to deal with these cases. A practical judgment is necessary and this judgment must be made by the person himself or by the counsellor. Scientific casuistry then is only a method, a scientific method, of application, solidly established in moral theology. Furthermore, scientific casuistry is not concerned with final aims or the practical existence of a moral obligation. It does not make judgments, nor does it decide whether one thing is to be recommended more or less. Such decisions are left to other sciences such as Theology.

The existence of a basic principle of Scientific casuistry is defined in Bouquillon, Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis, 2 ed., p. 530.[1 & 2]

The Catholics agree that there had been abuses, but they claim that these abuses were not due to real casuistry.[3] They claim further, that casuistry is authorized and permitted by the Church as long as it is used in its Scientific form.

---

[1] Not available, see also: Bouquillon, "Moral Theology at the End of the 19th Century", Catholic University Bulletin, (April 1895), p. 244 sq.

[2] "Casuistique", Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, (Paris: Le Touzey, 1905), Vol. II., pp. 1860-1877.

[3] Ibid., p. 1860.

In answer to the objection that moral duty is naturally commanded by the conscience, they reply that although moral principles may be evident, their application is not. To be able to understand the conscience and these ethical duties a long education would be necessary - and such an education is impossible with casuistry.[1 & 2]

Thus it is casuistry which takes care of the education of the moral judgment. To the objection that the casuists have dealt with too many delicate subjects and they have been at times too indulgent the reply that it is necessary to proceed in such a manner. And that the end of casuistry is nobler and more important because it directs the confessor and the confessor's duty. Furthermore it is a purely theological issue and hence no one's business.[3]

Many Christians have argued that casuistry is opposed to Christian Ascetics and Christian spirit for, its main aim is to limit the obligations of the conscience. But the Jesuits claim that casuistry is a changeable doctrine and has changed with the change of values and circumstances in history. In any case casuistry has appeared in history always when external laws, as opposed to ethical principles have been taken as its ultimate guide to conduct.

---

[1] F. Brunetiére, "Une Apologie de la Casuistique", La Revue des Deux Mondes, (Janvier 1885), p. 209 sq.

[2] Raymond Thamin, Un Problem Moral dans l'antiquité; Etude sur les Casuistique Stoicienne, (Paris: 1884).

[3] Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, op. cit., pp. 1867-1870.

Too many opinions and an absence of a guiding moral principles have led to the rise of the doctrine of Probabilism - which is claimed to be the logical outcome of casuistry.

Probabilism in ethics is defined as the Casuistic doctrine according to which it is sufficient to act according to a probable opinion in order not to be wrong, or not to act at all. That is, according to an opinion which is plausible and which may be backed by respectable partisans, even if such an opinion is less probable than another contrary opinion.

In logic Probabilism is defined as the doctrine according to which it is impossible to know the absolute truth, at least as far as knowledge of concrete or real order is concerned. This doctrine claims that the only thing man can know is how to distinguish among more or less probable opinions.[1]

Thus according to this doctrine even diametrically opposed ideas can be held if they have sufficient backing by known writers. Thus anybody who would act under a probable opinion can still be absolved. There can always be found some excuse, some "holy" writing to support an act, however sinful it may be.

---

[1] André Lalande, op. cit., p. 812.

> "Such is the manner in which they have spread themselves over the whole earth, aided by the doctrine of probable opinions, which is at once the source and the basis of all their licentiousness."[1]

René Fülop-Miller talks in defense of Probabilism and the Jesuit application of it. He claims that:

> "Probabilists held that only those laws need be observed which were unquestionably applicable to the case in point, since man was a free agent by nature, and this freedom could be restricted by definite obligations alone. An ambiguous law, they contended, was without binding force: Le Dubia non obligat.
>
> If, therefore, reasonable arguments existed both for and against the legitimacy of an action, the action, according to this view, was permissible; the fact that the arguments against may prevail over those for does not affect the case. So long as it is possible for two opposing views to be entertained, the law is ambiguous and accordingly not binding. If, therefore, there is a probability that an action is permissible, then it may be performed with a clear conscience, even though there exists a greater probability that it is contrary to the law.
>
> The Jesuits, then, adopted this theory of 'Probabilism', and made it one of the most prominent ideas of their moral system."[2]

The Jesuits have often been accused of having corrupted the "Catholic Christianity" with a pharisaical - rabbinical spirit. They are even accused of having perverted the moral laws of the Gospel into subtle Talmudic formulas.[3]

---

[1] Blaise Pascal, The Provincial Letters, trans. Thomas M'Crie, (New York: Modern Library, 1941), p. 375.

[2] René Fülop-Miller, The Power and Secret of the Jesuits, (New York: The Viking Press, 1930), p. 187.

[3] Ibid., p. 180.

There is in fact a great similarity between the Jesuit moral theology and the prescriptions of the Jewish Mishnah. Many of the cases mentioned in the writings of the Jesuit Fathers cannot be very well differentiated from cases discussed in the Mishnah. For example The Jesuit Gury in his Moral Theology (VII, 672/2) discusses the following:

> "Quirinus decides to steal a length of cloth; he breaks at nightime into a factory, kindles a light, but is careful to avoid all danger of fire. Through some unforeseen circumstance, as, for example, a cat's jumping, he drops his torch on to the litter lying around, and in a short while the whole factory is ablaze and it is only with difficulty that he succeeds in saving his own life. What is the position of Quirinus?
>
> The answer is: he is not responsible, since he had not been able to anticipate this particular risk.... That he was in the act of taking the cloth was not the cause of the fire not did the fact that he was carrying a torch, provided sufficient care were taken, constitute an immediate risk of fire. If, however, the thief was not merely about to take the cloth, but had actually completed the theft...and if, subsequently, through some mischance, as in the lighting of a torch, a fire breaks out, he is bound to make restitutions...."[1]

Similarly in the Mishnah (Chap. II, Example 3) the following case is given:

> "If a dog or a goat jumps off a roof and breaks something, then the damage must be made good since it is in the nature of these animals to jump. If, however, a dog steals a cake, and sets fire to the heap of corn through a live cinder adhering to the cake, then the owner of the dog must make full compensation for the cake but only to the extent of half of the corn."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 181. (quoted in).

[2] Ibid., p. 181-182 (quoted in).

Casuistic arguments have not only been used by the Jews in their Mishnah or the Talmud; writings and arguments of the same nature can be found in the writings of the earlier Greek and Roman philosophers. In principle casuistic arguments whether used by the Jesuits or the Greeks and the Romans amount to the same thing. In Nichomachean Ethics Aristotle examines the case when a virtuous man can be the friend of an evil man or vice versa.[1]

In fact, the

> "Academic and particularly the later Stoic Schools adduced and discussed in the course of their future examinations into the interrelationship of various virtues, a number of 'cases' which bear a striking correspondence to the Talmudic and Jesuit moral problems."[2]

Diogenes the Babylonian and Antippa of Tarsus have used abundantly such discussions. Hecato's work Of Duty is full of such arguments. He asks and gives answers to questions like the following:

> "Is it proper that a righteous man in times of acute famine should fail to provide his slaves with subsistence?" or "If, at sea, it is necessary to throw anything overboard, which should be sacrificed first, a valuable horse or a cheap slave?"[3]

Carneades of Cyrene questions the possibility of killing a man in order to save one's own life and finds it not only advantageous but also moral.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 187 (quoted in)

[2] Ibid., p. 183.

[3] Ibid., p. 183 (quoted in)

Cicero in his De Officiis gives also a clear expression to the maxims of casuistry; he claims that

> "Justice may sometimes require that a man may violate and fail to observe an obligation to restore property entrusted to him, to fulfill a promise he has made, or other duties imposed upon him by integrity and justice ...."

> "It may be that a man, while of sound mind, entrusted thee with his sword, and then, while no longer possessed of his reason, asks that the sword be delivered again to him; in such a case it would be wrongful to restore it to him, though a duty to restore it."

> "If one who has entrusted money to thy keeping it is about to engage thy country in war, must thou restore to him that which was entrusted to thee? I think not; else wouldst thou offend against the state, which by thee should be held most dear."

> "Thus, there are many matters of conduct which, in themselves, appear to be morally good, but which become morally bad in certain circumstances. To keep ones pledge, to abide by ones contracts, to restore property entrusted to one, all these things cease to be morally good with a change of interest...." "Who is there that would not hold that it is not necessary to fulfill a promise extracted by fear or secured by cunning"[1]

In the west casuistry has been mainly the fruit of the transplanted

> "Stoic morality during the early Roman Empire upon the ethical code of the Pentateuch in the Talmudic and post Talmudic explications of the exiled Jews and upon the received Christian morality during the period when the agricultural organization of European Society was breaking down."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 184 (quoted in)

[2] Cohen, op. cit., p. 265.

Thus analogies of casuistry can be found in the New Testament as well as in the writings of Greek philosophers and Roman Law. As the ethical teaching became more elaborate, casuistic cases became more numerous and systematic. They can be found in the form of "Cases of Conscience" well before the XIII century in the writings of the Church Fathers - Justine, Athanasius or Augustine.[1]

The elaboration of the Church Creed and practice led to further development of these "cases of conscience"; which reached completeness in the Great Scholastic thought of the 13th century.

In the late Middle Ages more importance was given to moral casuistry mainly because of the increasing significance of confession. As early as the 14th century numerous works on moral theology had appeared: Pupilla Oculi of the chancellor, Juan de Burgo; the Summa Silvestrina of the Dominican monk, Sylvester de Priero, the Confessionale of the Franciscan monk, Bartolomeo de Chaymin, and the Summula confessorum of St. Antoninus.[2]

At this time casuistry was mainly used for the classification of sins and the manuals of conduct were prepared chiefly as guides for the confessionals (Summa Artesana in 1330, Summa Pisana in 1442,

---

[1] Baldwin (ed.), op. cit., p. 157.

[2] Miller, op. cit., p. 165.

Summa Roselica in 1495 and Summa Pacifica in 1574).[1]

These manuals dealt with the minutest details of conduct and the subtlest refinements of motive and intension. St. Alphonsus became the pioneer in the case method. He adopted the "Medula" of Herman Busembaum which is largely casuistical.[2]

Cicero as well as Aristotle was considered as one of the most important of the early authorities. The Jesuits in particular had paid a great homage to Cicero.

> The "Platonic conception of the ideal significance of morality and the binding nature of the conscience necessarily leads to autonomy; the Aristotelean intellectualization of the conscience must logically lead to a heteronomous morality. If, for instance, the good is really the mere outcome of a decision of the reason, and if the conscience cannot afford absolute certainty, but merely a certain degree of probability, then the case will repeatedly arise in which man, owing to the imperfection of his mind will be unable to arrive at a clear judgment regarding his duties. He will fall into 'doubts of conscience' and immediately be tempted to ask a fellow-being for his judgment and to conform to this judgment. Cicero had already expressed the view that it is not inexpedient, 'in cases in which doubt exists, to seek the counsel of learned and experienced men, and to ascertain their judgment on what duty demands in individual cases....'".[3]

---

[1] Baldwin (ed.), op. cit., p. 265.

[2] "Casuistry", The Catholic Encyclopedia Dictionary, (New York: The Gilmary Society, 1930), p. 176.

[3] Miller, op. cit., p. 185.

But as the ancient philosophers, the Jesuits too could not agree on some of the "cases" and different Fathers developed different answers. Thus it is claimed that

> "To the question whether the wise man who had received bad money in exchange for good might give this money in settlement of a debt, Diogeness of Seleucia replied in the affirmative, Antipater of Tarsus in the negative, and Cicero, who quoted this discussion, upheld, for his part, the view of Antipater."[1]

If Diogeness and Antipater, Escobar and Sanchez differed over the right decision, how could the Fathers agree?

This gave rise to the theory of Probabilism which claimed that any opinion is probable if it "is based on grounds of some importance". It was evident then that

> "at times a single authority, if it commands respect, can render an opinion probable; a man who is entirely devoted to the pursuit of knowledge will not identify himself with an opinion unless it rests on good and adequate grounds."[2]

In the same way Sanchez claims that the probable opinion is one

> "which does not rest on superficial grounds; the view of a wise and learned man is, however, not a superficial but rather, a material ground."[3]

To the Jesuits the doctrine of Probabilism was of great use. For with this doctrine it was possible to regard certain actions as

---

[1] Ibid., p. 185.

[2] Ibid., p. 192-193.

[3] Ibid., p. 193. (quoted in)

guiltless, and there always existed the possibility of appealing to the less severe opinion, which permitted something prohibited.

For, according to the great casuist, Escobar:

> "although the opinion supported by the stronger grounds is more perfect and certain, for the reason that, as it is impossible to arrive at absolute certainty, God does not demand it. God demands of us only that we should act with such moral certainty as is to be found in the probable opinion. It would be an intolerant burden and would cause endless scruples if we were, in fact, to be bound always to follow the more probable opinion."[1]

As we have mentioned before, the Jesuits were not the sole originators of this doctrine. The theory of Probabilism can be detected in fact back to Aristotle. According to the Nichomachean Ethics,

> "moral actions are nothing else than the outcome of mental deliberation, of a reasoned choice between two contradictory possibilities, between good and evil. The will, which has to decide in favour of one or the other of these two alternatives, is, however, guided and determined in this process by the reason."[2]

Carneades of Cyrene, proceeding from the fundamental hypothesis of Aristotle developed the thesis that none of our ideas can be assumed as true; they can be only probable. This probability of ideas could then, according to him be classified in various degrees.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 193 (quoted in)

[2] Ibid., p. 188.

Basing himself on Aristotelian logic, Carneades had laid down the principle

> "That, while the possibility of error was always present, this fact could not rob us of certainty in action. For, since nothing in life is absolutely certain, and we can indeed, assent to no idea in the sense that we declare it to be 'true', nevertheless, we can always find a way out on the grounds of 'strong probability'."[1]

This point of view was taken by the Scholastics and finally in the year 1577, it was put in its final theologio-philosophical form by a Dominician monk, Bartholomeus of Medina. In his commentary on Thomas Aquinas' "Prima Secundae", Medina wrote that:

> "although, logically, the more probable view was always the more certain, yet man was not always bound to take the more certain course; man might also follow that decision which has been acknowledged as merely 'good and certain'."[2]

Towards the end of the 16th century Vasquez became the leading casuist and spokesman of Probabilism among the Jesuits. Pascal refers

---

[1] Ibid., p. 187 (quoted in)

[2] Ibid., p. 187 (quoted in)
Exponents of the Probabilist system were to be found not only among the Catholic theologians, but also among Protestant writers; thus, for example the Lutheran theologian, George Calixtus, wrote, in almost the identical words of Medina: "If, of two opinions the one is more probable, it is not necessary to choose the more probable; the less probable may be adopted, if it is supported by strong arguments or has authority." (loc. cit., p. 188).
Even the protestant clergy were studying "Cases of Conscience". The best known among the Protestant authors was a certain William Perkins from the Cambridge University (loc. cit., p. 166).

to Escobar as the real founder of the theory of Probabilism. According to him the Jesuits claim that Escobar had compiled his Moral theology from twenty four of the Jesuit fathers,

> "and thus founds an anology, in his preface, between his book and 'that in the Apocalypse which was sealed with seven seals', and states that 'Jesus presents it thus sealed to the four living creatures, Suarez, Vasquez, Molina, and Valencia, in the presence of the four-and twenty Jesuits who represent the four-and-twenty elders."[1]

The Jesuits by the end of the 16th century had become the ardent defenders of this doctrine. As a consequence the Jesuit moral theology recognizes that moral laws and rules do not have and cannot be regarded as having an absolute and binding force.

> "This shifting of morality to the plane of choice governed by reason became the basic idea of the whole Jesuit moral system, and through it the Jesuits arrived directly at that intellectualist conception of the conscience which is such a distinctive feature of their philosophy."[2]

There is really nothing medieval about casuistry, it is still used today. It has an unavowed place in the literature of the social sciences. It is used in psychology, in economy as well as in political science. Most of all it is used by the judges as an all continuing discipline. And above all it is used in politics.

> "The methodology of casuistry had commended itself to modern law teachers and sociologists as in other centuries

---

[1] Pascal, op. cit., p. 377 (quoted in).

[2] Miller, op. cit., p. 189.

> to the Jesuits and Talmudists, because of the case with which concrete problems are assimilated and vitalized in the student's experience."[1]

The Jesuits were known as

> "men distinguished for learning and sagacity, who are all under the guidance of divine wisdom - a surer guide than all philosophy."[2]

The doctrine of Probabilism, full of contradictory maxims and of diametrically opposed ideas gave the Jesuits a power greater than they ever had. The maxims of Probabilism could be held and used whenever their use was appropriate. Since the Jesuits wanted to satisfy all men, and since some men were more pious than other, the use of casuistical arguments was most appropriate. For the Jesuits their sound training in casuistry, was necessary to match all diversities.

> "By this policy they keep all their friends, and defended themselves against all their foes; for, when charged with extreme laxity, they have nothing more to do than produce their austere directors, with some books which they have written on the severity of the Christian code of morals; and simple people, or those who never look below the surface of things are quite satisfied with these proofs of the falsity of the accusation.
>
> Thus they are prepared for all sorts of persons, and so ready are they to suit the supply to demand, that when they happen to be in any part of the world where the doctrine

---

[1] Cohen, op. cit., p. 266.

[2] Pascal, op. cit., p. 372 (quoted in)

> of a crucified God is accounted foolishness, they suppress the offence of the cross, and preach only a glorious and not suffering Jesus Christ ...."[1]

Thus a person or an organization may follow the opinion which suits them best. And all that is needed for a thing to be good is the opinion of a "single grave doctor".[2]

Filiutius (a Jesuit of Rome) claimed that

> "it is allowable to follow the less probable opinion, even though it be the less safe one".[3]

Emanuel Sa in his Aphorism also claimed that

> "a person may do what he considers allowable according to a probable opinion, though the contrary may be the safer one. The opinion of a single grave doctor is all that requisite."[4]

It does not matter then, whether an opinion is less probable, it does not also matter that two doctors disagree about an opinion. Diana claims that

> "Ponce and Sanchez hold opposite views of it (a subject); but, as they are both learned men, each renders his own opinion probable."[5]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 374-375 (quoted in)

[2] Ibid., p. 382 (quoted in)

[3] Ibid., p. 382 (quoted in)

[4] Ibid., p. 383 (quoted in)

[5] Ibid., p. 382 (quoted in)

Then it would be enough to be a learned man to make an opinion good. Any probable opinion can be applied or accepted as true. Then anyone who considers himself a learned man or who is considered by at least one person as a learned man can act freely according to his own opinions and these opinions, no matter what they are must be respected by others as probable and therefore acceptable. At first sight such kind of a moral theology is not far from a situation where there is no moral theology - an absolute freedom of the conscience. There are though some rules to this kind of a game.

The Jesuit may answer to the questions put to him just as he pleases, or rather just as it may please those who ask for advice. The rules to such answers have been put by "Fathers Layman, Vasquez, Sanchez, and the four-and-twenty worthies. In the words of Layman they are the following:

> "A doctor, on being consulted, may give an advice, not only probable according to his own opinion, but contrary to his own opinion, provided this judgment happens to be more favorable or more agreeable to the person that consults him - si forte haec favorabilior seu exoptatior sit. Nay, I go further, and say, that there would be nothing unreasonable in his giving those who consult him a judgment held to be probable by some learned person, even though he should be satisfied in his own mind that it is absolutely false."[1]

---

[1] Pascal, op. cit., p. 383 (quoted in)

Thus if they cannot account for a thing on one side, they can always account for it on the other side, and anybody acting under such an opinion can never sin and will always be absolved.[1]

Let us take the example of fasting. To the question: "Is a man obliged to fast"? There are several answers. Escobar in his Treatise I, example 13, No. 67 states: "If a man cannot sleep without taking his supper is he bound to fast? Answer: By no means."[2 & 3] And if fasting upsets the order of the meals, the person is not obliged to fast, "because no person is obliged to change the order of his means."[4]

In example No. 38 of the same Treatise, Escobar discusses the following case:

> "If a man doubt whether he is twenty-one years old, is be obliged to fast? No. But suppose I were to be twenty-one tonight an hour after midnight, and tomorrow were the fast, would I be obliged to fast tomorrow? No: for you were at liberty to eat as much as you pleased for an hour after midnight, nor being till then fully twenty-one; and therefore having a right to break the fast day, you are not obliged to keep it."[5]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 374.

[2] Escobar had compiled the Moral Theology from the twenty-four Fathers. He was considered the real founder of the Probabilist system.

[3] Pascal , op. cit., p. 378 (quoted in)

[4] Ibid., p. 378 (quoted in)

[5] Ibid., p. 378 (quoted in)

Another method by which apparent contradictions were reconciled was by the interpretation of some phrases. Let us take the word assassin. Pope Gregory XIV decided that assassins

> "are not worthy to enjoy the benefit of sanctuary in churches, and ought to be dragged out of them; and yet our four-and-twenty elders affirm that 'the penalty of this bull is not incurred by all those that kill in treachery.' .....If the word assassin is interpreted as follows, all the contradictions will be disposed of. 'Are assassins unworthy of sanctuary in churches? Yes, by the bull of Gregory XIV they are. But by the word assassins we understand those that have received money to murder one, for the deed; but such as kill without taking any reward for the deed, but merely to oblige their friends, do not come under the category of assassins'."[1]

The Popes had also denounced the excommunication of monks who put aside their canonicals; the casuists put it as a question: "On what occasion may a monk lay aside his religious habits without incurring excommunication?"

A number of cases is given to show how this can be done. Among others the following is the best:

> "If he has laid it aside for an infamous purpose, such as to pick pockets or to go incognito into haunts of profligacy, meaning shortly to resume it."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 388 (quoted in)

[2] Ibid., p. 390 (quoted in)

The question of Simony is treated in the same way. Thus Valencia in his Treatise Vol. III, p. 2039 claims the following:

> "If a person gives a temporal in exchange for a spiritual good" - that is, if he gives money for a benefice - "and gives the money as the price of the benefice, it is manifest simony. But if he gives it merely as the motive which inclines the will of the patron to confer on him the living, it is not simony, even though the person who confers it considers and expects the money as the principal object."[1]

It should be mentioned that on this issue there is a straightforward contradiction with St. Thomas.[2] But this did not upset any of the casuists; it was not taken too hard that the probable opinions were different from the opinions of the ideologists or Fathers of the Church (St. Thomas or St. Augustine).

The Jesuits claimed that

> "The Fathers were good enough for the morality of their own times; but they lived too far back for that of the present age, which is no longer regulated by them, but by the modern casuists."[3]

In fact Diana decided the following:

> "Are beneficiaries bound to restore their revenue when guilty of mal-appropriation of it? The ancients would say yes, but the moderns say no; let us therefore, adhere to the latter opinion, which relieves from the obligation of restitution."[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 394 (quoted in)

[2] St. Thomas was opposed to it, for he expressly taught that it was always simony to give a spiritual for a temporal good, if the temporal was the end in view.

[3] Pascal, op. cit., p. 384-385 (quoted in) (See also the names of the casuists given).

[4] Ibid., p. 391 (quoted in)

Not only the Fathers of the Church could be contradicted but the Popes too, were contradicted whenever it was necessary. Diana remarks that:

> "To the decision of these three popes, which is contrary to my opinion, I answer, that they spoke in this way by adhering to the affirmative side - which, in fact, even in my judgment, is probable; but it does not follow from this that the negative may not have its probability too."[1]

He further claims:

> "The Pope, I grant, has said it as the head of the Church; but his decision does not extend beyond the sphere of the probability of his own opinion."[2]

It is not surprising then that Castro Palao, another Jesuit should claim that:

> "Beyond all dispute, a monk who has a probable opinion of his own, is not bound to obey his superior, though the opinion of the latter is the more probable. For the monk is at liberty to adopt the opinion which is more agreeable to himself - quae sibi gratior fuerit - as Sanchez says. And though the order of his superior be just, that does not oblige you to obey him, for it is not just at all points or in every respect - non undequaque juste praecepti - but only probably so; and consequently, you are only probably bound to obey him, and probably not bound - probabiliter, obligatus, et probabiliter deobligatus."[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 391 (quoted in)

[2] Ibid., p. 391 (quoted in)

[3] Ibid., p. 397 (quoted in)

Some critics maintain that the Jesuits had adopted this moral system to please people. They were afraid to loose members and so applied flexible principles to please them. According to Pascal, if Jesuits were asked why there was so much leniancy in their moral system they would answer:

> "Men have arrived at such a pitch of corruption nowadays that unable to make them come to us, we must e'en go to them, otherwise they would cast us off altogether; and what is worse, they would become perfect castaways. It is to retain such characters as these that our casuists have taken under consideration the vices to which people of various conditions are addicted, with the view of laying down maxims which, while they cannot be said to violate the truth, are so gentle that he must be a very impracticable subject indeed who is not pleased with them. The grand project of our Society, for the good of religion, is never to repulse any one, let him be what he may, and so avoid driving people to despair."[1]

Even from the above argument it is evident that the ingenuity of the casuistic arguments lies in proving that both the negative and the positive answer to the same question is right. Thus Father Bauny claims that

> "No law can be made to oblige the curates to say mass every day; for such a law would unquestionably (haud dubie) expose them to the danger of saying it sometimes in mortal sin."[2 & 3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 393 (quoted in)

[2] Ibid., p. 396 (quoted in)

[3] See for further details on father Bauny Pascal, loc. cit., p. 399.

Duelling was considered forbidden and taking part in a duel was a mortal sin, but to the casuists there was always a way out. Navarre solved the problem in the following manner:

> "....it is advisable to avoid employing the method of duel, if it is possible to settle the affair by privately killing our enemy; for, by this means, we escape at once from exposing our life in the combat, and from participating in the sin which our opponent would have committed by fighting the duel"[1]

It should be mentioned here that by killing privately they did not mean killing treacherously; for according to Escobar:

> "We call it killing in treachery, when the person who is slain had no reason to suspect such a fate. He, therefore, that slays his enemy cannot be said to kill him in treachery, even though the blow should be given insidiously and behind his back....." and "he that kills his own enemy whom he was reconciled under a promise of never again attempting his life, cannot be absolutely said to kill in treachery, unless there was between them the strictest friendship....."[2]

The principle of intention has played a very important role in supporting such arguments as the following: Henriquez claimed that

> "It is perfectly right to kill a person who has given us a box on the ear, although he should run away, provided it is not done through hatred or revenge, and there is no danger of giving occasion thereby to murders of a gross kind and hurtful to society."[3]

---

[1] Pascal, op. cit., p. 408 (quoted in)

[2] Ibid., p. 409 (quoted in)

[3] Ibid., p. 410 (quoted in)

These are but a few of the thousands and thousands of casuistical arguments. Casuistical arguments have been employed by that Scholastic philosophers all through the Middle Ages. They have been brought almost to perfection by the Scholastics of the Period of Decline. But it is not difficult to show that the old casuists can hardly match their modern heirs - the Communist leaders and revisionists - in their artful and over-subtle use of this old science. More than casuistry, Probabilism can be identified with the Communist movements. It must be emphasized that Marxian Communism has been converted into a creed and faith in Soviet Russia. As such, it must have its church, its priests and its commandments as well as its sanctions and sacrileges. The Communist Party seems to be playing the role of the church with its members comprising the priesthood, while the place of God seems to be taken by the aspiration to achieve the ultimate "withering away" of the state. And as far as the commandments and the sins are concerned; they change with the time and the place and circumstances, which is where casuistry has an important role to play in Soviet Russia.

To show how closely alike Scholastic casuistry and Soviet thought are and can be, it is necessary first to show what was Scholasticism like and what were its methods in its Period of Decline.

Scholasticism During The Period of Decline

In the Soviet Union Scholasticism is defined as:

> "1. A general term denoting the religious - idealistic philosophy of the Middle Ages, playing the role of the 'Maid of Theology'. Inimical to scientific and objective knowledge, Scholasticism, indulged in casuistical arguments of the 'Saint Writings' (Scriptures) and of the 'Fathers of the Church'. It perverted the works of philosophers, especially those of Aristotle and others."

> "From the eleventh century on, the Scholastics had misunderstandings and arguments which were fought mainly between the nominalists and the realists. During this period elements of materialism were introduced into Scholasticism."

> "The Catholic Church till today uses Scholasticism widely as a weapon in the struggle against science and culture. Scholasticism in its rebirth is used by the philosophers of Imperialism (see Neominism)."

> "2. The word Scholasticism usually denoted all kinds of things having nothing to do with life; useless and formal argumentation."[1]

From the above the antagonism and suspicion of the Communists towards Scholasticism, can be seen. They are not the only ones. Numerous scholars in the west have felt the same way. De Wulf complains that "Scholastic has become synonym for the out-of-date, the naive, the scientifically worthless."[2]

---

[1] Skolastika", Entsiklopednii Slovar (Encyclopedical Dictionary), (Moskva: Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia, 1955), Vol. III., p. 354. (translation mine).

[2] Maurice DeWulf, Scholastic Philosophy, trans. P. Coffey, (New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1956), p. 3.

It has been argued against Scholasticism as the

> "supersticious and senseless race of professors (genus hominum superstitiosum it vecors) who make their pupils swear never to contradict Aristotle."[1]

To Bacon Scholastic science and philosophy had seemed to have degenerated into "subtle, vain and unwholesome questions...."[2]

The Encyclopedists of the 18th century claimed that it was too bad for all "who devoted themselves to those miserable scholastic subtleties that consist more in words than things."[3]

It has also been claimed that

> "centuries at the bottom of that gloomy abyss (the Middle Ages) did not add a single idea to man's intellectual inheritance."[4]

> "Notwithstanding the controversies aroused by our general manner of conceiving Scholasticism and the philosophy of the Middle Ages, we are still convinced that during those centuries there was throughout the schools of the West a body of doctrines common to the majority of the great medieval doctors, and that those common teachings serve to characterize Scholastic philosophy."[5]

---

[1] Laurentius Valla, Dialecticae Disputationes, Praefatio, (Paris: Opera, 1540), p. 643, cited in De Wulf, loc. cit., p. 3.

[2] Roger Bacon, De Augmentis Scientiarum, I.1, c. 9, cited in De Wulf, loc. cit., p. 4.

[3] "Aristotle", Encyclopedia des Sciences, des Arts et Métiers, published by Diderot and d'Alembert, n.d.(pp. 663-664) cited in De Wulf, loc. cit., p. 4.

[4] H.A. Taine, History of English Literature, (n.p.n.n. n.d.) V.I., pp. 223 and 225, cited in De Wulf, loc. cit., p. 5.

[5] Maurice De Wulf, History of Medieval Philosophy, trans. P. Coffey (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1909), pp. v-vi.

The fact is that both philosophy and theology in the Middle Ages were placed under the power and the guidance of the Catholic Church. Cousin claimed that

> "the Scholastic philosophy could not be anything else that the product of thought in the service of the reigning Credo, and under the supervision of ecclesiastical authority."[1]

According to Dr. Wulf there is a difference between Scholastic philosophy and Scholastic theology. For,

> "theology is not a study of the light of human intelligence; it is at least in its dogmatic portion a systematization of certain doctrines that a positive revelation has delivered to us."[2]

The possible difference between theology and philosophy may be that one - theology - is a revealed word, a way of authority, whereas the other concerns reason and scientific proofs. But both, Scholastic philosophy and Scholastic theology, according to De Wulf, ran in parallel from the start to their culmination, to their decay.

Scholasticism then was a phenomenon, appearing at a certain stage of Western civilization. The term Scholasticism would designate a method as well as a system. Furthermore we can claim that it is applied to theology as well as to philosophy.

---

[1] Victor Cousin, Histoire Generale de la philosophie, (Paris: n.n., 1864), p. 189.

[2] De Wulf, Scholastic Philosophy, p. 7.

De Wulf quotes Ueberweg-Heinze claiming that

> "Scholasticism is a philosophy in the service of the existing Church doctrine, or at least in such dependence on it that, in a common domain, the latter holds the ruling place as supreme standard."[1]

It is evident then that one can argue that Scholastic philosophy has been largely inspired by religion and that in many instances it has been so closely related to theology that it is impossible to tell the one from the other.

In the Middle Ages philosophy was so often subjected to theology and to the Church, and it is not surprising that reason was also subject to authority. The free play of logic was greatly circumscribed. The conclusions of Reason were predetermined and the initiative of the individual thinker had to be confined to formal details in his treatment of questions or propositions. Reason was to avoid running counter to a dogma which was supposed to be certain; truth could not contradict truth.

In general we can claim that the major assumptions of the Scholastic philosophy were the following.

The Scholastics insisted on the distinction between philosophy and theology, and in the compulsory subordination of the former to the latter. They also believed in the pluralism of substantial

---

[1] De Wulf, Scholastic Philosophy, p. 53.

beings, in the idea of actuality and potentiality of matter and form as well as in the transcendence of a personal God.

Absolute objective truth could be attained by the human mind (or at least the thought of the divine could be re-thought). To the Scholastics the first principles of premisses of truth were revealed in Scripture and developed as Catholic doctrine by the Fathers of the Church.

In cases where philosophy extended beyond theology, truths were assertained by reflection on the teachings of Aristotle. In general it can be claimed that all through the eighth to the fifteenth century the Scholastics were "under the omnipotent direction of the Catholic Church which accepted one faith and practiced one religion."[1]

Actually all through the Middle Ages there have been deviations, changes and developments, the details of which we cannot discuss here.[2] The fact is that the general trend of thought, the main assumptions as well as methods have remained the same.

> However "Scholastic philosophy will denote, not all philosophy of the Middle Ages but one definite synthesis, the most widespread, the most ably defended, and the best constructed in the intellectual history of the Western Middle Ages. It is, if you will, its philosophy par excellence, but not its only philosophy."[3]

---

[1] Edwin Seligman (ed.), "Scholasticism", Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, (New York: MacMillan Co., 1934), Vol. 13, p. 580.

[2] See for further detail: Maurice de Wulf, History of Medieval Philosophy, Etienne Gilson, History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950),

[3] Ibid., p. 51.

It is not surprising then that Bertrand Russell should claim that

> "During the past four hundred years the history of metaphysics outside the scholastic tradition, has been that of a continuous succession of diverse and mutually incompatible systems each of which has been put forward as the final solution of all metaphysical problems, and has then failed to fulfill the hopes that had been entertained of it. And if Scholastic philosophy has preserved throughout a relative stability and unanimity, the hostile critic may be disposed to explain this on the grounds that it is not a genuine philosophy but a 'party line' imposed from the above by ecclesiastical authority for the defense of Catholic Dogma."[1]

De Wulf claims that

> "If the Scholastics are a party, is it any wonder that the party should have its troublesome members whom it distrusts, as well as its open adversaries on whom it wages an unending war?"[2]

Scholasticism was more than anything else the product of its own proper methods and system. In the following pages we will try to define scholasticism in terms of its method.

---

[1] Bertrand Russell, Science and Metaphysics, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1958), p. 10.

[2] De Wulf, Scholastic Philosophy, p. 50.

There is no doubt that all through the centuries Scholasticism applied an analytico-synthetic[1] method to philosophical problems. Systematization, syllogism and Commentaries were also used. The chief material was furnished by the works of Aristotle.

To individual questions a triadic process was applied. It consisted of a prefatory statement of pros and cons of the thesis. The solution of the question formed the body (corpus) of the article, and then at the end there were the replies to the objections. Later dialectic syllogism and historical arguments were added. Syllogism was very often used in the body of an argument to strengthen the argument.[2] Another peculiarity of the Scholastic method was the mixture of the philosophical questions with the theological ones.[3]

---

[1]For example: "The theory of exemplarism studies created essences in their relations to the creating intelligence; cosmic teleology follows out in all their applications the adaptations of beings to the ends they must attain; doctrines such as that on individuation are treated successively from analytic and from synthetic points of view." Thus the analytico-synthetic method was according to De Wulf "The only one that harmonizes fully with the solutions offered us on the philosophical problems dealt with." (De Wulf, Scholastic Philosophy, p. 21).

[2]This can best be seen in the works of Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus or William of Occam.

[3]See the 18 questions of the Summae Theologica of Thomas Aquinas.

We can see then, that the Scholastic methods are mainly based upon the mastery of a vocabulary, a terminology and on the manipulation of arguments. Diderot was partially right when he claimed that

> "Scholasticism is not so much a special philosophy as a certain dry, stiff sort of arguing, to which Aristotelianism incrusted by hundreds of puerilious questions has been reduced."[1]

Furthermore, Scholasticism is often considered as a

> "heap of formulae, with ideas, drawing consequences ad infinitum without verifying principles, these remaining above explanation."[2]

Scholasticism then may mean a

> "mode of thought characterized by excessive refinement and subtlety; the making of formal distinction without end and without special point."[3]

Thus it has happened that the term Scholasticism has acquired a special meaning, denoting a kind of reflection and rigidity of method. The term would also denote excessive intellectual subtlety, or a punctiliously systematic development of minute details devoid of real significance. It should be stressed though that the above

---

[1] Diderot, Works, French ed., (Paris, n.n., n.d.), Vol. 19, p. 362.

[2] Fouillée, History of Philosophy, (Paris: n.n., 1883), p. 198.

[3] John Dewey, "Scholasticism", Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, (New York: MacMillan 1902), Vol. II., p. 492.

mentioned defects are not peculiar to historic Scholasticism;[1] they are typical mainly of its decadent period. It is this period that we will deal with. From the ancient world the Scholastics had adopted the conception of a fixed universal structure which guided the scientific as well as the political developments of the centuries. They believed in the immutable structure of natural law, in the universal and timeless form which revealed itself equally and impartially to any human intelligence. The Scholastics also believed in the equality of human dignity and the equal powers of each individual.

The ancient Greeks were mainly concerned with trying to discover the intelligible essence which brought about the world of change. With the rise of Christianity, the idea of nature as sacramental; symbolic or spiritual truth was added to Greek rationalism.

The Scholastics of the Middle Ages tried to preserve what they knew from the Greeks and tried to add the few new things they could learn from Aristotle in particular. Then the "new sciences" were born; these did not really conflict with the idea of the Divine Providence, but they led to a variety of attitudes towards the relationship between reason and faith. Internal contradictions, contra-

---

[1] In this paper historic Scholasticism is not dealt with; it is only the Period of Decline that is relevant and therefore only this period will be examined.

dictions with authorities as well as contradictions with observed facts led eventually to radical criticism of the Aristotelian system and the Decline of Scholasticism.

In the eighth, nineth and tenth centuries Scholasticism contained only the underdeveloped germs of problems and controversies. During the eleventh and twelfth centuries, logic came widely into use and helped to elucidate theological dogmas with the help of which some "truths" were established. The thirteenth century was the Great Age of Scholasticism. The foremost doctor was Thomas Aquinas. In fact it can be claimed that medieval Scholasticism came into its most complete expression through the works of Thomas Aquinas, who achieved a formal and comprehensive synthesis of Aristotelian and Christian belief. But Thomas Aquinas was not a promoter of Scientific learning, "to him the scientific knowledge of nature was in Aristotle, whose doctrine he had learned, commented upon and accepted."[1] Thus in the thirteenth century an attempt was made to construct a comprehensive system based upon the alliance of philosophy and theology.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries this alliance of philosophy and theology broke down and the Scholastic system underwent

---

[1] Gilson, History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages, p. 381.

formal perfecting. The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are usually termed the period of the "Decline of Scholasticism".[1 & 2]

The decay of Scholastic philosophy was mainly due to

> "the dearth of philosophers, relaxation of studies and the steady inroads of anti-scholastic systems."[3]

The philosophers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries often indulged in absurd dialectic discussions. In the Scholastic language and methods there was an advanced stage of decay. There was

> "a subdistinction and syllogism and counter-syllogism; a veritable parody of the procedure in honour among the great scholastics: a spectacle which Stockl has described in accurate if not very elegant language, as Scholasticism suffocated by its own luxuriance."[4]

In the beginning of the fourteenth century the Thomists and Scotists schools monopolized all attention. But soon, a few years afterwards, a third school that of William of Occam successfully rivaled both.[5]

---

[1] De Wulf, History of Medieval Philosophy, p. 413 sq. Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages.

[2] Gilson, History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages, p. 480 sq.

[3] De Wulf, History of Medieval Philosophy, p. 413.

[4] Ibid., p. 415.

[5] For further details refer to De Wulf, History of Medieval Philosophy, p. 413 sq. and E. Gilson, History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages, p. 480 sq.

The Scotist School was never very widespread. Duns Scotus was a Franciscan. The knowledge of his philosophy has come to us mainly from his commentaries on others: Peter Lombard's Sententiae and his controversies with the followers of Thomas Aquinas. Scotus mainly argued that our ability to conceive the possibility of God's existence is a proof of God's existence.[1] The disciples of Scotus accentuated his formalism and multiplied his abstractions. Their language became cumbersome and confusing. Their methods, too, were awkward and rigid. The Scotists largely contributed to the decadence of Scholasticism. In fact their refusal to accept the teachings of the humanists during the Renaissance was so stubborn that they were often called "dunces".[2]

The Thomists, according to de Wulf, remained the better part of the Scholastics in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. But their influence too slowly waned.

The Terminists School led by William Occam became the most powerful and influential. William of Occam was also, like Duns Scotus, a Franciscan. But he argued that only particulars exist,

---

[1] For further details see De Wulf, Scholastic Philosophy and History of Medieval Philosophy.

[2] Jess Stein (ed.) The Basic Everyday Encyclopedia, (New York: Random House, 1954), p. 163.

that the universal is only a mental name. He also denied the distinction between essence and existence. Occam argued that God's existence could not be proved and that it is important to recognize that moral laws are good because they are willed by God. Besides Scotus, Terminism or revived Nominalism as the doctrine of William of Occam was called, was mainly responsible for the decay of the Scholastic system. The leading features of the Terminist school, according to de Wulf, were excessive simplicity, sceptism and an encroachment of logic.

Terminism was mainly a reaction against the fourteenth century formalism of Duns Scotus and his chimerical entities.

> "Taking as its motto, pluralitas nonest ponenda sine necessitate, terminism made a veritable hecatomb of metaphysical notions; and in doing so it often merely disfigured what it thought to simplify."[1]

Terminism, as far as certitude was concerned was essentially dogmatic in its teaching. But there was an anxiety restricted to the sphere of those truths that can be demonstrated by reason. There was as well a tendency to depress fallible reason and to exalt the infallible faith. This attitude De Wulf calls scepticism.

---

[1] De Wulf, History of Medieval Philosophy, p. 418.

This scepticism

> "fostered an unwholesome attitude of thought, a distrust that was dangerous and unwarrantable; it excited among the students in the following period the suspicion that scholasticism was wholly and entirely unsound and that its teaching ought to be rejected in globo."[1]

The Terminists furthermore are accused of having mutilated metaphysics, and after destroying it of having

> "used the debris for the decoration of logic. What they declared illusory in the world of realities they subjected to excessive analysis in the world of mental representations. And so terminism gradually developed the tendency to exaggerate the role of dialectic. William of Occam himself made much of such logico-grammatical notions as suppositio, significatio, etc. but he observed some moderation. His disciples, however, seizing on the Summulae of Petrus Hispanus, abandoned themselves to an orgy of quibbling and sophism which the Paris Faculty of Arts was powerless to remedy. And with all the logician's fondness for terminology, the Occamists multiplied endlessly new words, barbarisms and classifications."[2]

Thus it is not surprising that the Renaissance philosophers turned against the barbaric language and terminology as well as subtleties which the Occamist School had introduced into the Scholastic philosophy.

> "As for the men of science, they heaped ridicule on the Scholastics and the Aristotelians, who despite all the new discoveries still sought to preserve the false conception of the universe formulated by Aristotle and accepted for many centuries."[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 419.

[2] Ibid., pp. 419-420.

[3] Seligman (ed.), op. cit., Vol. 13, p. 581.

The later Middle Ages witnessed then a total wreck of Scholastic philosophy and theology. This decline was due mainly to the final divorce of reason and Revelation. According to Gilson,

> "to have faith is to assert to something because it is revealed by God. And now, what is it to have science? It is to assert to something which we perceive as true in the natural light of reason."[1]

But everywhere in the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages the natural order depended and leaned on the supernatural order. In fact the material order depended completely, especially as far as its origin and end were concerned on the supernatural order.

> "Nowhere was the culpable ignorance of the scholastics regarding contemporary thought so disastrous as in the domain of the natural sciences."[2]

The scholastics were shaken and taken aback by the new discoveries; for the new discoveries brought with them a revolution in physical and mechanical astronomy; they affected physics and chemistry as well as biology. The ptolemic geocentric system was substituted by the heliocentric system of Copernicus. The Aristotelian theory of solid celestial spheres was destroyed by the observations of the freely travelling stars through space.

---

[1] Etienne Gilson, Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950), p. 72.

[2] De Wulf, Scholastic Philosophy .....p. 148.

Aristotle had attempted to account for the motion of the planets and he claimed that heavenly bodies moved in uniform circular motion. But Kepler formulated and proved the laws of elliptic motion and Newton discovered the laws of universal gravity which unified all astronomical phenomena.

New stars were discovered by Galileo. The displacement of sun-spots on the solar disc gave evidence of the rotary motion of the sun, which till then was considered as fixed. Venus as well as the Moon had its phases. Saturn had a ring and Jupiter had eleven moons. Comets were no more the astronomical wills-of-the-wisp but stars travelling through interplanetary space.

Through the invention of the barometer the weight of air was discovered. Heat and cold were no more distinct properties of matter but different degrees of the same property of matter.

Many, if not all of the scientific theories which the medieval mind had incorporated into its views of the world were destroyed and discredited. Man's conception of the world had changed. In the years before the scientific discoveries

> "Philosophers and theologians all agreed in a universal determinism of an astrological kind. St. Thomas considered that the movements of the lower bodies were caused by those of the heavenly bodies and that all the phenomena of the sublunary world are ruled by the movements of the stars."[1]

---

[1] Etienne Gilson, The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936), p. 366.

But

> "now, if there are spots in the sun, the heavenly bodies are neither immutable nor perfect; if stars appear and disappear, they cannot be ingerobilia et incorruptibilia; and if all those special prerogatives of the heavenly bodies, as compared with terrestrial substances, are only so many chimeras, the stars can have no influence on the fate and fortunes of sublunary life and change."[1]

How did the scholastics account for these differences?

> "When attacked in all their strongholds by the Renaissance colition, the scholastics did not know how to defend themselves; they, committed the double blunder of ignoring the history of contemporary philosophy and holding aloof from the advances of the special sciences .... And as for the new theories, the scholastics of this period, with very rare exceptions, not only abstained from refuting them but deliberately avoided studying them. Contemptuous towards all rivals and full of self-sufficiency, they ostentatiously imprisoned themselves within the circumscribed and shrinking sphere of their own barren speculations."[2]

The methods used in these "barren speculations" were mainly those of casuistry. With the help of casuistical arguments the scholastics tried to retain the old beliefs and guard their place in the medieval world.

Things went so far that Erasmus claimed:

> "They will smother me beneath six hundred dogmas; they will call me heretic and they are nevertheless Folly's

---

[1] De Wulf, History of Medieval Philosophy, p. 582.

[2] Ibid., p. 487.

> servants. They are surrounded with a bodyguard of definitions, conclusions, propositions explicit and propositions implicit. Those more fully initiated further whether God can become the substance of a woman, of an ass, of a pumpkin, and whether, if so, a pumpkin could work miracles, or be crucified ... they are looking in utter darkness for that which has no existence whatever."[1]

According to Koestler

> "the medieval landscape is grown over with the weeds of astrology and alchemy, which invade the ruins of the abandoned sciences. When building started again, they got mixed up in the materials, and it took them centuries to clean them out.
>
> .... The union between the Church and the Stagirite, which had started with so much promise, turned out to be a misalliance after all."[2]

The sciences of the ancient Greeks were taken by the medieval scholars as truth mainly because the Greeks had come so much earlier and had collected all that could be known.

> "Since there was only one answer to every question, and the ancients had filled in all the answers, the edifice of knowledge was completed. If the answers did not happen to fit the facts, the error was blamed on the scribes who copied the ancient manuscripts."[3]

The thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth century scientific discoveries were not really taken seriously enough to bring about

---

[1] Arthur Koestler, The Sleepwalkers, (Hutchinson of London, 1959), pp. 110-111 (quoted in).

[2] Ibid., p. 111.

[3] Koestler, op. cit., p. 216.

serious conflicts. The first open conflict between the Church and science started with the Galileo trial. It created a popular belief that science stood for freedom and the Church for oppression of thought.

The attitude of the scholastics of the 17th century was far from what the events of the times demanded. Instead of welcoming the new scientific theories, they shrank back into their out-of-date theories. Professor of Mathematics at Pisa, under Scholastic influence refused to look through a telescope at the moons of Jupiter, having "proved" their non-existence by a-priori means. Galileo claimed that the Aristotelians were men "who rather than change the heavens of Aristotle, will impudently persist in denying the heavens they see in Nature."[1]

To the scholastics of these centuries Aristotelianism was the bases of all they knew and taught. They just could not alter a single thing without being obliged to alter the whole. This may be why they so obstinately defended the discredited astronomy and physics of the thirteenth century.

> "The religious controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries put theologians into a most unfortunate state of mind. They were always attacking and defending. They pictured

---

[1] De Wulf, History of Medieval Philosophy, p. 503.

themselves as the garrison of a fort surrounded by hostile forces. All such pictures express half-truths. That is why they are so popular. But they are dangerous. This particular picture fostered a pugnacious party spirit which really expresses an ultimate lack of faith. They dared not modify, because they shirked the task of disengaging their spiritual messages from the associations of a particular imagery ...."[1]

Thus Urban VIII claimed that

"a hypothesis which works must not necessarily have anything to do with reality for there may be alternative explanations of how the Lord Almighty produces the phenomena in question."[2]

At the University of Paris the statutes of 1600 installed Aristotelianism as the official teaching. The Aristotelians were asked to put a stop to the new theories.

"In 1624 the Faculty of Theology requested Parliament[3] to forbid certain philosophico-scientific thesis in which an art student named John Bitaud attacked Aristotle. In 1671 the king himself interfered, and there was another appeal to Parliament to insist on the doctrines of Aristotle being accepted."[4]

This petition or decree ordained

"that the said Aristotle be always followed and taught by the said professors and regents of the said university, without their being obliged, however, to read or to know

---

[1] A.N. Whitehead, Science and the Modern World, (Cambridge, 1953), p. 435.

[2] Urban VIII (1623-44), permitted the persecution of Galileo (1633) and decried Jansenism (1644).

[3] Probably the term "Parliament" refers to the Estates General.

[4] De Wulf, op. cit., p. 504.

> anything of his philosophy," referring them, for this doctrine, to their copybooks. Then, descending into detail, it went on to speak of heart, nerves, chyle, liver, blood, etc; restored "the entitez, the identitez, the petreitez, the polycarpeitez and other Scotist formulae to their former good fame and renown"; rekindled " the fine in the higher regions of the air, according to, and in pursuance of, descents made upon these places"; and relegated "the comets to the concave side of the moon with the strict injunction never again to venture forth to spy what was going on in the heavens"[1]

Martin Van Velden was prosecuted and tried for having proposed to discuss the system of Copernicus. It was claimed that

> "the system of Copernicus cannot be admitted; it has been rightly rejected as temerarious; because it makes the earth movable and displaces the center of the universe."[2]

This argument is evidently an excellent casuistic argument in itself, it is of the form A implies B, but A is wrong because it implies B, Why? Because it implies B.

The medieval scholastics argued that what Galileo saw through his telescope or what Copernicus or Kepler discovered could not be true; for according to them

> "observation is relied upon whenever it is possible to recognize a certain regularity, whenever something happens ut in pluribus, we can be sure that this regularity

---

[1] J. Féret, L'Aristotelisme et le Cartesianisme" Annuelle Philosophique Chrétienne (1903), pp. 16-17, cited in De Wulf, loc. cit., p. 504.

[2] Antonius Gaudin, Philosophia Juxta inconcussa tutissi, (o.p. Limoges, n.d.) cited in De Wulf, History of Medieval Philosophy, p. 504.

> has a cause and this cause can be none other than the presence of an essence of nature, which, by its operation, always produces the same phenomena. For the same reason the operation of this nature is necessary for it is only to account for the observed regularity that it is posited at all. The connection between conceptions of nature and necessity is so much closer, inasmuch as strictly speaking, the existence of natures is not to be demonstrated; sense perception reveals the existence of things acting from an internal principle, hence from a nature, and to want to reason further would be to set out to prove the known by the unknown."[1]

When the scholastics had finally to accept that there were spots on the surface of the sun and therefore the sun was no more perfect, they argued that

> "Nature is the work of God and makes no mistakes; matter lends itself to form just in so far as its Author wills, no more, no less. When these defectus naturae occur they must have been willed by God with some end in view; human monstrosities, for instance, are born in accordance with the laws that govern fallen nature."[2]

How could the new discoveries be true if

> "to assert the true is to assert what is, and to attribute to each thing the very being which defines it. The being of the thing therefore defines the truth of the thing and the truth of the thing is the foundation of the truth of thought."[3]

---

[1] Gilson, The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy, p. 365.

[2] Etienne Gilson, The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy, p. 369. (Here the Scholastics concerned could fall back upon neo-Platonism.)

[3] Etienne Gilson, The Philosophy of St. Thomas, (London: B. Herder Book Co., 1939), p. 347.

Casuistical arguments had always been used by the scholastics in problems of ethics, aesthetics and metaphysics.

> "Music, writes Thomas Aquinas, depends on the application of mathematical principles, which it cannot, therefore, contravene; but it is not concerned with their foundation, - that is not its affair."[1]

> "Thus the Bible teaches that God created the world in time. To avoid contradicting this dogma, Thomas eliminates the thesis that the world is eternal. But he does maintain that the idea of eternal creation is not contradictory, - because the eternity of the world would not be in opposition to its contingency."[2]

In the domain of ethics the following example illustrates the arguments used by Thomas Aquinas concerning law:

> "as to the proper conclusions of practical reason, neither is the truth or rectitude the same for all, nor, where it is the same, is it equally known by all. Thus it is right and true for all to act according to reason, and from this principle it follows as a proper conclusion, that good entrusted to another should be restored to their owner. Now this is true for the majority of cases; but it may happen in a particular case that it would be injurious, and therefore unreasonable to restore goods held in trust; for instance, if they are claimed for the purpose of fighting against one's country. And this principle will be found to fail the more, according as we descend further into detail, e.g. if one were to say that goods held in trust should be restored with such and such a guarantee, or in such and such a way; because the greater the number of conditions added, the greater the number of ways in which the principle may fail, so that it be not right to restore or not to restore."[3]

---

[1] De Wulf, Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages, p. 168.

[2] Ibid., p. 169. (Here Aquinas shows that he a good student of Aristotle, according to whom the universe is casually but not temporally contingent upon the Prime mover.)

[3] Thomas Aquinas, Summae Theologica, Dominican trans. 1^a 2^{ae}, q. XCIV, Art. 4, p. 48.

These kinds of arguments and others were used to cover up the lost prestige. The following are some arguments proposed by De Wulf in order to explain why the scholastics were behaving in such a manner towards the new science of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

> "If a fanatical 'ipsedixtism' was the reproach of the decadence, the philosophers of the great Scholastic century are free from it .... What guided the scholastics in borrowing from the past was by no means a blind cult, but their thirst after truth for its own sake."[1]

> "Those vices of observation and generalization reached a climax in the hollow and inflated sciences of the epoch of the decadence, and exerted there a most fatal influence on the destinies of scholasticism."[2]

> "The scholastic manuals and compilations of the later Middle Ages are no better than mere counterfeit of the masterly productions of the philosophers of the thirteenth century."[3]

> "Amid the debris of the demolished science there remained untouched quite sufficient data to support the constitutional doctrines of scholasticism."[4]

> "It is sufficiently obvious that philosophers and scientists alike should have closely watched and studied the scientific progress of the time in order to be able to pronounce upon the possibility or impossibility of adapting the new discoveries to the traditional philosophy. That is certainly

---

[1] De Wulf, Scholastic Philosophy, p. 78.

[2] Ibid., p. 88.

[3] Ibid., p. 148.

[4] Ibid., p. 149.

what the princes of Scholasticism would have done had they lived at such a critical turning point in the history of the sciences. We are aware from the well-known and oft-quoted texts that they never meant to give all the scientific theories of their own time the value of established theses, but rather of more or less probable hypotheses whose disproof and rejection would in no wise compromise their metaphysics..."[1]

The old scholastics then, once defeated must have argued in the following fashion:

"The Copernican system of astronomy seems to us to ruin the whole Christian conception of Heaven and Hell, and of the central position of man in the universe and the esteem of the Lord in the universe..... After all, Copernicus laid down no theory as to the location of the hereafter; that could be left to the Christian folklore as theretofore. Similiarly, Newtonian physics had the effect of ruling completely out of the universe any manifestation of divine power in the form of and interference with the even flow of physical action and reaction. This might seem to be a death-blow to the Christian law of divine government and guidance; but it was nothing of the kind. A supreme and omnipotent Being must of course be able to conduct a universe without the backing and filling to which men are accustomed. He would - it now seemed obvious - by preference design it so perfectly that forevermore it would proceed under its own steam. His management and guidance would thus be implicit, put into the whole system at the start and effective throughout every operation. Thus the very laws of motion were only so much more evidence, quite desirable evidence, of the perfection of God's design. So also evolution: God created the universe in six days which we are now to understand as six tremendous periods of time. This is more plausible than six literal days, and is altogether a desirable amendment of the Mosaic Law. Man was created last, as evolution and Genesis agree, and a

---

[1] Ibid., p. 150.

little lower than the angels. That this means also a little higher than the monkeys is a point of no theological concern. God moves in His mysterious ways His wonders to perform."[1]

---

[1] C.E. Ayres, Science the false Messaiah, (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1927), pp. 133-134.

The Scholastic Character of Soviet Marxism and the Role of Casuistry

It is often said that Marxism or Communism is a religion. But Marxism as well as Communism is not a religion in the proper sense of the word; the Communist has no God, no Church, no priests. But if

> "religion is defined as man's relationship to whatever he regards as ultimate or to whatever he trusts most for deliverance from evils and hazards of life, then Communism is undoubtedly religious."[1]

The Communist, like the Christian, Moslem or Buddhist is a man of faith. He is committed to a cause and has an ultimate confidence in that cause and its destiny. The claim has been made that Communism incorporates a whole series of particular Christian doctrines in a secular form.[1]

Both the Communist and the Christian believe in a world which is not as it should be; but which is wicked. The Communist as well as the Christian believes that this corrupted world is a result of some "sin" committed in the earliest days of mankind. To Marxism, it was the introduction of private property. Thus the wickedness of this world is not really due to the wickedness of some individual exploiter, but due to a society as a whole.

---

[1] John Bennett, Christianity and Communism Today, (New York: Association Press, 1960), p. 45.

> "Redemption from the primary and original sin has come about - and here Marx was consciously taking over a Christian heritage - through the atonement of a sinless sacrificial lamb; the proletariat, by its undeserved suffering must pay the prices for the emancipation, not of its own class alone, but of the whole of human society."[1]

Redemption can only be bought through Revelation - Marx's discovery of the law of social development. As in Christianity, this revelation can be found in a sort of Holy Writ. As in Christianity the writings of the one man have a certain authority; infallible and absolute. As in the Roman Church there are secondary authorities who may be used to a greater or lesser extent. The sanctity of the faith in both cases is entrusted to an infallible authority; in one case the Church, in the other the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

For both, the Roman Church and the Central Committee of the Communist Party claim to be the focus of organization and theory and assert their decrees to be the inexhaustible spring of wisdom - whether Christian or Marxist - Leninist.

> "In general the Communist Party figures as a sort of a new 'Church'; this comes out most clearly in the requirements of 'partisanship', to which all Marxist theoreticians are obliged to adhere."[2]

---

[1] Gustav Wetter, Dialectical Materialism, Trans. Peter Heath, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958), p. 559.

[2] Ibid., p. 560.

Thus Communism offers to its adherents not only a goal in life, but also a faith in redemption from all the recognized evils, a guidance, an authority. Sacred Scriptures, Fathers of the Church as well as Saints have their analogues in Communism.

Jules Monnerot in, Sociology and Communism[1] claimed that though it may seem paradoxical to apply religious categories to a philosophy dedicated to materialism and atheism, it is a fact, an evident fact, that dialectical materialism is concerned with more than a mere denial of God.

According to Nikolay Berdyaev

> "the dialectical materialist attribution of 'dialectic' to matter confers on it, not only mental attributes only, but even divine ones. And we find in fact that on such a view matter is eternal, infinite in space and time and internal potency of being, that at a certain stage of development it also acquires mental properties, and that it even has a genuine power of creation, so far as it is capable of bringing forth the higher from the lower, the more perfect from the less perfect, a task which would certainly call for genuine creative power. Matter here appears as a new absolute, a new divinity replacing the transcendent Creator - God, and as such unable to tolerate any other sort of diety by its side. The Communist warfare against religion is not a causal historical misunderstanding, but proceeds from its innermost nature."[2]

Scholastic philosophy as shown in the previous section was interwoven with theology and greatly affected by its religious

---

[1] Jules Monnerot, Sociology and Communism, (London: n.n., 1953), p. 30.

[2] Wetter, op. cit., p. 558. (quoted in)

aspirations. Religion of the Middle Ages has left its permanent imprint on the politics, art, ethics and psychology of the scholastic philosophy.

Scholastic philosophy may be defined as a

> "philosophy placed in the service of doctrine already established by the Church, or at least philosophy placed in such subordination to this doctrine that it becomes the absolute norm for what they have in common."[1]

It may also be asserted that Soviet philosophy is a philosophy placed in the service of doctrine already established by the Party, or at least philosophy placed in such subordination to this doctrine that it becomes the absolute norm for what they have in common.

Scholasticism of the Middle Ages can be called the oldest of all Totalitarian movements. Sydney Hook compares its modern form - Catholicism to Fascism, Nazism or Stalinism. He claims that

> "in every case the mystique is different, but in every case we find present not merely dogmas sacred and profane, rituals of canonization and excommunication, but the desire to revolutionize 'the soul' of man through the directing force of a highly organized minority, using those three great instruments described by Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor - miracle, mystery, and authority - to order a society in behalf of the interests of a bureaucratic hierarchy. Miracle in the form of bread in return for absolute submission; mystery in the form of doctrine to conceal the true source of the bread and the exploitation of those who make it; authority in the form of sacred scriptures, a leader and the secular arm to make doctrinal mysticism acceptable."[2]

---

[1] Maurice De Wulf, Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages, trans. p. Coffey, (New York: Dover Publications, 1956), p. 150.

[2] Sydney Hook, Reason Social Myths and Democracy, (New York: The Humanities Press, 1950), p. 76.

In fact long before Communism was established in Russia Dostoyevsky had claimed:

> "Our people are not only becoming atheists but believe in atheism as if it were a religion."[1]

Sydney Hook further argues that:

> "Marx can claim to have inherited the bequest of classic rationalism as expressed in the social insights of Plato and Aristotle with much greater justification than those of his critics who rant with mystic fervor about the Graeco-Roman whole. For the harmonious organization of natural impulses under the control of reason which according to Plato and Aristotle are essential to good life, is conditioned, according to Marx, by the harmonious organization of natural and economic resources under the rule of intelligence."[2]

Both movements, Catholicism and Bolshevism are strong and powerful mainly because of their theoretical adaptability and practical resourcefulness. Both have their roots in Christian soil. It is often claimed that Communism is a onesided development of the Christian Church, for it has become an anti-Religion, Anti-Church, Anti-God mainly because

---

[1] Wetter claims that mysticism has always been near to the Russian heart. Many Russian intellectuals had adopted Hegel because of the mystical dialectic. "In virtues of this connection one may perhaps venture to assert that the element of 'mysticism' deriving from the dialectic is the very feature in Marxism which had enabled it to attain such sweeping success in Russia." (Wetter, op. cit., p. 553.)

[2] Hook, op. cit., p. 133.

> "... it originates, chiefly through the fault of a Christian world unfaithful to its own principles, in a profound sense of resentment, not only against the Christian world, but - and here lies the tragedy - against Christianity itself."[1]

As we have mentioned above, Communism seems to be nearest to Christianity, and above all to Catholicism - i.e. Scholasticism in its modern form.[2] It would be of some interest to draw a few parallels between some Christian or Scholastic dogmas and principles and those of Communism or Marxism as applied in the Soviet Union.

The Jesuit as a militant Catholic has much in common with the Bolshevik philosopher - who considers himself as the warrior of the true philosophy - the Communist philosophy.

> "The affinity in the forma mentis on either side arises, in effect, from this, that the Soviet philosophers ... base their inquiries not on a philosophical method, but on an explicitly theological one; a method which asks not whether a proposition is true or false in itself, but whether it figures in the corpus of revealed truth issuing from a demonstrated infallible source of dogmatic authority."[3]

---

[1] Jaques Maritain, True Humanism, (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1940), p. 33.

[2] Bennett claims that "It has often been noted that there is a parallel here between Communist thought and practice and Calvinist thought and practice. In both cases there is a doctrine that seems to be a hard determinism. In both cases this doctrine became a fighting creed and a great stimulus to action. In both cases the doctrine has failed to undercut the tendency to moral condemnation of opponents, which presupposes their moral responsibility." (Bennett, op. cit., pp. 37-38.)

[3] Wetter, op. cit., p. 556.

The demonstrated, infallible source, of course, are the Scriptures, the writings of the Fathers of the Church or Marx's writings, further supplemented by the infallible teachings of the Church or the Party itself. The Soviet philosophers, like the Catholic philosophers treat certain propositions of the "church fathers" as admitting of no discussion.

The Scholastics believed in a world which was not inert and static, but full of change and motion. Change, according to them was the real passage from one state to another. To pass from state A to a state B, one must possess beforehand in the state A some of the germs of the state B.

> "This is demanded by the principle to which all that is must be obedient, under the penalty of not being at all. To deny this sort of pre-existence is equivalent to denying change from one state to another, the evolution of reality."[1]

> "The successive stages of change in each of the becoming substances and the recurrence of the same transformations in the corporal world, require the inclinations on the part of each being to follow a definite order in its activity. Such inclination in each substance is immanent finality."[2]

Although Engels had claimed that:

> "Hegel's dialectic is upside down because it is supposed to be the 'self-development' of thought, of which the

---

[1] De Wulf, Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages, p. 200.

[2] Ibid., p. 207.

> dialectic of facts is only a reflection, whereas really the dialectic in our heads is only the reflection of the actual development which is fulfilled in the world of nature and of human history in obedience to dialectical forms."[1]

if the Scholastic principles of change and finality of becoming and being are studied carefully, many common aspects between the dialectical process of Marx and the former can be detected.[2] For,

> "historically and analytically the belief in a 'Naturdialektik' has been a central doctrine of every system of metaphysical idealism from Plotinus to Hegel. Almost every variety of dialectical materialism current today is the outcome of the perversion of scientific standards in the interests of a politically motivated metaphysical idealism."[3]

Dialectical materialism, suggests a conception of motion which is thought of not merely as change of position in space, but as change in the Aristotelian sense - "change" in general.

> "Owing to the above mentioned disappearance of true dialectic from the conceptual scheme of Soviet dialectical materialism, the individual categories have again taken on the values they had in the pre-idealist scheme of things which ultimately goes back to Aristotle, and hence (that) Soviet philosophy has come to share a common pattern with the Aristotelian and Scholastic tradition ...."[4]

---

[1] Carew Hunt, A Guide to Communist Jargon, (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1957), p. 60.

[2] Wetter, op. cit., pp. 396-401 (a detailed treatise of the subject can be found).

[3] Sydney Hook, Dialectical Materialism and Scientific Method, (Manchester: J.B. Foy & Co., 1955), p. 28.

[4] Wetter, op. cit., p. xi.

Communism thus becomes a new sort of religion - a world outlook. Dialectical materialism, furthermore, in the official Soviet creed has become both a combination of world-outlook and a methodology. The subject matter of dialectical materialism, according to Soviet philosophers, consists in the possibility of finding the

> "right orientation in any situation, to understand the inner connection of current events, to forsee their course, and to perceive not only how and in what direction they are developing, but how and in what direction they are bound to develop in the future."[1]

Dialectical materialism then provides Marxism with the most general laws of motion; change and development in Nature, society and science. It is the universal law by which all things are governed, and to which all laws conform. It provides Marxism-Leninism with a mystique and makes it the only explanation of reality, the unitary scientific world - picture.

Communism in present Soviet Russia, with the help of the theory of dialectical process and historical materialism, has become a total philosophy of life. It answers many questions which Christianity has been unable to answer, or has evaded.

> "Despite its campaign against any sort of 'mysticism', dialectical materialism with its doctrine of the 'contradiction' in the world, has restored to its adherents a feeling for the paradox and mystery of the world and thereby prepared the ground for the revival of a truly philosophical 'sense of wonder'." [2]

---

[1] Hunt, op. cit., p. 61.

[2] Wetter, op. cit., p. 552.

Though the Communist interpretation of history is materialistic, nevertheless it is guided by a metaphysical dialectical materialism - which is a fighting creed. It is a creed which forces men to change the structure of the society and of social life.

> "rather than to rationalize them either by identifying the ideal with the real in terms of concrete historical institutions and by piously accepting the existing order, however unjust it may be, as ordained by God."[1]

Thus,

> "the question of bread for myself is a material question; but the question of bread for my neighbors, for everybody, is a spiritual and religious question."[2]

Dialectical materialism has no place for God as the Creator of the Universe, no devotion to the all powerful and omnipotent ruler of the world. Its devotion is a devotion to human goals and a trust in a historical process where God is the process itself.

> "We even think it no exaggeration to maintain that dialectical materialism, in its present day official Soviet form, bears a far greater resemblance to the 'forma mentis' of Scholastics, than to that of Hegelian dialectics, notwithdtanding the presence of certain Hegelian concepts and expressions which are still adhered to, though robbed by the 'materialist inversion' of their idealistic meaning, and accorded an interpretation which is simply that appropriate to ordinary common sense."[3]

---

[1] Bennett, op. cit., pp. 33-34.

[2] Ibid., p. 34 (citing Berdyacu).

[3] Wetter, op. cit., p. 556. (see also Bennett, loc. cit., pp. 33-39).

Furthermore, historical materialism implies an absolutely atheistic position and substitutes the dialectic of history for all transcendent causality and for the universe of Christianity. This dialectic of history replaces the philosophical religion of the Scholastics by a new religion, alive, where man, not God but man alone, and through himself can bring about his salvation. His salvation is exclusively temporal and can therefore be accomplished without God.

> "If it is true that in the dialectic of culture, communism is the final state of anthropocentric rationalism, we see that in virtue of the universality inherent in reason, - even in reason gone mad -, Communism is all embracing, and sets itself against Christianity by pretending to substitute for the universalism of the Mystic Body of Christ its own earthly universalism."[1]

Dialectical materialism is set forth as the creed of Communist Russia. It consists of the same egoistic idealism inherent in Scholasticism, but carried into a materialistic cynism. The claim has been made that the dialectic is not an evolutionary doctrine but just a kind of pre-Darwinian rationalism. It advances a general principle based on a number of observed instances. This general principle, then, it imposes dogmatically on all occurrances. It also insists that history must bear out this principle. The absolute

---

[1] Jaques Maritain, Scholasticism and Politics, (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1940), p. 20.

definition of the nature of causal relations does not allow any empirical analysis, allowing thus only a method of social analysis. This necessarily allows no place for objective knowledge. Thus dialectical philosophy like the Scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages has been primarily concerned with partisanship and not the quest of truth. Like the Scholastics, the dogmatic rationalism of dialectical materialism maintains and supports an absolute theoretical principle. Furthermore its doctrine of economic determinism leads to false conclusions and conflicts with the unexpected economic changes.[1]

It is evident then, that the dialectical method

> "engenders a mythical philosophy of nature and prepares the way for a doctrine of 'two truths' - one ordinary, scientific, and profane, the other esoteric, 'dialectical' and 'higher'."[2]

It has been claimed for example that absolute truth is

> "an absolutely exact agreement of thought with its object, i.e. a content of our knowledge such that neither now nor in the future in consequence of the further development of knowledge can it ever be proved false."[3]

And that

> "All the fundamental theses and an enormous number of lesser tenets of Marxist-Leninist science, and the

---

[1] See also Miller, History and Science (University of California Press, 1939), pp. 150-170.

[2] Hook, op. cit., p. 27.

[3] Wetter, op. cit., p. 514. (citing Reetkevitch).

theory of socialism and the class - struggle are absolutely true. That matter is primary and consciousness derivative, that the collapse of capitalism is inevitable, that the socialist system will follow capitalism as inevitably as day follows night, that the socialist economic system offers unlimited scope for the development of productive forces, etc. - these are all absolute truths, so far confirmed by practice that nothing in the future can ever refute them."[1]

In their turn, the Scholastics claim that human or positive law has a twofold aspect. .....

"the jus gentium, which belongs to all peoples alike, and the jus civile, civil law, which belongs properly to a single state as such. In either case, this human law is simply a derivative from the natural law. And natural law in turn is only the application - to man as a natural creature of the external decree of the uncreated wisdom, lex acterna."[2]

Furthermore,

"the law of nature, or natural human right is that totality of regulations which rests upon the fundamental perfection of the human being; this does not change and cannot change because it abides in the mutual relationship between the essence of God (the solitary support of all reality) and His creatures. The natural law therefore is the participation in the eternal law."

"It follows, then, that each human individual bears in himself a totality of rights and duties, which are the expression of his nature, - that is to say, of his status as a reasonable being. It also follows that the natural precepts of this law, the principles

---

[1] Ibid., p. 515.

[2] De Wulf, op. cit., p. 257.

> of social order, are the same for all men and for all time, and that to destroy them would mean the destruction of man himself. Positive, or human, law cannot violate them. For, as Thomas says, in so far as human law disagrees with the law of nature, it is no longer a law, but a corruption of the law; it is placed outside the scope of human legislation."[1]

It is not difficult to identify the above statement with some of its terms replaced by appropriate terms of the Communist jargon, as any of the usual proclamations of the Party.

The Communists promise a Godless kingdom of God - in the New Order established after the revolution. Their faith in the ultimate triumph of justice over the forces of injustice and evil is as strong as the faith of the Old Testament prophets.

Redemption, too, was promised to the people, but God was replaced by the human being - a reality more finite than God. The faith in the human being and his capacities has led to a kind of "Rationalized idolatry". Communism thus has become an absolute movement of redemption creating an optimism in the people, which leaves them unprepared for the new kinds of evils which may arise in the new Communist Society.

> "The lack of critical attitude toward the new Communist power is evident today, and we have the strange spectacle of an idealism that promises a world that will need no police but is unable to keep its own excessive use of the police under criticism."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 257-258.

[2] Bennett, op. cit., p. 23.

The Communist also believes in sin - the root of all evil which is concentrated in the capitalistic form of property. He neglects all other universally human roots of evil which persist in the Communist state as well as in the Capitalistic one and which will outlive both. This leads to the excommunication of opponents. Hence those who believe in Communism and in its organ - the Party, think themselves absolutely right. We have here a kind of a Party Conscience, very similar to the Moral Conscience of the Scholastics.

Since all authority to the Scholastics was of divine origin, universal principles then became absolute, the moral Conscience then, became merely the application of these universal principles to some particular case.[1] Since all authority and its decrees are infallible, then the "Party Conscience", too, is merely the application of these principles to some particular case. Logic then in both cases is "understood to be the body of laws to which the mind must conform in order to understand science."[2]

By science here we do not mean things concerned with the individual, or characteristics of things we mean knowing things in a necessary and universal manner. Hence if men cannot be persuaded

---

[1] Ibid., p. 23.

[2] Maurice De Wulf, Scholastic Philosophy, p. 140.

to learn science they should be excommunicated. This leads necessarily to the notion of the already mentioned Partisanship.

Lenin had claimed that:

> "In bourgeois society, absence of partisanship merely signifies a nypocritical, wrapped up, passive expression of membership of the party of the well-fed, the party in power, the exploiter's party."[1]

But it has been argued that

> "the principle of partisanship is based on the notion that so far as knowledge of truths is concerned, the proletariat is in a priviledged position; it appears to some extent as the bearer of a new kind of revelation."[2]

Therefore one should adopt the reality of the Proletariat to know the truth. But he should follow the Communist Party, for only the Communist Party is the sole representative of the Proletariat. The Party then is the organ which brings forth the Idea. It generalizes the experiences of the working class in their struggle and thus promotes the development of Marxist-Leninist theory. It is also the Party which applies the Idea to reality and thus transforms reality into the shape of the Idea.

> "The history of the C.P.S.U. represents an organic unification of revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice, the visible incarnation of the ideas of Marxist-Leninism."[3]

---

[1] Wetter, op. cit., p. 268 (quoted in)

[2] Ibid., p. 269.

[3] Quoted in Kommunist

Communist persecutions like religious persecutions have been based on the assumption that the given truth is an absolute truth and that one's own formulation of the doctrine can only be the right one. According to Berdyaev

> "Soviet philosophy is .... more a sort of godless 'theology'. It depends on revelation and the 'holy scriptures'; it bows before the authority of a 'church' and the opinions of the 'fathers'; it distinguishes between 'Orthodoxy' and 'heresy' ... Philosophical discussion here implies no free pursuit of truth, no clash of diverse opinions matched in argument; it consists in the unmasking of heresies and the excommunication of those convicted of them."[1]

As we have seen from the above the similarities between Scholastic and the Communist philosophies are many, especially in so far as their character and structure are concerned. The differences as far as universals are concerned are also numerous. The basic assumptions underlying both philosophies are totally different.

It may be said that insofar as method and theology are concerned there is a striking parallelism between Catholicism and Soviet thought. Furthermore it is not difficult to detect that as far as their conceptual schemes and manner of stating problems is concerned there is a great agreement. There is also a wide-ranging correspondence between certain fundamental categories of thought and lines

---

[1] Wetter, op. cit., p. 274. (quoted in).

of inquiry in Soviet philosophy and Thomism or Catholicism.[1]

> "Indeed, the curse put upon the dialectic by its transference to the realm of Nature, like the special meanings attached to the Stalinist categories of 'possibility and actuality', are directly responsible for the fact that in contemporary Soviet dialectical materialism we find ourselves dealing with a mode of thought that is internally far more akin to the Aristotelian and Scholastic doctrines of act and potency than to the Hegelian dialectic."[2]

The Scholastic theory of the categories of act and potency fit easily into materialistic dialectics. There is a great affinity with the Scholastic doctrin of Mutatio Substantialis of the theory of transition from quantitative to qualitative change.[3] Both philosophies have a corresponding notion of the concept of contingency in the theory of categories.

> "When the Soviet philosopher disputes whether space-time continuum of relativity theory can be regarded as form, and matter as its content, the Thomist immediately feels tempted to enter the fray from the stand-point of Aristotelian holomorphism. When the Soviet psychologists argue whether mental activity can be a special process distinct from physiological processes, and yet still have its substratum in the material organism of the human brain, the scholastic again finds it easy to intervene in the controversy and to point out to the Soviet thinkers that, on the strength of certain principles they accept (motion is impossible without a substantial substratum) they

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 366-371 for further details.

[2] Ibid., p. 557.

[3] The Hegelian tone of this doctrine has been remarked upon by Prof. R. Puccetti.

> are effectively obliged to push on and postulate a spiritual substance to support this process. In the field of epistemology dialectical materialism goes on far, that in treating the concept and its formation by abstraction, it ever claims to have originated this very definitely Thomist view."[1]

Communism has been described as a Christian heresy[2]. Monnerot has called it "20th century Islam"[3]. And also as an anti-church, a perversion of Christianity[4]. One authority suggests that Communism is

> "just the modern version of the old Scholastic futility that defined the nature of things in terms of their visible motions and then explained their motion as the consequences of the things' natures. What barks and bites is a dog, and if you would know why it barks and bites, I will tell you. It is because it is a dog."[5]

Despite all the parallelism which may be claimed, the two philosophies are irreconcilable. The parallelism can be drawn and established only in the formal sphere. And it is this that we are concerned with.

As mentioned earlier, the Scholastics and the Communists resemble each other most in their methods and practices, i.e. in their ways of arguing for their own truth and against the truth of their

---

[1] Ibid., p. 557.

[2] Maritain, op. cit., pp. 12-15.

[3] Monnerot, op. cit.,

[4] Wetter, op. cit., 559.

[5] Miller, op. cit., p. 170.

foes - the method of casuistry. There is also much in common between the methods of persecution devised by the Inquisition in the late Middle Ages and those of the N.K.V.D. or the G.P.U. - its more recent equivalent.[1] Only the latter is more refined, subtle and better developed, for it had all the material available to learn from.

Both are based and draw their strength from a dogma. Stalin had very often used the term Talmudism instead of Dogmatism. In the Short Philosophical Dictionary the term Talmudism is defined as "the uncritical acceptance of dogma without considering the conditions of its application"; that is, the notion that Marxism-Leninism constitutes a body of fixed principles which supplies "ready-made solutions" to any problem that arises. The dictionary points out that Marx and Engels always insisted that their teaching was "not a dogma, but a guide to action", that Lenin fought against the dogmatic vulgarization of Marxism, and that Stalin had done the same.

Marxist-Leninist theory opposes to dogmatism

> "creative Marxism, which is here defined as 'truly revolutionary Marxism', 'a guide to revolutionary action' as 'a progressive science which does not stand still but moves forward with life itself and moves life forward'."[2]

---

[1] The G.P.U., M.G.B. and other organizations have been absorbed into the apparatuses of the Union Republics, but the functions are still performed.

[2] Hunt, op. cit., p. 65.

Both use the same excuses for the mistakes they have made. Thus it is held that

> "various polemics and controversies of the medieval scholastics lose most if not all their meaning when taken out of their historical setting: those problems have developed from epoch to epoch, and their very evolutions are a proof that scholasticism has steadily moved with the march of thought, however slow may have been the stages of its progress."[1]

But Stalin also claimed that the Marxist-Leninist creed

> "should not be regarded as a collection of formulae which 'will serve for every period and country, for every possible contingency'."

> "Again, an article in the Cominform Journal of August 4th 1950 pointed out that whereas 'in the forties of the last century .... Marx and Engels had concluded that a socialist revolution could not be victorious in a single country, and that it would be victorious only as a result of a joint blow in all or in most of the civilized countries ... Lenin, proceeding from Marxist theory, came to the conclusion that in the new conditions of development the socialist revolution could prove fully victorious in any given country.' The article declared that these conclusions 'not only contradict but exclude each other', but proceeded to condemn those 'dogmatists and Talmudists' who argued that one or the other must therefore be incorrect, seeing that each was valid for its own period, the first for that of pre-monopoly Capitalism, and the second for that of monopoly-Capitalism."[2]

---

[1] De Wulf, Scholastic Philosophy, p. 187.

[2] Hunt, op. cit., p. 66.

Such arguments have filled the Party's publications and have been accepted in the same way as the casuistical arguments of Escobat, Molina or Sanchez.[1]

The Communists use such arguments whenever they meet difficulties and contradictions, or whenever the Marxist-Leninist doctrine is not exactly what they need at the given moment. They use it not only in philosophical questions but also in science, ethics, psychology or art. In the following discussion we will attempt to show some of these arguments in the different fields.

> "The Communists have developed propaganda to a fine art, and their brass hand is never silent. As they are seeking to reach the masses, much of what they say is so fantastic that the only difficulty in answering it is to know where to begin. There is always a temptation to use any argument, however worthless so long as there is a chance that it will convince someone."[2]

---

[1] Prof. Joseph Malone has suggested an excellent example of casuistry which can be found in Stalin's writings in the 1920's: "Objectively regarded, the struggle of the merchants and middle-class intellectuals for the independence of Egypt is a revolutionary struggle, notwithstanding the middle-class origin and position of the nationalist leaders and notwithstanding their opposition to Socialism; while the struggle of the Labour government in England to hold Egypt in subjection to England is a reactionary struggle notwithstanding the working-class origin of those Labour ministers ..... and notwithstanding their so called 'Socialist opinions'."

[2] Carew Hunt, The Theory and Practice of Communism, (London: Geoffrey Bles 1957), p. vi.

It is not difficult to see why this has happened. As mentioned before, the dialectic process is the central core of all Soviet philosophy. But the process of dialectics being too idealistic attributes to matter divine qualities. There is therefore a basic contradiction in the whole system.

> "Hence it comes about that dialectical materialism not only proclaims in its teaching that contradiction is the most essential element of reality, but also exemplifies a single vast contradiction on its own account."[1]

In June 1947, at a conference of philosophers, Zhdanov declared that:

> "Our Party long ago discovered... that particular form of revealing and overcoming the contradictions of socialist society, for such contradictions exist and philosophy cannot avoid dealing with them.... In our Soviet society, where antagonistic classes have been liquidated, the struggle between the old and the new, and consequently the development from the lower to the higher, proceeds not in the form of struggle between antagonistic classes and cataclysm, as is the case under capitalism, but in the form of criticism and self-criticism, which is the real motive force of our development..... This is incontestably a new aspect of movement, a new type of development, a new dialectical law."[2]

This principle of contradiction can be found anywhere in the Middle Age manuals of casuistry, it is in fact an example of casuistry

---

[1] Wetter, op. cit., p. 551.

[2] Pravda, July 30th 1947, quoted in Hunt, A Guide to Communist Jargon, p. 48.

itself. Similar arguments, characteristic of Communist partisans are well portrayed by Koestler in his novel Darkness at Noon where the old Communist Ivanov argues the following:

> "Every year several million people are killed quite pointlessly by epidemics and other natural catastrophies. And we should shrink from sacrificing a few hundred thousand for the most promising experiment in history? Not to mention the legions of those who die of under-nourishment and tuberculosis in coal and quicksilver mines, rice fields, and cotton plantations. No one takes any notice of them; nobody asks why or what for; but if we shoot a few thousand objectively harmful people, the humanitarians all over the world foam at the mouth. Yes, we liquidated the parasitic part of the peasantry and let it die of starvation. It was a surgical operation which had to be done once and for all; but in the good old days before the Revolution just as many died in any dry-year-only senselessly and pointlessly."[1]

The Inquisition also believed that it "functioned" for the good of humanity.

The Communists argue in the same way that since economic force is assumed to be the only real force in society, all other movements must be its manifestation, and there should and would exist no conflicts with the economic advances. But it happens that there is a conflict, especially in the political sphere. New hypotheses are then added

> "defining the order of economic progress as a succession of overlapping but incompatible economic systems, for

---

[1] Arthur Koestler, Darkness at Noon, (Penguin Signet Edition), pp. 116-117, quoted in Bennett, op. cit., p. 85.

> example, agricultural, mercantile, industrial systems, and since each system is supposed to carry its peculiar political structure, the revolutionary shift from one economy to another is accompanied by a struggle between outgoing and incoming political systems."[1]

In both cases values and rules as well as laws can be changed, simply because of "historical necessity".

> "Like the religious fundamentalists who see in every new scientific discovery a confirmation of some Biblical text, some orthodox dialectical materialists see in the progress of modern science a progressive vindication of the doctrine of the founding fathers."[2]

Similar arguments are made in De Wulf's Scholastic Philosophy in which he claims that the scientific theories of the founding fathers of the church were not wrong but were interpreted in the wrong way. He claims that

> "we are aware from well known and often quoted texts that they (the fathers of the Church, Thomas) never meant to give all the scientific theories of their own time the value of established thesis, but rather of more or less probable hypothesis whose disproof and rejection would in nowise compromise their metaphysics."[3]

In the same way a well-known Marxist claims that

> "From the dynamics of relativity, motion and man become equivalent. This conclusion; which required all the refinements of mathematical technique of Michaelson and

---

[1] Miller, op. cit., p. 26.

[2] Hook, op. cit., p. 26.

[3] De Wulf, op. cit., p. 150-151.

> genius of Einstein to demonstrate in the twentieth century, was grasped in principle by Marx and Engels before the middle of the nineteenth century."[1]

The similarity of both arguments is striking. As the scholastics, the Communists met great difficulties when they were faced with modern advances in the science. In the case of the Marxists, the problem was the dialectic process. Since it is the dialectic process which determines all, and since nothing can be true unless it is conformed by the dialectical process, then even scientific discoveries are forced under the laws of the dialectic. This led to much misunderstanding and trouble in the history of Soviet science.

With the discovery of the atom and atomic structure Marxist materialism met serious problems in philosophy. The advances in physics and mathematics, especially in the field of relativity theory and quantum physics brought much damage to the philosophical position established by dialectical materialism.

The Soviet philosophers tried to prove "that modern science affords a dazzling confirmation of dialectical materialism."[2] In the field of quantum physics the Soviet philosophers claimed that modern physics confirmed in all ways dialectical materialism and that

---

[1] J.D. Bernal, Aspects of Dialectical Materialism, (London, 1934, n.n.), p. 101.

[2] Wetter, op. cit., p. 406.

"its entire content confronts the scientist with the task of consciously applying dialectical materialism to the investigation of Nature."[1]

In fact the whole discussion concerned with refuting the Western theories of Quantum physics has nothing to do with the antithesis or thesis, it lies rather in the conflict between an idealist or positivistic epistemology and a realistic one.[2]

During Stalin's life the relativity theory was in disgrace. Its rejection had gone originally so far that even the facts discovered through relativity theory proper, such as the relativity (or the dependence on the observer's standpoint) of lengths and intervals, was doubted. In fact there was even an opposition to the relativity principle of Galileo.

A.N. Maximov was the main spokesman against the relativity theory. He had "shown" that the theory was false, in fact he was the same person who had "shown" the quantum theory as false. After Stalin's death, Maximov was accused of

"having taken up a 'vulgarizing' and 'subjectivist' attitude, which had led him to 'nihilistic views about one of the most important theories in modern physics'."[3]

---

[1] M.E. Omelyanovsky, Filosofskie Voprosy Kvantovou Mekaniki, Moskva 1956), p. 33.

[2] For further details see Wetter, op. cit., pp. 405-415.

[3] Ibid., p. 420. (quoted in)

In the field of Chemistry things were no better. The main issue was structural chemistry. The reaction was mainly against the Resonance theory put forward by the American chemist Linus Pauling. The second issue was that of the theory of mesomerism developed by a British chemist, Ingold[1]. Articles like "On a Machist Theory in Chemistry and its Propagandists" filled the press. The Resonance theory was accused of "subjective idealism, agnosticism and mechanism".[2]

In cosmogony the problem was the same.[3] Arguments like the following were supplied:

> "There can be no motion without a substantial substratum. But any such substantial substratum can consist only of mass, i.e. matter. Hence all motion, all becoming, is necessarily bound up with matter. Hence there can be no other reality apart from matter, and philosophical materialism is proved."[4]

The problem of the expanding and the oscillating universe was approached in the same manner. Thus, according to Barabashev, all the Western tendency in explaining the universe was a "false and absolutely untenable speculation, remote from all genuine science."

---

[1] For details refer to Wetter's _loc. cit._, pp. 432-436.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 434.

[3] This period may have witnessed a display of Soviet patriotism. Butlerou's theories were an opportunity to defy the West.

[4] _Ibid._, p. 437. (quoted in)

> "Because such theories are completely untenable and wholly at variance with dialectical materialism, since they either lead ... to the assumption of an act of creation, or they presuppose the appearance of new material bodies and new space in the course of the expansion of the universe and their destruction and disappearance into nothing during the phase of contraction. It is evident that both these assumptions are unscientific anti-dialectical and lead to open and undisguised popery."[1]

The greatest and most spectacular trouble arouse in connection with the problem of inheritance.[2] In this field the ideological pressure was felt most and Soviet science in the field of biology got involved itself with dialectical materialism rather deeply. The problem mainly consisted in the advocation of a New Theory of Inheritance by Lysenko and Michurin as opposed to the classical Mendelian proposition. It has been stated that

> "Michurinism, as their form of genetics is called, is largely based on ancient superstitions which the advance of scientific knowledge has left behind; in any event, it is less a branch of science comprising a basis of facts, than a branch of ideology, a doctrine which it is sought to impose upon facts."[3]

Till Stalin's death Lysenko's theory was the official creed in biology, it was regarded as the embodiment of materialism and a conquest

---

[1] Barabashev, The Struggle against Idealism in the field of Cosmology and Cosmolgenical Hypothesis, see also Wetter, loc. cit., p. 438.

[2] For further details refer to Huxley, Soviet Genetics and World Science, London: Ghatto and Windus, 1949, pp. 455-469.

[3] Ibid., p. viii.

of idealism. It was claimed to constitute one of the most important constituents in the scientific foundation of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook.

In August 1948 an entire session of the Lenin Academy of Agronomic Sciences was arranged to discuss Lysenko's report "The situation in biological sciences". The opposition was strong, namely that of professor Zhebrak - the president of the White Russian Academy of Sciences. At the meeting Lysenko's first words were:

> "The Central Committee of the Party examined my report and approved of it."[1]

The earnest applause and ovation were followed by a no less earnest shift of the adherents of the Mendelian-Morgan theory to Michurinism.

The shift was soon followed by a confession signed by Professor Zhebrak and published in Pravda. Zhebrak claimed that

> "so long as two schools of thought in Soviet genetics were recognized by the Party and controversies between them were reckoned to constitute fruitful discussion of theoretical problems, I have been obstinate in defending my own views ... But now, having convinced myself that the principles of Michurinism in Soviet genetics have been approved by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., I no longer find it possible for myself, as a party member to persist in these opinions, which have been declared erroneous by the Central Committee of our Party."[2]

---

[1] Pravda, 10th August, 1948 ("O Polozhenii Biologicheskich nauk") see also Wetter, loc. cit., p. 191. and Huxley, loc. cit., pp. 37-39.

[2] Pravda, 15th August, 1948.

Soon a final statement was issued by the Praesidium ("To the prosperity of our progressive science".) It claimed the following:

> "Michurin's materialist direction in biology is the only acceptable form of science, because it is based on dialectical materialism and on the revolutionary principle of changing Nature for the benefit of the people. Weismannite - Morganist idealist teaching is pseudo-scientific, because it is founded on the notion of the divine origin of the world and assumes eternal and unalterable scientific laws. The struggle between the two ideas has taken the form of the ideological class-struggle between socialism and capitalism on the international scale, and between the majority of Soviet scientists who have retained traces of bourgeois ideology, on the smaller scale. There is no place for compromise. Michurinism and Morgan-Weismannism cannot be reconciled."[1]

One cannot but be reminded of the trial of Galileo in 1632. As a result of long trials and warnings Galileo too wrote a confession which was much like that of professor Zhebrak's, for he claimed

> "I, Galileo Galilei, son of later Vincenzio Galilei, of Florence, aged 70 years, being brought to judgment .... abandon the false opinions which maintain that the Sun is the center and immovable ... and I will not hold, defend, or teach the said false doctrine in any manner."[2]

It should be mentioned that there is very much common between the procedures at such trials, the trials of the so called "heretics", scientific heretics - as carried out by the O.G.P.U. and the

---

[1] Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R., a statement published by the Praesidium ("To the Prosperity of our progressive science") see also Huxley, loc. cit., p. 39.

[2] Philip Cane, Giants of Science, (New York: Pyramid Books, 1961), p. 51.

Inquisition.

In both cases the charges against the accused are not communicated to him, and the accused is asked to guess what he may have done.

Arthur Koestler claims that

> "The 'inquisitorial' character of the O.G.P.U. methods is more than a figure of political jargon. The absolute secrecy enjoined on the accused regarding the proceedings and even the fact that he is under investigation; the absence of lawyers for defense, and the assumption that he is guilty unless proved innocent; the methods of psychological pressure, the alternation between threats and paternal reassurance, and above all, the metaphysical axiom of the 'union of wills' between Church and penitent are only more salient features which the O.G.P.U. copied after thorough study of the Inquisition's methods and procedure."[1]

The same problems were extended into the fields of Anthropology and Sociology or Psychology. Education therefore experienced a grave ideological impact. It is impossible to consider all the reforms in textbooks, methods and teaching staff. In the following chapter Polytechnical education and the corresponding reforms in this field will be treated.

---

[1] Arthur Koestler, The Sleepwalkers, (Hutchinson of London, 1959), p. 484, see also pp. 485-495.

CHAPTER III

SOVIET EDUCATIONAL REFORMS AND CASUISTAL METHODS

Reforms in Polytechnical Education

The Party has changed its educational views through the past forty years many times, but real, abrupt changes have taken place three times: - once, right after the revolution, in the early 1920's, the second time in the early 1930's and the third time in 1950.[1 & 2]

In the 1920's the Communists did not have to start from the beginning. From the Russia of the Tzars, the Soviet regime inherited an intellectual tradition and a respect for learning. It also inherited a certain academic and scientific excellence.[3]

---

[1] There is a slight disagreement as to the periods. De Witt in Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R., National Science Foundation, 1961, has used the above division. So did Bereday in The Politics of Soviet Education, Praeger, New York, 1960. But I. Nikodimov, O Polytechnitcheskom Obrazovanii v SSSR, (Polytechnical Education in the U.S.S.R.), Institute on the Study of U.S.S.R., Munich 1957, claims that Polytechnical education in the early 1930's did not disappear but was really stressed and it was only in the mid-1930's when the concept was forgotten and pushed away. As far as the 1950's period is concerned there too, is a slight disagreement.

[2] Another one is coming through now.

[3] At the secondary level, the four prevailing types of State-controlled schools (gymnasia, pro-gymnasia, real school, and commercial schools) were primarily designed to prepare a few students - estimated by the Soviet Union to be about 7 percent of the schools population in the 1914-1915.

Although education was available to a minority, it was good, and much of the higher scientific and technological training was comparable to the best western education. The educational system, as it was, was designed for only a few. The Russian peasants were illiterate, backward and ignorant.[1] Furthermore, any teaching, whether in the gymnasia, schools or training schools followed classical and highly authoritarian methods. The students enjoyed no freedom in the classroom, no choice of subjects.

The Revolution of 1917 brought an abrupt, overwhelming change in education. A new order was established and with it a new educational system appeared. Through all these changes the ideas of Communist education, Marxist education, the working-class education and above all polytechnical education have played a decisive role in the shaping of Soviet educational practices.

The revolution was not merely a political or an economic one, it was basically a psychological and moral revolution. In the beginning it was a revolution in the attitude of the people toward the needs and possibilities of life. In the early 1920's the Party was

---

[1] It is estimated by the Soviet Union that in Russia before 1917 illiteracy was between 60-70 percent. The Gymnasia, progymnasia, real schools, and commercial schools prepared only a few students - estimated to be about 7 percent of the school population in 1914-1915. (Education in the U.S.S.R. (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1957), p. 13.)

faced with many problems in education - the major one being the reshaping of attitudes. The 1920's thus became a period of experimentation, of trial and error.

Progressivism took an upper hand in the Soviet educational philosophy of that period and those reforming and progressive men who were hampered in every possible way by the Tzar's regime were actively and officially promoted by the Bolshevik regime.[1] Also the methods and ideas of progressivism were in high favor for they aided the new regime to demolish old institutions and make a clear break with the past; the old habits of discipline and hierarchy had to be destroyed. Together with Marxist educational views, these ideas and methods played an important if not a decisive role in Soviet schools of the 1920's period.

> "The history of Soviet education, aside from the plethora of enthusiastic experiments of all types, shows two principal concerns: a. the development in children of elemental virtues of the socially conscious and independently active citizen, and b. the provision of the gigantic quantities of qualified technical workers needed for the industrial construction."[2]

---

[1] This fact influenced many liberal intellectuals to lend their cooperation to the Bolshevik government.

[2] Robert S. Cohen, "On the Marxist Philosophy of Education", Modern Philosophies and Education, The 54th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. (1955), p. 203.

In the official documents, Commissar Lunacharsky[1] stated:

> "The two chief present problems of social education are: (1) The development of public economy with reference to Socialist reconstruction in general and the efficiency of labor in particular; (2) The development of the population in the spirit of communism."

The aims of education were set forth as follows:

> "(1) The union of general culture with efficiency of labor and power to share in public life; (2) supply of the actual needs of national economy by preparation of workers in different branches and categories of qualifications; (3) meeting the needs of different localities and different kinds of workers."[2]

It is hardly surprising then, that progressive education was adopted, for theoretically it could satisfy those conditions. The post revolutionary Soviet psychologists too, had ideas much resembling those of the Western psychologists.[3] The child was considered

---

[1] Anatole V. Lunacharsky was the Commissar of Education in the early 1920's, but was condemned in the 1936 purges.

[2] John Dewey, Impressions of Soviet Russia, (New York: New Republic Inc., 1929), p. 87. (quoted in)

[3] They were mainly behaviorists. This school was founded by J.B. Watson in 1913 and reduced the field of psychological study to behavioral responses, especially in a stimulus-response situation. Thinking thus was regarded as implicit behaviour whereas emotions were regarded as implicit reactions. Conditioned reflex replaced instinct theories and theories of inheritance of behaviour patterns or special abilities posited by other schools.

inherently good and could be shaped by his environment. In general it was considered that the new socialist society could itself, without any elaborate institutions educate its citizens appropriately. Thus great reliance was placed upon the child's initiative, self-reliance and freedom. Progressive education was practiced almost to the point of the withering away of the school.[1]

The Soviet philosopher and educator, V. N. Shulgin wrote:

> "In my opinion, there will be no school in the future Communist society. The child will go immediately into social work. There he will find no pedagogues, but a work director, who will be a sufficiently cultured person, and one who knows how to handle children. More correctly, we will all be pedagogues. The child will go directly from social work to industrial work, and from there to the library, where he will find answers to all the questions which interest him. We are approaching closer to this all the time."[2 & 3]

---

[1] During this period Soviet educationists drew heavily on the philosophy of John Dewey. See George Z. F. Bereday, William W. Brickman, Gerald H. Read. (eds.) The Changing Soviet School, (Boston: The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1960), pp. 64-67.

[2] W.W. Rostow, The Dynamics of Soviet Society, (U.S.A.: New American Library, 1954), p. 108. (quoted in)

[3] V.N. Shulgin was the director of the Marx-Engels Institute of Pedagogy. In 1931 the Institute was dissolved and Shulgin and several others of his followers were either purged or liquidated in other ways; S.T. Shatsky and Paul Blonsky were some of the influential Soviet educators purged in the 1936 trials.

It can be seen that the central problem of the soviet educators was the production of a new mentality. Their belief in the reality of a science of society as a basis for diagnosis of all social ills and their belief in a new, absolute ideology - "economic determinism".[1] was to help them.

> "Hence, from the Communist standpoint, the problem was not only that of replacing capitalistic by collectivistic economic institutions, but also one of substituting a collective mentality for the individualistic psychology inherited from the 'Bourjui' epoch - a psychology which is still ingrained in most of the peasants and most of the intellectuals as well as in the trading class itself. Thus the movement is caught in a circular predicament, only it would be officially described as an instance and proof of 'dialectic'."[2]

What was needed then, in the 1920's was a new man a new "Homo Sovieticus", and institutions able to create a new mentality, a new psychological attitude were necessary. Propaganda was employed as a constant and systematic tool. Dewey claimed that: "In consequence propaganda is education and education is propaganda. They are more than confounded, they are identical."[3 & 4]

---

[1] "Economic determinism" is the faith that ideas and beliefs which currently prevail are fixed by economic institutions and processes.

[2] Dewey, op. cit., p. 52.

[3] Ibid., p. 54.

[4] It is interesting to note that Dewey argued that: "This new educative struggle may not succeed, it has to face enormous abstacles it has been too much infected with propagandist tendencies. But in my opinion the latter will gradually die of innation in the degree in which Soviet Russia feels free and secure in working out its own destiny." (Dewey, op. cit., p. 32).

The political and economic changes led necessarily to a new atmosphere, an atmosphere favorable to collectivistic mentality. The educational transformation had to achieve then a change in the mental and moral disposition of the people. Schools were claimed to be the "ideological arm of the revolution". For through them Communism could be taught and indoctrinated. Through them anti-religious indoctrination was carried out. To change the mental and moral disposition of the people their faith had to be changed, religion being the "opium of the people" had to be replaced. "The October revolution, which dethroned the Tsar of the Earth, (has) made superfluous the Tsar of heaven."[1]

To indoctrinate, illiteracy had to be liquidated. To Lenin illiteracy was a great problem for he believed that:

> "An illiterate person stands outside; he must first be taught the A.B.C. Without this, there can be no politics; without this, there are only rumours, gossip, tales, prejudices, but no politics."[2]

The next thing to destroy was the family. Nothing could be done with the older generation, since their ideology was already formed and fixed. The hopes of the new regime were naturally turned

---

[1] Bereday, op. cit., p. 60.

[2] Albert P. Pinkevitch, The New Education in the Soviet Republic, (New York: John Day, Co., 1927), p. 375. (quoted in)

towards the younger generation. But the old were still in their way. Lenin believed that:

> "The school, apart from life, apart from politics, is a lie, a hypocrisy. Bourgeois society indulged in this lie, covering up the fact that it was using schools as a means of domination by declaring that the school was politically neutral, and in the services of all. We must declare openly what is concealed, namely, the political function of the school. While the object of our precious struggle was to overthrow the bourgeoisie, the aim of the new generation is much more complex; it is to construct communist society."[1]

The family then, being an undesirable influence, an exclusive and isolated effect, became hostile to the regime. The natural role of the school was then to undermine the importance and uniqueness of family life.

Children who were 3-7 years old were obliged to stay 8-10 hours daily in nursery schools. Summer colonies, where children were away from parents for two or three months were also organized, and on the whole legal church marriages were regarded as bourgeois and reactionary. Having taken care of "the development in children of the elemental virtues of the socially conscious and independently active citizen" ... a provision for qualified technical workers for the industrial reconstruction had to be made. Labor became the socially

---

[1] Dewey, op. cit., p. 82. (quoted in)

helpful activity - the basis of all education. This principle was officially designated as the "complex system" or the "complex method", defined by the educator Paul Blonsky as "a central theme in connection with which children receive the necessary information concerning nature, labor, and social life of mankind."[1]

Study methods then had to be connected with social life. This led to the "project method"[2] which would provide the necessary useful social work. This was how the "Unified Labor School" was born in 1920. In this school the child was able to go through all grades up to and including the ninth in the same school. Throughout the nine years the child took part in socially helpful activities. Thus through actual experience in work the student learned how to live in a collective social order.

---

[1] Paul Blonsky, "Russia", Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teacher's College, (New York: Columbia University, 1927), p. 324.

[2] The project method was the same as that adapted in the West, in fact it was a purely western idea. "Originally the "project" had a reference to a method of problem solving largely associated with practical problem situations of a manipulative or constructive nature in manual arts or agriculture. As problem solving procedures became accepted as educationally more important, the techniques of the "project" were recognized as having broad application value in all types of problem-solving situations. Particularly this has been true as the emphasis has shifted from primary responsibility of the teacher to that of the pupil in the actual process of learning." (Nelson Bossing, Teaching in Secondary Schools, (Boston: Haughton Mifflin Co., 1952), p. 120.)

For the new school psychological orientation was invented. Pedology[1] which according to Blonsky was

> "the science of chronological development of the child under the conditions of definite social-historical environment."[2]

To Professor Bosov[3] it meant,

> "the scientific synthesis of all that which presents the actual results of different scientific disciplines studying the developing human, each from its own approach."[4]

Towards the end of the 1920's, the Unified Labor School developed into the Polytechnical School.[5] These were schools of 7-years and the students were instructed in the methods which were fundamental to a number of special industrial technics. The Polytechnical School followed the Marxian conception of polytechnical education. It gave the former "work school" or "labor schools" idea a

---

[1] Pedology continued to be popular till 1931, then both Blonsky and pedology were discarded.

[2] Bereday, op. cit., p. 63. (quoted in)

[3] Another Soviet philosopher in education of the early 1920's.

[4] Ibid., p. 63.

[5] The 8th Communist Congress claimed for Polytechnical education for all children to 17 years old and professional education for all above 17 (1919), see also I. Nikodimov, O Polytechnicheskom Obrazovami v SSSR, (Polytechnical education in U.S.S.R.), (Munich: Institute for the study of the U.S.S.R., 1957), p. 17.

For the new school psychological orientation was invented. Pedology[1] which according to Blonsky was

> "the science of chronological development of the child under the conditions of definite social-historical environment."[2]

To Professor Bosov[3] it meant,

> "the scientific synthesis of all that which presents the actual results of different scientific disciplines studying the developing human, each from its own approach."[4]

Towards the end of the 1920's, the Unified Labor School developed into the Polytechnical School.[5] These were schools of 7-years and the students were instructed in the methods which were fundamental to a number of special industrial technics. The Polytechnical School followed the Marxian conception of polytechnical education. It gave the former "work school" or "labor schools" idea a

---

[1] Pedology continued to be popular till 1931, then both Blonsky and pedology were discarded.

[2] Bereday, op. cit., p. 63. (quoted in)

[3] Another Soviet philosopher in education of the early 1920's.

[4] Ibid., p. 63.

[5] The 8th Communist Congress claimed for Polytechnical education for all children to 17 years old and professional education for all above 17 (1919), see also I. Nikodimov, O Polytechnicheskom Obrazovami v SSSR, (Polytechnical education in U.S.S.R.), (Munich: Institute for the study of the U.S.S.R., 1957), p. 17.

"definitely socialistic form by interpreting the idea of work on the basis of the new estate of the worker brought about by the proletarian revolution."1 & 2

The idea was to study some principles, let us say of a natural science, but not to treat such a principle as isolated entity to be learned by itself, but to consider it in the ways in which it occurs in human life by means of utilizing natural resources and energies in industry for social purposes. In the beginning, thus, freedom of student auto-organization was given, the project method was carried out in several schools. Soon things went to the extreme, learning by doing now could have meant anything.

Collectivism was practiced to the utmost, social and political participation overshadowed all other aims. Teachers as well as parents had no more any authority. A chaos followed for about a decade.[3]

During the NEP technical and professional schools were opened; and very seldom the term polytechnical was applied anywhere else but

---

[1] Dewey, op. cit., p. 92.

[2] The 1920's were characterized by the effort to fill the gap between practice and theory, so as to fulfill Marx's dreams.

[3] It should be mentioned that there had been most of the time no clear understanding of the term Polytechnical - no one knew whether it meant professional training, or trade.

in meaningless theoretical formulas. All attention now was turned to financial questions. In fact the schools in this period were in great financial troubles. Professional training and development of trade were now accentuated.[1]

The 1930's saw a radical revision of the deterministic and progressive notions in Soviet psychology and hence in education.

> "The turning point came not as a result of a sobering up by Soviet pedagogy, but by the dictates of the Party and Stalin and their decision to go ahead with the First Five-Year Plan."[2]

The first years of the First Five-Year Plan witnessed a radical change in educational methods. An improvement was requested in the quality and quantity of training specialists for the industry. The strengthening of polytechnical education was decreed as essential. But in these same years, more or less as a direct result of the Five Year Plan, the deterministic notions in Soviet psychological theory and in other ideas of psychology and education changed.

> "There was an obvious clash between a national program designed, by conscious state policy, to alter swiftly the economic foundations of the society and psychological

---

[1] In the X All-Russian Congress of Soviets (7.XII.1922) it was decided that in schools of first and second degree the students should pay fees. See also, Nikodimov, op. cit., p. 19.

[2] Nicolas DeWitt, "Polytechnical Education and the Soviet School Reforms," Harvard Educational Review, No. 2, 1960, Vol. 30, p. 101.

and educational theory which regarded the individual as the reflex of his heredity and environment.'"[1]

The slogan "the school is nothing but a branch of the factory" became the foundation of the polytechnical education of the late 1920's. This led to a more labor oriented polytechnization, which was not general and did not offer training in the basic skills necessary for factory work, but was technical and vocational, and above all specific, meeting the immediate need of supplying industry with skilled labor.[2]

The 12. VII. 1928 Plenum of the Central Committee of the All Russian Communist Party made a resolution concerning the improvement in the preparation of new specialists. In this resolution a stress was put upon the strengthening of the bond between educative work in the VTUZ and the Technicums with production and industry. They claimed, furthermore, that the system of preparation of specialists did not equip the worker with the necessary skills needed in industry. Industrial preparation was thus unsatisfactory.

The July Plenum of the same year claimed for the strengthening by all means of the role of industrial training in the general

---

[1] Rostow, op. cit., p. 108.

[2] For further details see, G.S. Counts, The Challenge of Soviet Education., (New York: McGraw Hill, 1957), pp. 60-68.

preparation of specialists. They asked for the insurance and the raising of the training standards in schools.[1]

The last actions towards labor oriented polytechnization led really to the abolishment of polytechnical education and to the establishment of narrow vocational, specialized training; in other words "monotechnism emerged as the goal of polytechnical education."[2] Nevertheless, early in 1930 there was again a stress, for a very brief period, on the polytechnization of schools.

The Sovnarkom of U.S.S.R. of 14. VIII. 1930 recommended, the reinforcement in all ways and by all means of the polytechnical character of the schools of general education.[3]

Early in 1930 books, articles and essays on polytechnical education re-appeared. Once more polytechnical education was praised. A certain Beniukh in his book Ot Shkoli Rozovornoi k Polytechnitcheskoi (From Speech schools to Polytechnical Schools), (Moskva: izd. Robotchii prosveshtechenetz, 1930), described how polytechnical education had now become a reality; it had become a political state

---

[1] For further detail refer to Nikodimov, op. cit., pp. 20-21.

[2] DeWitt, op. cit., p. 101.

[3] Nikodimov, op. cit., pp. 20-22.

problem leading to the fastening of the bond between practice and theory, knowledge and industry.[1]

Bubnov was at this time the great partisan of polytechnical education in its pure form. He wanted to educate the New Soviet Man. the all-around man.[2] He also launched the much used slogan "Bor'ba za polytechnitcheskuyu shkolu - Bor'ba za socialism" (Struggle for polytechnical school - struggle for socialismus) (1931).

That a great stress was laid upon polytechnical education in the early years of 1930 can be seen from the Resolution of the XV All Russian Congress of Soviets in 1930:

> "The polytechnical school must be in the hands of the Soviet State a means through which the division of classes will be annihilated, it must be a means to the liquidation of the contradiction between the town and the village and the gap between physical and mental labor."[3]

Much serious work was done, especially in the field of theory on polytechnical education. Even a journal was published: "Za polytechnitcheskuyu shkolu"[4]. It should be mentioned that in general

---

[1] Another book of the sort is E. Perovski, Sovietskaya Polytechnitcheskaya Trudovaya Shkola (Soviet Polytechnical Labor School), (Moskva, 1931).

[2] Bubnov, Shkola na Povorote (The School at The Turning Point) is a good reference.

[3] Nikodimov, op. cit., p. 20 (quoted in) (translation mine)

[4] See also Nikodimov, op. cit., pp. 10-30.

in the early 1920's polytechnical education was an ideal, a pedagogical method, carried out according to Marxist ideals, word to word - it was a hope, a tool to educate the "New Soviet Man". But in early 1930's it had a different aim - the education of specialists and technicians. Although in Pedagogical Journals and Conferences of those years the classical question was - How should an engineer be educated? - The classical answer was - Not highly specialized, but generally educated, having in addition to his specialization a general knowledge of many subjects - widely cultured.[1]

The facts were different. The Soviet economy was shaken, it needed rebuilding, specialists were needed as fast as possible. At a worker's conference in 1931 Stalin claimed:

> "We are lagging fifty to one hundred years behind the advanced countries, and, we must win this distance in ten years or we will be crushed."[2]

It was evident that the introduction of polytechnical education meant more time to educate specialists. Time was precious in the early 1930's; it was more precious than polytechnical education. Nevertheless in 1930-1931 Bubnov claimed that the Party had reached

---

[1] Nikodimov, op. cit., p. 26.

[2] G.S. Counts, op. cit., p. 44-45. (quoted in)

its goal in education; that now there are only a few schools where there had not been introduced polytechnical education. But at the same time in his report to Stalin in 1931 he stated: "We are very far from the things that the Party told us to do."[1]

In 1931 he wrote again in Vseobukh i Polytechnizatzia Massovoi Shkoli (General Education and Polytechnization of the School) (RSFSR: Narkompros, 1931:

> "We are already finishing the building of socialist economy. Now, we can rebuild our school on polytechnical foundations ...."

But in his Politechnizatzia Shkoli, Utchitelstvo i Khozaistvenniki (Polytechnization of the School, Teachers and Economic Executives) (Moscow: izd. OGIZ, 1930), he claimed: "In polytechnical education we are still at the very beginning."[2]

The complex economic and social forces were stronger. They led to the collapse of polytechnical education. Although the idea of polytechnical schools was still much alive and nourished by the Party organs, it soon gave way to the traditional educational philosophy. The Soviet education in the 1920's and the early 1930's went through

---

[1] Nikodimov, op. cit., p. 27, (quoted in) (translation mine)

[2] Ibid., p. 29, (quoted in) (translation mine). See also Klimov, Vseobshtechee obutchenie i polytechniztzia shkoli (General Education and the Polytechnization of the School), Moskva: Gos. Izd., 1931).

a process of constant change. This change brought about essentially a complete disorganization in instruction. The Soviet state having now taken the total responsibility for the change in the environment of its citizens could no more afford to support the psychological conception,[1] which claimed that human behaviour is the product of and can be blamed on the environment.

The 1930's was also a period when Stalin consolidated his power and liquidated virtually all remaining leaders of the Party - Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky[2]. Stalin's purposiveness with respect to the evolution of Soviet economy led necessarily to new theoretical changes in psychology and education. One man rule, one man dictatorship was being established. This and also the desire to bring order out of the chaos led the Communist Party leaders to abandon their experimentation and flexibility. Foreign pedagogical ideas of Western philosophers were abandoned and disgraced in the next decade. A new decade of totalitarian and authoritarian rule in all branches of government as well as in education had dawned.

Stalin had claimed that:

---

[1] The former mentioned behaviorists.

[2] By 1928-1929 Stalin completed taking over the Secret Police, the Trade Unions, the army. Some of his critics and enemies within the Party he won over, others he liquidated.

> "Education is a weapon whose effect depends on who holds it in his hands and who is struck with it."[1]

It is not surprising that old progressive education was completely abandoned; the concept of the "New Soviet Man" was introduced, and with it strict training in the useful techniques and methods of production was imposed.

> "The intent of the Soviet regime (is) was not to educate, but to indoctrinate through a culturally totalitarian system of controls which produces, in the words of Stalin, a group of intellectuals who are 'engineers of human minds', and for the rest, minds capable of being engineers."[2]

It was in this manner, this time that the "New Soviet Man" was to be created.

In the mid-1930's there was silence about polytechnical education. The motto - "for polytechnical education","for polytechnical schools" still remained as a basic principle of Soviet and Communist education - but now it was nothing but a dead formula - with no clear meaning.

> "New interpretations of Marxist-Leninist theory, imperative under the one-man rule of Stalin, also contributed to the closing of the permissive period in Soviet education."[3]

---

[1] Stalin had said this to H.G. Wells, when asked about his views on education.

[2] Donald Treadgold, Twentieth Century Russia, Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1959, p. 349.

[3] G.Z.F. Bereday and Joan Penner (eds.) The Politics of Soviet Education, (New York: Praeger, 1960), p. 31.

The new interpretation of Marxist-Leninist theory led also to the re-interpretation of polytechnical education which in this period meant nothing else but

> "firm acquisition of applied knowledge and learning of the natural sciences, physics, chemistry, and mathematics."[1]

There was a return to traditional methods of instruction; emphasis on discipline and obedience, grading, training and learning. Regular class instruction was established, attendance was controlled, teachers' authority was restored, and students had to sit for a general exam to be admitted to higher studies. The project method, tests and measurements were discarded as bourgeois perversions. The family was re-established and given importance. Even the curriculum changes reflected the trend of the new education. Tight planning and centralization of the administrative control throughout all the Soviet republics was imposed.

> "Geared to the need for research specialists, the curriculum emphasized the easily administered subjects rather than the practical subjects that dominated the schools of the twenties. Primary and secondary schools all over the Soviet Union adopted the same inflexible curriculum designed by the Russian Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. With the stress on industrial research as well as on basic research in the preparation for the coming war, the expansion of technical institutes and universities

---

[1] Nicolas DeWitt, Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R., (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961), p. 82.

> foreshadowed the entrenchment of the educational philosophy that was to transform the primary, incomplete secondary, and secondary schools into preparatory institutions for higher education."[1]

After the war the Soviet industry needed specialists and technicians even more than before. Up till the 1950's Lenin's educational principle of the "unity of theory and practice" was carried out to the utmost. But the "unity of theory and practice" really meant classroom instruction in the fundamentals of science especially, supplemented by practical applications needed in the formation of work habits. And during the period 1945-1952 there was almost no mention of Polytechnical Education in Soviet Pedagogical Journals or Conferences.

1952 saw another major educational reform. The idea of polytechnical education was to be combined with productive labor training. During the changes the same pattern as in the 1930's was followed - the old theories were once more denounced, its supporters were accused of ideological deviation, persecuted and purged; then the new theory of education was formulated, followed by new methods, revised curriculums and textbooks.

This new educational reform was launched in 1952 when Stalin's Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., was published. In

---

[1] Bereday, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

this work Stalin wrote

> "that one of the three major conditions necessary for the transition from socialism to communism was an overall raising of the cultural level of the people so that "all members of society may have a many sided education for their full physical and mental development and all members will obtain enough education to become active participants in social development and to be able freely to choose their occupations and not be chained for the rest of their lives to one occupation because of the existing division of labor."[1]

In the same year the 19th Party Congress passed a resolution

> "proposing to undertake the realization of polytechnical instruction throughout the secondary schools"[2],

It was claimed that:

> "The directives of the 19th Party Congress on the Five Year Plan envisage a wide program concerning the field of national education. The realization of the goals of universal secondary education, the introduction of polytechnical education in the secondary schools pre-supposes a great effort on the part of the workers of the pedagogical sciences and psychology."[3]

Malenkov at the 19th Party Congress reminded the members of an old obligation - which had not been realized - the introduction of polytechnical education in the Soviet school.[4]

---

[1] De Witt, op. cit., p. 84. (quoted in)

[2] Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia, (Moscos: 2nd ed.), Vol. 33, p. 556.

[3] Pravda, No. 322, 1952 (translation mine)

[4] Nikodimov, op. cit., p. 33. (quoted in)

He further claimed that

> "in order to improve the socio-educational role of the general school and to permit students who graduate from it a free choice of occupation, polytechnical instruction should begin in secondary schools and all required measures should be taken for the transition to universal polytechnical education."[1]

In 1953 the RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences - the authority on Soviet educational methodology and theory - published a book called Polytechnical Instructions in Schools of General Education. In this book the authors defined once more the concept of polytechnical education using Marx, Engels and Lenin as well as Stalin, who claimed:

> "What would be the consequences if not only separate groups of workers but the majority of workers should raise their cultural-technical level to the level of engineering-technician personnel? Our industry would be lifted to a height beyond the reach of the industries of other countries."[2]

The book also discussed the relationship between theory and practice or general education and polytechnical education. Stalin again is quoted in relation to the true meaning of "polytechnic". To be truly polytechnic a course must be as follows:

---

[1] DeWitt, op. cit., p. 84. (quoted in)

[2] Politekhnicheskoye Obucheniye v Obshcheobrazovatelnoi Shkole (Polytechnic Instruction in Schools of General Education), M.A. Melnikov and M.N. Shatkin, (eds.), (Moscow: RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, 1953), p. 16.

> "If the students are to be given only theoretical knowledge of scientific principles on which productive processes are based at the neglect of inculcating work skills, then the polytechnic instruction will have an abstractly theoretical character and will have poorly prepared (the students) for work. If only the work skills are inculcated without the theoretical knowledge of productive processes, then the instruction will not be a polytechnic instruction but a sterile training in trades - 'technicianism'."[1]

In the same year the Ministry of Education of the RSFSR in August 1953 (Concerning Polytechnical Instruction) published the following directive:

> "Polytechnical education in secondary schools should be of such a type as to (1) acquaint the students in the process of studying the fundamentals of science, with its application in industry and agriculture ... (2) to acquaint the students with the elements of production technology .... (3) to offer some skill-education which may be useful in future productive activity ....(4) to create a link between socially useful labor and the school by subordinating all laboring activity of the school to the study-educational objectives of the school."[2]

Until 1955 polytechnical education, or at least the idea, flourished among the slogans of October and May parades and demonstrations. The slogan: "Workers of national enlightment, fight for the polytechnization of schools" could be heard everywhere.[3]

---

[1] Politekhnicheskoye obucheniye v obshcheobrazovatelnoi shkole, op. cit., p. 16.

[2] DeWitt, op. cit., p. 84. (quoted in)

[3] Nikodimov, op. cit., p. 33. (quoted in)

The struggle for a universal secondary school resulted in a rush of students into the higher classes; students of lower standards, who pulled the general standard of the school down. Thus only a very small number of graduates from these schools were capable of going to colleges or universities and more educated workers were supplied to the industry. In general during these years the curriculum had not really changed much. Polytechnical instruction was used as a tool for learning other traditional academic subjects which then could be applied in practice.[1] Though the students learned some theory in the basic sciences and some basic skills in practical work, neither was sufficient.[2] The halfway application of polytechnism supplied neither well prepared students for higher studies, nor well prepared workers equipped for practical activity for employment in industry and agriculture.

In 1954 I.A. Kairov, the RSFSR Minister of Higher Education claimed that

---

[1] See also M.N. Shatkin, Polittekhnicheskoe Obuchenie na Soyremennom etape Razvitiia Shkoly (Polytechnical Education in the Present Stage of School Development) (Moscow, 1956), pp. 4-13.

[2] Polytechnical education was mostly carried out halfway because of lack of equipment (machines, textbooks, guidance and especially qualified staff, and individuals) see also Korol, Soviet Education for Science and Education. (London: Chapman & Hall, Ltd., 1957), pp. 20-67.

> "The most responsible and important questions for us (the Soviet educationists) are the moral nurture of children, their upbringing in labor and their training for labor activities"... "The school is now faced with the responsible task of uniquely re-educating the pupil psychology. Up to the present time the school only prepared them for the institutions of higher education. Now, when a considerable portion of those finishing school will go directly into life, our task is to nurture young people right from the beginning in the habits of work, in the love of work, and in respect for labouring people."[1]

In general there was widespread confusion concerning polytechnical education. Even the Academy of the Pedagogical Sciences was unclear on the subject, for on one hand they were asked to follow "Lenin's will", on the other the directives of the Party. Thus the Academy could take no one position. It is not surprising then, that the statements issued by the Academy on polytechnical education had either double meaning or were completely misty.

After a number of sessions on "Polytechnical education" Kairov in a speech to the Academy stated the basic elements of Polytechnical education to be:

(1) Practical work in school workshops
(2) Knowledge of the scientific basis of production
(3) Praktikums for older classes
(4) Excursions and productive practices for all students
(5) Work in the production for students
(6) Teaching the students specialized knowledge.[2]

---

[1] Komsomolskaya Pravda, August 11, 1954.

[2] Nikodimov, op. cit., pp. 44-45. (quoted in) (translation mine)

Soon the authorities became dissatisfied and in 1956 at the 20th Party Congress Khrushchev denounced the failure of polytechnical education. After having accused the teachers and members of the RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of being people who

> "are still engaged in general talk on the usefulness of polytechnical education but are doing nothing for its practical realization."[1]

he declared that what was needed, was

> "to reshape radically the instruction programs of the secondary schools in the direction of greater production specialization," which would not only permit graduates to enter higher education, but also "prepare them for practical activity" so that they could "enter direct employment in various branches of the national economy."[2]

The directives of the 20th Party Congress in 1956 claimed that it was necessary to

> "develop polytechnical education in universal schools, to make sure that the students would get to know and become familiar with the important branches of contemporary industry and agriculture. To insure the close bond between learning and labor, to educate the growing generation with Communist attitude toward labor."[3]

As a result in February 1956 Khrushchev announced to the 20th Party Congress the intention to establish a new system of education.

---

[1] Pravda, February 15, 1956.

[2] DeWitt, op. cit., p. 85. (quoted in)

[3] Nikodimov, op. cit., pp. 33-34. (quoted in) (translation mine)

With the regular ten-year school, a network of boarding schools for children to 17 years old was to be established. These schools, too, were to be schools of general education.

> "At the time of his surprising announcement, it would have been logical to conclude that what Khrushchev had in mind was eventually to delegate the college preparatory functions to the new boarding schools while, by 'polytechnization' and other means, gradually transforming the regular ten-year school into one huge system for vocational education and training."[1]

It is evident that behind the pedagogical character of polytechnical education there is hidden its practical character - a great possibility for the utilization of youth. Polytechnical education seems to be only another tool which would help the Communist Party in the realization of its aims and goals for its recurrance is directly linked with labor shortage. Polytechnical ideas as ideals no more exist - they are used only as a cover - to hide narrow specialization - the very specialization that Marx fought against. This all leads to the exploitation of youth. For the young cannot choose what they want to do. Under the so called "polytechnical contracts" the Soviet youth is assigned work - for vocational and manual training, of course. Thus in 1955 V. Petrov, a social inspector, wrote:

---

[1] Korol, op. cit., p. 32.

> "The polytechnic contract has acquired a particular importance in attracting the pupils to take part in agricultural work on the collective and state farms. A polytechnic contract obliges the school and farm administrators in advance to apportion the work of different types by grades and to utilize the pupil's labor in the greatest possible advantage of the farm and of the labor and polytechnic training of the school students."[1]

In this new interpretation by contemporary Marxists, polytechnical education looses its real meaning, it no more gives, but refuses education, it does not help in the development of the youth and its talents, nor does it allow choice. In the Literaturnaya Gazeta a certain author writes how a graduate of the 66th school - Vasili Tarasenko wanted to enter the Institute of National Air Force, but he could not, - so what to do? After a long reflection he tried the factory, he had no other choice.[2]

On December 24, 1958, a new law on education was enacted. This law was called "Law on Strengthening the Ties of School with Life and on the Further Development of the System of Public Education in the U.S.S.R."[3] The economic and cultural development of the country

---

[1] "Pravilno Reshat Zadachu Politekhnicheskovo Obucheniya" (To Solve Correctly the Task of Polytechnic Instruction), Sovetskaya Kirgiziya, (October 16, 1955), p. 3. For other examples see, Utchitelskaya Gazeta, May 25, 1955; also June 25, 1956.

[2] Nikodimov, op. cit., pp. 34-35.

[3] See for further details, Soviet Commitment to Education. Report of the First official U.S. Educational Mission to the U.S.S.R., (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare), p. 126 cf.

needed greater numbers of young people trained not only in general education but also in the techniques and vocations of industrial life. There was no time to waste, specialized technicians and workers were needed. This was the end of polytechnical education.

In 1958, in his speech to the Komsomol Congress, Khrushchev not even once mentioned anything about polytechnical education, he simply ignored it. Khrushchev had evidently decided to forget everything about polytechnical education; for the way he wanted the new reformed school system, it was essential to discard the concept of polytechnical education.

> "He therefore ignored it and placed emphasis upon 'physical labor', 'productive labor', and the necessity of reforming the existing school system so as to prepare youth mentally, physically, and psychologically for the performance of useful labor tasks, thereby establishing a 'link between the school and life'."[1]

A new period in Soviet educational history was launched. In this new era emphasis was laid upon labor, labor activity, socially useful labor. In other words what counted was production and industry - not education. Control over the distribution of man-power became of utmost importance.

Since in the Soviet Union everything is planned, how can the distribution of man-power be left unplanned? To what extent the

---

[1] DeWitt, op. cit., pp. 86-87.

choice of a career is predetermined and how the young generation feels about it can be well illustrated by the following letter from a girl who had finished her 10th class and wanted to continue her studies, but fate, or rather the State, had decided otherwise. This letter was printed in the Komsomolskaya Pravda .....

> "Think of the following question: the person who finished a school where he studied for ten years, must choose some kind of a road in life. In our country, where all the roads for youth are 'opened', he at once decides to be a street cleaner, or goes to carry stones. So should I, knowing Newtons Laws, logarithmic physics, nuclear reactions and having some knowledge of Soviet literature. Will I go to sweep the streets? Yes, it is so Romantic. So, my dear aunt, I am not such a child, to be carried away by such romanticism, or by romanticism at all. If you ask any student of Mr. Luvov where he is going after the tenth class, he will only answer: 'TO KPU, - kuda pap ustroyit' - (where my father can fix me). There is all your romanticism."[1]

---

[1] Komsomolskaya Pravda, 21,6, 1959. (translation mine)

The Use of Casuistical Arguments

At any period of history "Communist ethics may be defined according to a brief formula: what is of use to Communism is moral, all that which is useless or hostile to it is immoral."[1]

The above is true of Soviet Communism, which today is in many aspects different from Marxist Communism. Berdiaev has considered Soviet Communism as a "Russification and Orientalization of Marxism."[2]

To be able to understand Soviet Communism, one must not think of it as Marxism applied in practice - word by word, for this is not the case in Soviet Russia. One must try to understand it in its spirit - not Marxist but Russian - and mystical or even metaphysical. Thus it may be said that in its spirit Soviet Communist ideology differs from the Marxian Communist ideology. For, by ideology, we mean

> "first of all, idea. An ideology is a number of ideas which form a whole, a theory, a system and even sometimes a state of the spirit ... But an ideology is not only a collection of pure ideas which can be separated from all sentiment; an ideology includes necessarily sentiments, sympathies, antipathies, esprits, fear, etc."[3]

---

[1] Caucasian Review, (Russian ed.) No. 3, 1956, p. 63 (translation mine).

[2] N. Berdiaev, Les Source et le Sens du Communisme Russe, (Paris: Gallimard, 1951), p. 145.

[3] Ibid., p. 145. quoted in "Problèmes Sovietiques", Review Annuelle, (Munich: Institut d'études sur l'U.S.S.R., 1956), No. 2, p. 125.

This is the case with Soviet Communism. Often the ideas become a question of approach and ideals which are moral in one period of history, become immoral in another, simply because they are no more of use, either to the state as a whole or to the individual rulers. Just like so many ideals, the ideal of polytechnical education too, has become a question of approach. Being such in character, the term polytechnical can always be twisted to the needs of the one who uses it.

Marx thought of polytechnical education as an education through which all individuals would attain an all-rounded, general education. He believed that such individuals can be educated only in a Communist state where the division between mental and physical labor has been erased. He believed that each individual in such a state would be thoroughly trained in the theory and practice of all branches of production.

> "Thus, in essence, polytechnical education as conceived by Marx did not signify one-sided vocational education or specialized labor training. Yet, despite the fact that Marx's concepts are still cited by Soviet ideologists and educators as the continuing basis of Soviet educational policies, they have in fact been reinterpreted and applied in ways quite contrary to the intention of their formulator. In practice, polytechnical education has assumed many forms - instruction in manual labor and, particularly, in applied industrial and agricultural techniques, vocational training of one sort or another, productive work in school workshops, laboratory work in scientific subjects, the use of visual aids in teaching, excursions to industrial plants,

> etc. In fact, almost anything short of a textbook or a teacher's word has been referred to as 'polytechnical instruction' at one time or another."[1]

In the 1920's polytechnical education was understood as the type of teaching designated by Marx and Engels as that which:

> "familiarizes one with the basic principles of all productive processes and at the same time gives the child or the adolescent the skill of using the simplest tools employed in every branch of production."[2]

In fact very often

> "the policy of the 'proletarization of education' - i.e., preferential treatment of workers or their children, with total disregard of their intellectual capacity - was regarded as a sufficient condition to insure polytechnism."[3]

The slogan "the school is nothing but a factory" was often heard. This led as mentioned before to monotechnism, narrow vocational training and specialization. The decline of scholarship and chaos in the 1920's, brought a sobering up; series of decrees were issued and polytechnical education was defined again as

> "the firm acquisition of applied knowledge and learning of the natural sciences, physics, chemistry, and mathematics."[4]

---

[1] DeWitt, Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R., p. 79.

[2] Korol, op. cit., p. 27, quoting K. Marx and F. Engels, Sochineniya (Works)(Russian ed.), Vol. 13, Part I, p. 199.

[3] DeWitt, Soviet Professional Manpower, (Washington D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1955), p. 34.

[4] Ibid., p. 35.

An even subtler definition was given when an excuse was needed for the discarding of polytechnical education in the 1930's. The Central Committee of the Communist Party in 1931 claimed that:

> "Every attempt to disassociate polytechnization of the school from a systematic and firm mastery of science - especially of physics, chemistry, and mathematics, the teaching of which must be based upon rigorously defined and carefully worked out syllabi and curricula and carried out in accordance with a firmly established school calendar - represents a most fundamental perversion of the concept of the polytechnical school."[1]

As already mentioned, from then on, for almost twenty years Polytechnical education lay forgotten. In 1952 a new definition of Polytechnical education was given. In fact, it meant theoretical instruction through methods used in traditional class instruction supplemented by practical instruction in the laboratories or workshops.

We can easily see how flexible it can be made. The casuistic talents of the Soviet educators and above all of the Central Committee of the Communist Party have been put to test through the forty years of Soviet education. We may claim that the concept "polytechnical" as used by the Soviets is a concept which has a number of probable meanings, the probability of each to be true having the same chance at different periods in history.

---

[1] "O nachalnoi i srednei shkole" (On the Elementary and Secondary School), September 5, 1931, cited in Directive VKP (b) i postanovlenyia sovetskoyo pravitelstva o narodnom obrazovanii za 1917-1947, gg., Vol. I, p. 151, quoted in Korol, op. cit., p. 27.

An opinion may be more probable when the authority which has issued this opinion has been accepted as a "father". When a definition or a trend in education becomes more probable and how does it become more probable, depends on how good a casuist the authority in power is. For, otherwise, how could the Soviets account for the above mentioned changes? How could progressive education, once so exalted become suddenly useless and inimical to the "progressive Soviet State"? Was it now the education prescribed by Marx, Engels and the early theoreticians of the Party? How could the old theories be denounced, its supporters accused of ideological deviation, persecuted and purged? How could the new theories of education, the new methods, curriculums and textbooks again be according to Marxist-Leninist theory of education?

Just as the casuists of the Middle Ages claimed that the time is past for the old "Fathers" and that the opinions of the new "fathers" are therefore more probable, the Communists argue that, just as the classless society was to be arrived at through certain stages and changes, which of course could not be known or predicted, classless or ideal education had also to undergo these same series of changes. And just as in the case of political, social or economic changes, the practical measures and reforms in education could not be fortold in advance. The kind of education feasible at a certain stage of development depended on and was the function of the historical

period the society was just passing through; if that changed, the philosophy and practice of education had to change also.[1]

But the above explanation is not enough. For if the above was true then there would have been a gradual development from one stage to another. The fact is that the forty years of Soviet education are represented by contradictory, vague and ambiguous statements published and forced into practice by the Central Committee of the Party. Soviet education at any stage of its development has been nothing else but another whim of the Party. With the help of formulas and slogans, and the talent of a subtle and refined casuistry, the Communist Party has been able to offer to the masses convincing enough arguments. If some of the directives of the Communist Party and some of the basic principles which have helped in shaping the major trends in Soviet education are analysed as issued at different stages of their development, one can easily see how the contradictions which have so often occured have been treated.

As mentioned before, the elements which shaped the 1920's educational forces could be summarized as:

---

[1] Is it possible that the Marxian theory is so flexible and inconsistent that it is not difficult to find any kind of logically valid arguments to maintain one's right to induce any kind of changes whether in political, social, economic or education theories? It seems to be the interpretation of these theories rather than the theory itself that brings about the inconsistencies.

1. The Western ideas of the progressive educational philosophers, especially those of Dewey.
2. The progressive methods - mainly the Dalton Plan and the Project Method - also a great emphasis on the freedom of the child and the insignificant role of the teacher.
3. The science of Pedology.
4. The complete destruction of the family in order to have a free access to the children and their formation.

It is interesting to see what happened to these elements throughout the 1930's and the 1950's.

In the 1920's Pinkevitch, one of the foremost Soviet educators of that period defined Pedology as the science which is

> "concerned with the psychological and physical development of the child from birth to maturity. It studies the biology and psychology of human growth. Pedagogy takes the findings of pedology and utilizes them in the organization of methods for promoting the desired physical and mental development of the child."[1]

Pedology became a general Party line in the 1920's. It was acclaimed as "the" science which would help to bring about the future ideal Communist state. Numerous books were written on the subject and all educators were urged to apply the science of pedology in the

---

[1] Pinkevitch, The New Education in the Soviet Republic, op. cit., p. 7.

schools and the classrooms. Around the early 1930's it lost its previous influence and finally in 1936 it was abolished and the pedologues were sent to concentration camps.

On July 4, 1936, the Central Committee of the Party issued a decree "On the Pedological Perversions in the System of the Narkompros."

> "Pedology was branded as pseudo-scientific and anti-Marxist. It was accordingly abolished and its practitioners condemned. Intelligence and other psychological tests were discontinued, with the result that the function of psychology was, for all practical purposes eliminated."[1]

Thus strangely enough in a few years due to "historical changes" and further "progress toward socialism - communism" a "historicaly important" science became a pseudo-science and a perversion of the very Marxist principles it represented. Though the term "pedology" was a purely Soviet invention and was never used really in the West, in 1954 Pedology was defined as a

> "false science dealing with the upbringing of the growing generation practiced widely in the Bourgeois countries.."[2]

At the same time the methods; project method and the Dalton Plan, relative freedom of the child and the insignificant role of

---

[1] Bereday, The Changing Soviet School, p. 72.

[2] "Pedologia", (Pedology), Dictionary of Foreign Words, (Moscow: 1954, n.n.), p. 527.

the teacher were attacked. In the 1920's Pinkevitch's view on the Dalton Plan was the following:

> "Let us now examine the Dalton Plan from the point of view of the socialist labor school. We admit of course at once its indisputable merits. In the first place, it abolishes the passive classes with the silent students the the loquacious teacher. The latter is now in the background: he has ceased to be a schoolmaster and has become a leader. We should point out perhaps that long ago many of our Russian schools strove toward this cabinet system with considerable success..... the Dalton Plan permits each child to follow his own inclinations and aptitudes. This in our opinion is extremely desirable .. ... Under the Dalton Plan the pupil feels himself free ..."[1]

Although Pinkevitch admitted that the idea of the project method was born in the West, he nevertheless claimed that

> "there is no doubt, however, that of all the contemporary attempts to reform the school, such as the Dalton Plan, the Platoon Plan, the Winnetka Plan, the Jena Plan, the Decroly method, and many others, the project system with appropriate changes is best adapted to the nature and purposes of the Soviet school. It affords the children greater freedom of activity, encourages them to engage in practical work, demands of them independent planning, and trains them in the methods of investigation. We are certain, moreover, that, even if we had been unfamiliar with the experiments of Collings and with the other attempts in America to develop the project system, our school would unavoidably have assumed approximately its present character. Our community purposeful work arose quite independently, and acquaintance with the "project method" has merely helped to give it a more definite form."[2]

---

[1] Pinkevitch, op. cit., p. 282. (Emphasis mine)

[2] Ibid., p. 287.

From the above statement several things are evident: first that Pinkevitch and undoubtly other Soviet educators of his period were familiar with the progressive ideas of American educators and had studied them to a great extent, second, that although evidently they had borrowed heavily from those progressive ideas, they did not want to admit it really and claimed that the project method was really the product of the Soviet society, and third, that the Soviet educators, or at least Pinkevitch sincerely believed in those progressive ideas and in their success in the Communist state. But in 1928 the Central Committee of the Party decided that:

> "It was inevitable to fight against the light-headed and frivolous project methods which have not yet been confirmed in practice ...."[1]

Towards the end of the NEP period the work of

> "those who have set forth the communist conception of education in Russia .... Lunacharsky, Blonsky ... Shoolgin and Pestrak..."[2]

were branded as "Kulatckaya Literatura" (Kulak Literature) and even Krupskaya in 1928 confessed that the ideas of the early 1920's seemed to be rather naive.[3]

---

[1] Nikodimov, op. cit., p. 15, (quoted in), (translation mine), (Emphasis mine).

[2] Pinkevitch, op. cit., p. 198.

[3] Nikodimov, op. cit., p. 15.

Pinkevitch, whose turn had not yet come, hastened to reform, and in 1931 he stated that:

> "Unfortunate results showed that the project method and the Dalton Plan do not provide sound and profound knowledge, and do not train the children to work systematically."[1]

It would be interesting to know how Pinkevitch would account then for his earlier statement ..... "long ago many of our Russian schools strove toward this cabinets system with considerable success.." mentioned on the previous page, as well as other statements in the same quotation. Would the excuse be that "now" is different from "long ago"?

In 1948 Sovietskaya Pedagogika published an article in which the members of the Academy of the Pedagogical Sciences were criticized as

> "powerfully influenced by the bourgeois pedagogy of Western Europe and America" and as having no pre-revolutionary consciousness of "the close connection between school reform and the radical transformation of Russia and with the socialist Revolution" and as "mostly dependent on capitalist ideologies."[2]

The real scapegoats in this affair were Shatsky and Blonsky.

---

[1] Pinkevitch, Science and Education in the U.S.S.R., (London: Victor Gollancz, 1935), p. 40.

[2] Sovetskaya Pedagogika, No. 2, 1948 (translation mine). See also: N.A. Konstantinov, 30, Jahre Sowjet Pa dagogik, (Berlin: Volk und Wissen Verlag, 1948), p. 3.

After the 1936 purges Pinkevitch tried for the last time to save his reputation by finding an excuse for the shift to systematic instruction. He claimed that:

> "The Soviet Union has set itself the task of overtaking and outstripping the capitalist countries in the matter of technique and economics. It can fulfill this task only if it masters all the knowledge of science and technique to be found in the most advanced countries of Europe and America. It is in correlation with this task that the general and vocational schools of the U.S.S.R. carry out their work. Hence the need for discipline in the school."[1]

In 1932 Andrei Bubnov as commissar of People's education had insisted that the "next task is to re-establish discipline in the schools," since "without planned discipline properly imparted to the students there will never be a real Soviet education."[2] It would be interesting to know how did this real Soviet school differ from the real Soviet school of the 1920's.

The next problem was the family and its role in education. In the early period the family was almost abolished, the school had become totally responsible for the upbringing of the youth. Now discipline was lacking, the school was not able to carry out the task

---

[1] Pinkevitch, Science and Education in the U.S.S.R., pp. 40-41.

[2] Bereday, The Changing Soviet School, p. 71, (quoted in)

of disciplining youngsters by itself, it needed the family to help and if necessary to blame. The periodical Zarya Vostoka wrote:

> "The problem of bringing up young people to be educated, disciplined, developed, ready to work in various branches of the national economy, devoted to the homeland and Communist Party - can be successfully resolved only through close cooperation between the family and the school."[1]

These new turns of policy were all along supplemented by aggressive statements attacking the bourgeois education and especially Dewey. All along the Soviets claimed that the Western-European and American educators formulated theories which served reactionary political purposes under a mask of "objectivity", "scientific approach" "and love for the child" ..."The role of Dewey is very significant in this connection."[2]

On the other hand they claimed that the chief aim of the teacher of natural science was to "arm the students with knowledge" so as "to achieve a conscious mastery of the natural scientific foundations of the Communist world outlook."[3]

A reviewer of a volume on the history of the Middle Ages claimed that "the very greatest fault of the textbook is its insufficiently

---

[1] Zarya Vostoka, Jan. 4, 1956. (translation mine)

[2] George, S. Counts, The Country of the Blind, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1949), p. 162.

[3] Ibid., p. 160.

high Bolshevik ideology."[1] The question to be asked is, what kind of Bolshevik ideology, if any, one can detect in a history of the Middle Ages? Did the author find much in common between the Soviet or Bolshevik ideology and the ideologies of the Middle Ages?

That there is not much difference between what the Soviets accuse the bourgeois of and what they themselves advocate, can be seen clearly from the following editorial on the resolutions "For Bolshevik Ideology in Soviet Pedagogical Sciences" published in the journal Sovietskaya Pedagogica in 1946.

The editorial proclaimed that

> "'the serious shortcomings exposed recently by the Central Committee on the ideological front are unquestionably present in our pedagogical sciences,' that 'the ideological training of our youth is above all political,' that 'we must not forget for a moment that every science is Party Science,' that 'teaching cannot be divorced from the politics of Party and state,' that 'workers in pedagogical science must first of all study stubbornly, persistently, and consistently the science of sciences - the Marxist-Leninist theory,' and that they 'must become bold and militant propagandists of the great Communist ideas of educating the new man'. The editorial reported also that the resolutions "stirred profoundly the whole of Soviet society.' It is entirely appropriate to note here that in the Middle Ages under the dominion of the Church theology was called the 'queen of the sciences'. The parallel would appear to be quite close."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 260.

[2] Ibid., p. 259, quoting Sovetskaya Pedagogika, No. 10-11, Oct.-Nov., 1946, pp. 3-8. (Emphasis mine)

Dewey, also, received his share. In 1929 Pinkevitch praised him as one of the "bourgeois forerunners of the true labor school" and as coming "infinitely closer to Marx and the Russian communists than contemporary German educators."[1]

It is evident that in the 1920's Dewey was very popular. In the 1931 edition of the Boshaya Sovetskaya Entciklopedia Dewey was defined as "an outstanding American philosopher, psychologist, sociologist, and pedagogue ..."[2]

But soon Dewey's popularity began to decline and in 1952 edition of the Bolshaya Sovietskaya Entciklopedia, Dewey is called "a reactionary bourgeois philosopher and sociologist ..." "one who is working .." in the interests of the aggressive policy of the government of the USA.." "spreading racial obscurantism, amorality, unscrupulousness..."

The article concludes as follows:

> "The philosophy of Dewey is a philosophy of war and fascism. Dewey is a proclaimer of contemporary American reaction, an ideologist of American imperialism, (and) a violent enemy of the U.S.S.R., the country of the people's democracy and of the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism."[3]

---

[1] Bereday, The Changing Soviet School, p. 67.(quoted in)

[2] Ibid., p. 67, (quoted in)

[3] Ibid., pp. 67-68, (quoted in)

In the work "The Pedagogy of J. Dewey", in the Service of Contemporary American Reaction by V.S. Shevkin, Dewey is described as

> "the wicked enemy not only of the American people but also of all the freedom-loving peoples on our earth. The entire system of his views on the world, society, and the younger generation is, knowing no bounds, an apologia for American imperialism."[1]

Not only are the above statements about Dewey contradictory, but they are also filled with "big words" often ambiguous and meaningless. The Soviet writers and especially the Party organs seem to indulge in such statements. From the above statements on Dewey one may easily be led to think that Dewey during these 30 years has changed his mind and become reactionary and therefore an enemy to the progressive Soviet Union.

In 1931 the Central Committee of the Communist Party trying to find an excuse for the sudden shift from progressive practices to traditional ones declared:

> "The fundamental shortcomings of the school is that it does not provide a sufficient amount of general education and handles unsatisfactorily the task of preparing fully literate persons for technicums and higher educational establishments, persons who have acquired the fundamentals of knowledge (physics, chemistry, mathematics, languages, geography, etc.)

---

[1] V. S. Shevkin, Pedagogika D. Diui na Zluzhbe Sovremennoi Amerikanskoi Reaktsii, (Moscow: Uchpedzig, 1952), p. 135.

> Because of this, polytechnical education in many instances acquires a formalistic character and does not prepare builders of socialism with many-sided education, who can combine theory with practice and who have mastered technology."[1]

It was further claimed that polytechnical education should be such that

> "all socially productive labor performed by the students is directly subordinated to study and the educational objectives of the school."[2]

This again could have meant anything, for the "educational objectives of the school" is a term that can be stretched in all directions - from progressive education to traditional classroom teaching. Thus it was not difficult to claim, in the 1930-1950's that polytechnical education meant the firm acquisition of applied knowledge and learning through traditional methods.

The 1952 reforms were nothing new; new names were merely given to an old system. Thus in the book Polytechnical Instruction in Schools of General Education, published by the RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences in 1953, it was claimed for example that the polytechnic knowledge of science would include a mastery of theory

---

[1] DeWitt, Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R., p. 82 (quoted in) (Emphasis mine).

[2] Ibid., p. 82, (quoted in) (Emphasis mine)

first and then the mastery of measuring techniques -

> "determination of weight, specific gravity, pressure, velocities, efficiency of machines, temperatures, specific heat, electric current characteristics, light and illumination intensities, and others - and the development of certain manual skills. A question naturally arises as to just what comprised the laboratory work in Soviet secondary school physics before the 1952 rediscovery of polytechnic instruction."[1]

The Academy of the Pedagogical Sciences through the forty years of Soviet education had used so many ambiguous statements that even Pravda in 1952 complained that:

> "The Institute of the Academy of the Pedagogical Sciences and the journal Soviet Pedagogy substitute the solutions of polytechnical education questions and of other problems in pedagogical sciences with declarations on the necessity of solving these same problems."[2]

In the 1950's what the Soviet industry really needed were workers, not necessarily educated, but skilled. To produce such workers would have meant sinning against the principal Marxiam thesis on education - all-rounded education. Thus the best solution was to cover the reform with terms and formulas - such as "polytechnization" which really meant now an experiment which had as its aim not only to produce enough skilled workers but also

---

[1] Korol, op. cit., p. 29.

[2] Pravda, No. 322, 1952 (translation mine).

> "to curb the stirrings of nonconformity, challenging attitudes, problems of delinquency, and the distinct aversion to physical labor under Soviet conditions which appears to prevail in the mood of Soviet students aspiring for higher education."[1]

Towards the end of 1950's polytechnical education meant specialized vocation (skilled labor) training and polytechnical activity could now be stretched in any direction suitable to the local conditions and opportunities. In fact in this decade polytechnical education meant any of the following:

> "Polytechnical instruction consists of building and repairing school buildings. Polytechnical instruction is involved when students 'can do any manual work assigned to them,' or when they work in a production interprise as auxiliary helpers (floor sweepers). In agriculture if youths are placed directly in 'agricultural work brigades for students' and work 'like anybody else' in the field, this is also polytechnical education. Those who come from urban areas to get 'polytechnical experience' in agriculture are assigned to 'labor camps' (trudovye lagery), from which students are assigned to work in ordinary agricultural brigades for field work ...."[2]

This again was evidently against not only Marxist principles but also those of Lenin. But it was not difficult for the Soviet minister of RSFSR education, Dubrovin, to show that the case was not such and that the reforms were fully in agreement with Marxist

---

[1] Korol, op. cit., p. 31.

[2] DeWitt, "Polytechnical Education and the Soviet School Reform," p. 109.

principles. In Pravda, in 1954, the following statement was published:

> "The higher educational institutes have a possibility of enormous choice from the number of students who sit for the 'concours exams'. The secondary school has finally become also the basis for the preparation of highly qualified workers for the industrial as well as agricultural production, solving thus a historical problem - that of making all workers and all peasants cultured and educated."[1]

As far as narrow specialization was concerned, there too was a good enough excuse: using the well known motto: "from each according to his abilities", the Soviet Party claimed that it was the only possible authority who could know what was the ability of each student through the methods of so called "psychotechnical tests."[2] Thus the Party only could decide what was good for each student. "From each according to his abilities" was after all a Marxist motto.

Consequently, the Communist Party in 1958 proudly proposed:

> "To further increase the part played by the general school in socialist education and to ensure pupils completing secondary school a free choice of profession, a start is to be made in introducing polytechnical training in secondary schools, while the ground will be prepared for the transition to universal polytechnical training."[3]

---

[1] Pravda, No. 166, 1954.

[2] These were the same tests which were condemned as Bourgeois and reactionary.

[3] M. Saburov, Report on the Directives of the 19th Party Congress (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1952), p. 53 (Emphasis mine).

Khrushchev, too, has not been left behind. In 1960 he claimed that polytechnical education meant:

> "production specialization of instruction in secondary schools for the explicit purpose of preparing graduates for immediate employment. In so doing, he clearly departed from Marxist and Leninist concepts of the function of polytechnical education, but he nevertheless called his proposals a move toward the restoration of Leninist principles of education. Actually, what he advocated was tatamount to a revival of narrow monotechnism and straight vocationalism."[1]

> "Moreover, despite Khrushchev's claim that emphasizing labor preparation in the school is in full accord with both Marxist doctrine and Lenin's ideas of combining education with productive labor, the fact is that neither Marx nor Lenin ever envisaged the 'productive specialization of the school" as meaning simply that the whole purpose of education was to equip students with 'useful vocational skills'."[2]

Another argument in favour of the sudden change in the system of education was the fact that Stalin had made a mistake and what Khrushchev really had done was to bring back Soviet education into the right path - the path designated by Marx and Lenin. The fact still remains that Khrushchev did not try to go back to the directives of Marx and Lenin, he went further back. Through the system of Boarding Schools he adopted the Tsarist educational methods.

---

1 DeWitt, Education and Professional Employments in the U.S.S.R., pp. 85-86.

2 Ibid., p. 87.

Krupskaya, still hailed as the leading Marxist pedagogue, wrote in 1929:

> "We need the Marxist conception of the milieu. We do not want to isolate the child from life. We do not need that. It was necessary for the landowners to educate their child in Boarding Schools: institutes, military colleges, lyceums. It was necessary for the bourgeois. The greater the isolation of the children from real life with its struggle, the less do they understand life and its troubles, and the easier life becomes for them. In closing their eyes to the life around them, they can all the more easily depend on their own landowner's bourgeois point of view."
>
> "We organize the education of our children in the understanding of life with the aid that life itself gives, moving along the road of the unceasing and everdeepening struggle for socialism."[1]

The Boarding Schools of Khrushchev are not much different from the Boarding Schools at the time of the Tsars. Before 1917, education as viewed by the Marxists was considered to be a tool of the ruling class used to suppress the ruled. As education in Tsarist Russia, so education in Soviet Russia today has become an elitist, traditionally oriented system, accessible to the few and with a high academic standard. Only those who attend the Boarding Schools can enter the university and other higher educational institutions. The general secondary school has been converted into a professional school and thus students who attend it can no more go into higher studies. In

---

[1] N. K. Krupskaya, "Vospitanie" (Education), Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia, (Moscow: 1st ed., 1929), Vol. XII., p. 320.

these Boarding Schools there are tuition fees - high enough to make them inaccessible to the masses. Thus only the children of the Party elite will be educated in those schools and the children of the masses - of the workers will be turned into the factories and fields. Where then is "universal polytechnical education" Khrushchev again has a plausible answer. He argues in favour of creating these Boarding Schools because it would solve "the problem of creating the spiritual prerequisites for completing .... the transition from the lower stage of communism to its higher stage."[1] He further proposed that

> "the state assume a larger role in the nurture and upbringing of children. Referring to the Tsarist schools for the children of privileged classes, such as the Pages and Cadet Corps and Institutes for Girls of Noble Birth, in which he said, the children received a thoroughly aristocratic upbringing," he said that the task of the Soviet state is to bring up the "builders of a new society, individuals of great spirit and lofty ideals, wholeheartedly serving their people who are marching in the vanguard of all progressive mankind."[2]

It is evident that such a reform will necessarily lead to a sharper class distinction, and will determine beforehand who will and who will not have a higher education.

---

[1] "Khrushchev's Speech", in Pravda, Feb. 15, 1956, quoted in Korol, op. cit., p. 33.

[2] Ibid., p. 33.

> "That such proposals are made, despite adherence to the genetic theories of Lysenko and Michurin and the Soviet philosophical postulate that all are equally educable, merely reflects the cleavage between Communist theory and Soviet practice."[1]

As a masterpiece of Soviet casuistry the following excerpts from an address "Thirty Years of Soviet Education" written by Kalashnikov, the Minister of Education of the RSFSR, need no comment.[2]

"The thirty years of the existence of the Soviet state are thirty years of struggle - thirty years of victories which the Soviet people have conquered under the banner of Lenin, under the leadership of Stalin. During these years a new and most progressive social and governmental system has been created in our country. A socialist industry has been established and the collectivisation of rural economy has been carried through successfully. Under the leadership of the Communist Party a genuine cultural revolution has been achieved, resulting in the extension of education to the widest masses of the people."

"The Soviet Union has become the center of a progressive socialist culture, a light to illuminate the road for other people and states...."

---

[1] Bereday, The Politics of Soviet Education, p. 44.

[2] A.G. Kalashnikov, Thirty Years of Soviet Education, (Moscow: 1947), 31 pages, (address delivered under auspices of the "All-Union Society for the Dissemination of Political and Scientific Knowledge" on October 24, 1947.) Quoted in Counts, the Country of the Blind, pp. 262-274, (all emphasis mine).

"For the first time in the history of mankind education has become actually popular, that is accessible to all the people and directed to the satisfaction of the interests of the people."

"In questions of public education the Bolshevik Party has been led by the Lenin-Stalin teaching of the intimate relation of the school to politics."

"'...Education,'" as Comrade Stalin pointed out in his conversation with H.G. Wells, 'is a weapon, whose effect depends on who holds it in his hands and at whom it is aimed.' In capitalist society the school is a weapon in the hands of the bourgeoisie for the idealogical enslavements of the workers, a weapon for the strengthening of their ruling position. The bourgeoisie in fact deprive the working masses of education, doling it out to the people only in the measure that satisfies their interests."

"The class character of education in pre-revolutionary Russia was often exposed in the writing of Lenin and Stalin. In the words of V.I. Lenin, the popular masses in Russia, 'from the point of view of education, were robbed of light and knowledge.' The class or cast school of tsarist Russia nurtured, on the one hand, gentlemen, and on the other, servile slaves and efficient workers capable only of giving profits without being troublesome to their masters.[1]

---

[1] Note Khrushchev's reform in favour of Boarding Schools - a striking resemblance.

"In 1913 in exposing the anti-people's character of the activity of the Ministry of Public Education under the leadership of the vicious reactionary, Kasso, V.I. Lenin wrote: 'The working class .... will know how to prove .... its ability in the revolutionary struggle for genuine freedom and for a genuinely classless and castless public education'."

"The bourgeois theoreticians and politicians always strove to conceal the class character and political direction of the school, to cloak it with long discourses about the 'neutrality' and the 'universal quality' of education, expressing hypocritical indignation toward the Marxist-Leninist position about the relation of the school in politics. Through the voice of V.I. Lenin the Communist Party sharply and clearly declared to the whole world that a school outside of life, outside of politics is a lie and an hypocricy. Also Marx wrote: 'The most enlightened part of the working class fully recognizes that the future of its class and consequently the future of mankind as a whole depends on the education of the rising generation'."

"And by bringing the great masses of workers and peasants in contact with culture, by educating the young in the spirit of Communism, our Soviet school, has become the instrument of cultural revolution, a weapon for the Communist re-birth of society."

"Throughout the entire course of its history Soviet Education, both in its ideological content and in its methods and organization, has been determined by the politics of the Communist Party." ..... "The aims and tasks of the Soviet school, which determined the content and the organization of its work, were formulated in a program of the Party, adopted as the Eighth Congress in 1919. The Party set as its goal the completion of the task begun by the October Revolution of converting the school from a weapon of the class state of the bourgeoisie into a weapon for the complete annihilation of the division of society into classes, into a weapon for the Communist rebirth of society."

"For the first time a great reformative function was imposed on the school. It was confronted with the task of the nurture of a new man, free from the slavish psychology of Capitalist society. In achieving the task of Communist education the school had to provide an all-round development of its pupils to make of them rational and cultured people, to form in them a scientific - materialistic point of view, to instill in them a Communist morality."

"The task was imposed on the school of becoming an exponent of the principles of Communism through the widest masses of the toilers, of becoming the organizer of the education influence of the proletariat and its vanguard - the Communist Party - on the semi-proletarian and non-proletarian toiling masses. The Party regarded the school,

not as a self-inclosed educational institution, but as an educational center, dissiminating Communist ideology and Communist morality outside the school, and above all in the family."

"As the Soviet state grew and developed, the principles governing the education of the rising generation, which formed the basis of the work of the Soviet school from the beginning of the great October Socialist Revolution, were clarified, broadened, and made concrete. The classical works of Lenin and Stalin laid the theoretical foundation of Soviet pedagogy - a new Soviet science of the education of children." ....

"However, during the years 1925-30 deviations from the instructions of Lenin were observed in school practice. The osequiousness and genyflection on the part of some Soviet educators before the educational theory and practice of Western Europe and America led to the uncritical introduction into the Soviet school of methods of education evolved by reactionary bourgeois pedagogy. This found its expression in the so-called complex programs, the project method, the Dalton Plan, and the laboratory brigade method, which were imposed on Soviet schools. These injurious methods of teaching hampered the work of our schools and prevented them from carrying on the serious general educational preparation of pupils demanded by the Party and the country."

"The struggle of the Trotskyists and right-opportunist elements against the general line of the Party during the period found its counterpart in the field of pedagogy. The Party was obliged to conduct a decisive warfare, on the one hand, with the leftist, anti-Leninist 'theory of the withering away of the school' and, on the other hand, with the right-opportunist elements who strove to preserve the remnants of the old scholastic school and disregard the socialist nature of the Soviet school."

"The Party exposed all of these anti-Leninist tendencies and straightened out the line of development of the Soviet school. Of historic significance of this respect was the resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of September 5, 1931, "On the Primary and Secondary School"."

"While recognizing great strides in the field of school work, the Central Committee stated that the Soviet school is far from complying with the demands made upon it by the contemporary stage of socialist construction. The school had failed to give the necessary body of basic knowledge and consequently had failed to prepare for entrance into technicums and higher schools of fully literate people who had mastered well the foundations of science."

"The Central Committee pointed out that teaching in schools must rest on the basis of definite, carefully prepared courses of study and teaching plans organized within the framework of a firm

schedule of studies. As a guide for further work of the school the Central Committee proposed the use of the instructions of Lenin given as early as 1920 in his comments on the theses of N.K. Krupskaya "On Polytechnical Education" at the Third Congress of the League of Young Communists."

"Having condemned all anti-Leninist tendencies in educational theory and practice, the Party suggested that the school employ those methods of teaching which contributes in the education of active and energetic participants in socialist construction. It also pointed to the necessity of strengthening the struggle against all attempts to indoctrinate children in the Soviet school with the elements of the non-proletarian ideology."

"This resolution played an outstanding role in the life of the Soviet school and served as the most important theoretical and practical weapon in the struggle for the improvement of the quality of instruction."

"In subsequent years the Party adopted a number of significant resolutions, directed toward the further improvement of school work and the development of Soviet pedagogy. Especially note-worth was the resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of August 25, 1932, "On Courses of Study and the Regimen of Primary and Secondary School." The resolution stated that the basic form of the organization of instruction in primary and secondary schools

must be the recitation with a careful classification of all pupils and the systematic schedule of studies. Thus the time-tested class-recitation system was restored to its rightful place in the schools. The same resolution outlines a series of concrete instructions on methods of teaching and the strengthening of the leading role of the teacher in the organization of educational work and the struggle for conscious discipline in the school."

"The remarks of Comrades I. V. Stalin, A.A. Zhdanov, and S.N. Kirov on outlines for textbooks in the History of the U.S.S.R. and the New History constituted a document of large ideological and theoretical value played an important role in developing a correct conception of the work of the school and gave a genuinely scientific Marxist direction to the teaching of history."

"During the succeeding years Soviet pedagogy achieved new successes. The rout of the so-called pedology, which had been introduced into our school by worshippers of foreign, chiefly American bourgeois pedagogy, was completed. The Central Committee of the Party in its resolution of July 4, 1936, "On pedological Perversions in the System of Narkompros", exposed this pseudo-science which was founded on false premises concerning the nature of the child, unmasked its reactionary - bourgeois essence, and demanded the full restoration of the rights of pedagogy and teachers. The resolution played a fruitful role in the activity of the Soviet school and in

the development of pedagogical science."

"The same role was played by the instructions of the Eighteenth Congress of the Party on the significance of Communist education and the overcoming of the remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of the people - builders of Communism. In this Congress Comrade Molotov said: 'On the success of Communist Education in the broad meaning of the word, of Communist education embracing the entire mass of workers and the entire Soviet intelligentsia - first of all, on our successes in this sphere depends the resolution of all other problems'."

"The decisions of the Eighteenth Congress of the Party demanded that the school improve decisively the Communist education of pupils and insure that general educational, ideological, and cultural preparation of the younger generation which would meet the growing demands of the Soviet people. The Congress set itself the task of achieving universal secondary education in the city and universal seven-year education in the village." ....

"And now when our country is achieving the grandiose plan for the restoration and the development of the public economy, questions of the instruction and ideological education of the young continue to stand in the center of the attention of the Party and the entire people."

"The historic resolutions of the Central Committee of the Party on the question of ideological work, approved in 1946, were particularly significant in the life of the school. In the postwar period, when the reactionary bourgeoisie passed over to attack on the ideological front, employing the weapon of the lie and slander in order to revile the Soviet social order and to discredit socialist culture, the struggle with the reactionary ideologists and decaying bourgeois culture took on a peculiarly sharp character. The Party demanded of all workers on the educational front, including the Soviet teaching body the strengthening of political vigilance and Bolshevik Party loyalty. The Party set before the school the task of educating our youth to become cultured people, ideologically mature, with high moral standards, firm, energetic, able to overcome obstacles."....

"The results of the Soviet system of education are seen in the remarkable traits which our youth revealed in the years of the Stalinist Five-Year Plan when, trained in the realization that labor in our country is a matter of honor, valor, and heroism, they achieved genuine labor victories. Thus also in the years of the Great Patriotic War against fascism when the high understanding, deep patriotism, and lofty moral qualities of Soviet youth were a powerful factor in our victory over the enemy."

"The high ideals of our school children are not infrequently revealed in school compositions. Already from the school benches Soviet children dream of serving their fatherland, of heroic deeds, which they will achieve in its name in the future. They are proud of their motherland, of its heroic past, of its socialist present. Here, for example, is what Sasha S., a pupil of the fourth grade writes in a class composition: 'I was born and grew up in Smolensk, but my Motherland is the entire Soviet country, I am proud of the Soviet Motherland. I am proud that I am a Russian. There is no other such country as ours. All of our people have equal rights, and there is no oppression of nationalities. We are rich in everything and we need no assistance from foreigners'."

"The love of children for the Motherland is linked indissolubly with their love for Comrade Stalin. 'There is one man,' writes a pupil in the fourth grade, Vera F., 'who has made our life happy and joyous. The entire country knows and loves him. His name is Stalin. This name lives in our hearts'."

"And there is no doubt that under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin the Soviet school will achieve new successes in the achievement of lofty and responsible tasks in the education of the younger generation, builders of Communism." .....

"While in the Soviet Union genuine democratic and humanistic principles of education are being realized, a number of countries,

of so-called "bourgeois democracy", hypocricy is being nurtured, hatred towards freedom-loving peoples and contempt for peoples not belonging to the white race are being inculcated. Science is falsified or altogether eliminated from the education institutions of these countries."

"Moral education, which should aim at the formation of noble qualities of human personality, is converted into the cultivation of the traits of the petty-huckster, the self-centered egoist, who sees the source and goal of human activity in money, inpersonal enrichment." ....

"Everything is for sale and everything is to be bought. Whatever brings profit is moral. Such is the code of morality cultivated in the American school. Such is the true content of bourgeois education."

"If in the Soviet Union from year to year the network of educational institutions and the number of pupils increase, in the countries of capitalistic Europe and America public education is on the decline." ....

"But yet more grave is the moral position of the teacher in the West. He is compelled to teach a falsified science and to cripple the souls of children to please the reactionary policy of the bourgeoisie. Widely known are the "oaths of allegiance" of American teachers who are compelled to swear that they will not *teach

Communism to children®."

"Only in the Soviet Union is the school genuinely democratic and truly humanistic."

"The thirty-year road of development of Soviet education is the road of uninterrupted improvement in accordance with those tasks which are placed before the school by Lenin, Stalin, the Party of Bolsheviks, and the Soviet state."

"The truly grandiose work in the field of public enlightenment which during the thirty years of Soviet power has been conducted in our country under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin is one of the decisive factors in the victories and achievements of socialism. Our schools, children®s homes, higher educational institutions, and numerous schools and courses for adults have prepared people for industry and agriculture, science and technique, art and literature. They have introduced vast multitudes of people to the cultural heritage, they have assisted in the flowering of Soviet culture, socialist in content and national in form. They reared a new man - the man of the Stalinist epoch. And into this magnificient house of socialism which is constructed in our country went not a little labor of the workers of public education. With full right they can repeat the stirring words of Vladimir Mayakovsky:

I rejoice
that
my labor
is poured
into the labor
of my republic".

" In celebrating with the entire Soviet land thirty years of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the workers of the public education realize with pride that their labor in the education of the rising generation brings nearer the realization of Communism and contributed to the final victory of the cause of Lenin and Stalin."

Most of the references in the above report are false, but this should not matter, because the word "Party" wherever used as an adjective is enough to insure that no questions will be asked. Truth or falsehood - do not matter, what matters is how well the "Party" cause is served.

CONCLUSION

Education is primarily a social process. Any philosophy of education must of necessity proceed from that basic understanding. The significance of this social dimension of educational philosophy varies according to the conception one has of how individuals should be related to each other. Differently arranged social relations will lead to different educational practices.

In democratic societies, the individual's freedom and unique value is recognized and respected; enterprise, initiative, competition and self-reliance are encouraged and rewarded. In totalitarian societies individualism is curbed in the attempt to impose a common pattern. In such a state any individual who does not conform to the totalitarian practice and contradicts its theory must be "re-educated" or liquidated. Individualism is a heresy, there can be only one social whole - the state. All education is sponsored by the state and for the state. The individual is educated as a citizen first, then as a man; the state is the end of education, the individual becomes a means to its realization.

Whether the tyrant is king or commoner, whatever form the dictatorship may take, royal absolutism or one-party rule, the result is the same -- free discussion is absent and education is not a process of self-realization or emancipation of the individual. Because education is unfree, it is an instrument by which the

individual is exploited in the interests of the state.

The degree of this exploitation depends upon the efficiency and the dynamism of the ruler. The more totalitarian a regime, the more efficient is the exploitation. In such a government the more the authority imposed from the top - the greater will be the measure of obedience from below.

When economic interests become subordinated to political ends, education too, can expect the same fate, for public opinion as well as educational theory and practices are shaped into the official mold. And even the findings of science must conform to the approved doctrine.

The above statement of totalitarian ideals of education could as well represent Soviet or Communist ideals of education. The Communists criticize democracy and individualism, oppose the atomistic organization of the society where each individual has a unique value, and equally oppose the competitive spirit and free choice. It is not the state which should serve the individual but the individual who must serve the state.

We may summarize the character of Soviet education through the following address:

"We shall let ourselves be infallibly guided by your direction as to the strict preservation of the unity of theory and practice, philosophy and politics, as to the principle of Bolshevik partisanship in theory."

"We promise you, dear comrade Stalin, to take a leading part in the struggle against idealistic reactionary doctrines ...."

"We promise you to transform our chairs into militant party collectives, exercising a continuing influence on the entire process of pedagogical teaching and displaying Bolshevik vigilance and intolerance against every manifestation of bourgeois objectivism and cosmopolitanism."

"We shall fight unceasingly and untiringly against the reactionary ideology of Anglo-American imperialism. By wielding the sharp sword of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism we shall raise our work of teaching, scientific research and party propaganda to a higher level, consonant with the task of the struggle for Communism."[1]

The world of theory has come out to be different from the world of practice and Lenin's dream of training harmoniously developed human beings has not come true. The road to classless society is very long, for such a society is a myth. The dictatorship of the proletariat will last for many years - in fact - in Stalin's own words, it will last as many years as needed to educate the proletariat to

---

[1] "An address to our leader and teacher Joseph Vissarionovitch Stalin, participants of a conference of the Philosophical Institute of the Academy of Sciences". (quoted in Gustav Wetter, Dialectical Materialism, trans. Peter Heath (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958), p. 559.

efficient self-government, and to re-educate and mold the minds of the bourgeoisie in accordance with the ideals of Communism. But the education which will bring forth the Homo Sovieticus of the classless society, Marxian education has been as much a part of the Soviet myth as the myth of the "classless society". And the classless society as well as the Homo Sovieticus have become a question of faith.

In the Soviet Union where Communism is a faith and a creed, the people are supposed to believe what they are told. The Communist Party line is not different from that of any other great religion - Christianity or Islam, Judaism or Hinduism. It demands the absolute obedience of the believers. Its methods as well as claims are unquestionable. Any changes, any turn of policy should not be questioned because the higher authority - God or the Party knows better and is the only one who can know and understand the reason behind such a change.

When Catholicism was at its peak, as far as power and influence is concerned, during the Middle Ages, it followed the same practices as the Communist Party today. But the Catholic Church had a powerful tool and weapon - Casuistry. With the help of which it cleansed itself of all guilt, it found excuses and good reasons for everything it did.

Since then, casuistry in its proper form has been forgotten, logicians talk today of Probabilism - a science. The Jesuits and

the Catholic Church of today are ashamed of Casuistry and its methods. Books on Casuistry lie in their libraries covered with dust. In other libraries they cannot be found. But, strangely enough, Casuistry has been revived, nourished and practiced by a creed opposed in all aspects to the Catholic Church. Casuistry has been flourishing in the Soviet Union for the past forty-five years, for the very character of Soviet Marxist philosophy is Scholastic. And it is with the help of Casuistic methods that the Soviet government is able to reason and argue for everything it does, whether it is in the Marxian line or not.

It is not difficult to conclude that in the Soviet Union, freedom of choice cannot exist, for everything has been determined from before, through the Marxian belief in determinism. If freedom of choice does not exist, can there be any freedom of science or learning? The state controls the educational philosophy as well as the subject matter taught. Textbooks are under the control of the state. Each time the state changes its educational or other ideological views, history, geography, philosophy, sometimes even science are re-written.

"The claims of Soviet ideologists on the possibility of developing the Communist conception of life on the basis of education have definitely failed. And the falsification and 'touching up' of scientific disciples, the re-writing of the history of different

peoples according to the political circumstances at a given time, all these methods do not aid young people but only intensify their ideological confusion."[1]

Though science cannot be really rewritten, or changed except for some minor things, freedom in this field is limited. It is limited in the sense that the scientist does not have the freedom to "play around" with any ideas which would interest him. He is in fact, more than anybody else responsible for the reconstruction of the state, its developments, and progress. He, therefore, must be interested in those things only, which interest the state. Communist education then, seems to be nothing else but a certain kind of training - a training in the service of the state.

Marx claimed that education must be free from class prejudice. But in the Soviet Union a new class has been born. The bourgeoisie has been replaced by the bureaucracy - the Communist Party elite. The children of the Party elite are educated in better schools, the children of the masses are turned into the factories as soon as possible. Class barriers are felt much more at the university levels. The children of Communist Party members get privileged places - they become engineers, they go to military academies, they study philosophy, law and economics or history.

---

[1] Caucasian Review, (Munich: Institute for the U.S.S.R., 1957), No. 4, p. 74.

The children of the masses go to the pedagogical or agricultural institutes, they fill up the second rate high schools - or they go to the factories and farms. It is evident that education in the Soviet Union is not very much different from that under Tzarist Russia. It is true that now the masses have been educated, that illiteracy has dropped to a great extent; but have the masses really been educated, in the sense we understand education, or have they been trained? In any case one thing strikes us most; Tzarist education was based upon three basic principles - those of Autocracy, Orthodoxy and Nationalism.

These three principles were denounced by the Communists on the basis of Marxist philosophy; they have been replaced: - they have been replaced by Autocracy, Orthodoxy and Nationalism again. But the religious Orthodoxy of the Tzars has been replaced by the unconditional acceptance of the social, political and economic orthodoxy of the Party Line.

Tzarist Russian Nationalism has not been changed in its spirit but has been carried out to a greater extent and perfection; not only the members of the Soviet Union must learn Russian language, literature, arts, but also the satellites have been undergoing the same process of Russification as the racial minorities did at the time of the Tzars. The Autocracy of the Tzars has been replaced by a more complete autocracy of the Communist Party.

The means seem to have changed the end. Soviet theory based on Marxist principles has been changed into a form of Scholasticism the methods of which are casuistry highly perfectioned. And it seems that "In the Soviet Union falsification, like everything else is monolithic. All who speak or write must tell the same lie. This means that behind the 'iron curtain' even scholarship, the last hope of truth, has become a naked political weapon. In its historical sense, therefore, scholarship is dead."[1]

---

[1] George S. Counts, American Education through the Soviet Looking Glass, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951), p. 16.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Alsted, Henri. Theologia Casuum. Hanover, 1621.

_____. Arkhivi Marksa i Engelsa. Moscow: Gos. Izd., 1934.

Augé, Paul. Larousse du XX Siècle. Paris: Librarie Larousse, 1929.

Ausley, Clarke F. The Columbia Encyclopedia. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947.

Ayres, C. E. Science the False Messiah. Indianopolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1927.

Baldwin, James Mark (ed.) Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology. Gloucester: 1957.

Barrett, Boyd E. The Jesuit Enigma. New York: Boni & Liveright, 1927.

Bennett, John. Christianity and Communism Today. New York: Association Press, 1960.

Berdiaev, Nicolas. Les Sources et le Sens du Communism Russe. Paris: Gallimard, 1951.

Bereday, George et al. (eds.). The Changing Soviet School. Boston: The Riverside Press, 1960.

_____. The Politics of Soviet Education. New York: Praeger, 1960.

Bernal, J. D. Aspects of Dialectical Materialism. London: n.n., 1934.

Black, C. E. (ed.) Rewriting Russian-History. New York: Praeger, 1956.

_____. Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia. Moscow: 1939, 2nd. ed. 1955.

Bonal, Raymond. De la Théologie Morale. Lyon: Antoine Beaujollin, 1937.

Brubacher, John S. Modern Philosophies of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1950.

Brugger. Philosophisches Worterbuch. Breisgau: Herder, 1961.

Bubnov, A. Shkola Va Povorot (The School on the Turn). Moscow: 1931.

Bucceroni, J.S.J. Casus Conscientiae. n.p., n.n., 1894.

Cane, Philip. Giants of Science. New York: Pyramid Books, 1961.

Carrière, J. S.J. De Contractibus. n.p., n.n., 1843.

The Catholic Encyclopedia. New York: The Encyclopedia Press Inc., 1908.

The Catholic Encyclopedia Dictionary. New York: The Gilmary Society, 1926.

Cohen, Robert C. "On the Marxist Philosophy of Education," The Fifty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part. I. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Counts, George S. American Education Through the Soviet Looking Glass. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1951.

_____. The Challenge of Soviet Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., Inc., 1957.

_____. The Country of the Blind. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1949.

Cousin, V. Histoire Générale de la Philosophie. Paris: n.n., 1864.

Dewey, John. Impressions of Soviet Russia. New York: New Republic Inc., 1929.

DeWitt, Nicolas. Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R. Washington: US Government Printing Office, 1961.

_____. Soviet Professional Manpower. Washington D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1955.

De Wulf, Maurice. History of Medieval Philosophy. Trans. Peter Coffey. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909.

_____. Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages. Trans. Peter Coffey. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1953.

_____. Scholastic Philosophy. Trans. Peter Coffey. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956.

_____. Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique. Paris: LeTouzey et Ané, 1905.

Diderot et d'Alembert (eds.) Encyclopedie des Sciences, des Arts et Métiers. Paris: n.n., n.d., Vol. I.

Education in the U.S.S.R. U.S. department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1947.

The Encyclopedia Britanica. New York: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 1910.

Engels, Friedrich. Anti-During. Moscow: Gos., Izd., 1931. (Russian Ed.)

_____. Principles of Communism. Moscow: Gos. Izd., 1931. (Russian Ed.)

_____. Entsiklopedmii Slovar (Encyclopedical Dictionary), Moscow: Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia, 1955. Vol. 3.

Ferreres, J. B. SJ. Casus Conscientiae. Paris: n.n. 1926.

Fouillé, A. Histoire de la Philosophie. Paris: n.n. 1883.

Friedrich, Carl J. (ed.) The Philosophy of Hegel. New York: The Modern Library, 1954.

Fulop-Miller, René. The Power and Secret of the Jesuits. New York: The Viking Press, 1930.

Garaudy. La Théorie Matérialiste de la Connaissance. Paris: P.U.F. n.d.

Genicot and Salsman. Casus Conscientiae. n.p., n.n., 1902.

Gilson, Etienne Henry. Etudes sur le Role de la Pensée Médievale dans la Formation du système Cartésien. Paris: J. Vrin, 1930.

_____. History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages. New York: Random House, 1955.

_____. The Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. London: Herder Book Co., 1939.

_____. Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.

_____. Spirit of Medieval Philosophy. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

_____. The Unity of Philosophical Experience. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.

Cury, J. P. SJ. Casus Conscientiae. n.p., n.n., 1875.

_____. Compedium Theologiae Moralis. n.p., n.n., 1850.

Hastings, James (ed.) Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edinburg: J.T. Clark, 1910, Vol. III.

Heilboner, Robert L. The Wordly Philosophers. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1953.

Heriberte, Jone. Précis de Théologie Moral Catholique. n.p., n.n., n.d.

Hook, Sydney. Dialectical Materialism and Scientific Method. New York: J. B. Foy & Co., 1955.

_____. Reason, Social Myths and Democracy. New York: The Humanities Press, 1950.

Huisman Denis and Vergez, André. Metaphysique. Paris: Fernand Nathan, 1960.

Humphrey. Conscience and Law. London: n.n., 1896.

Hunt, Carew. A Guide to Communist Jargon. London: Geoffrey Bles. 1957.

_____. Marxism Past and Present. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1954.

_____. The Theory and Practice of Communism. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1957.

Huxley, Julian. Soviet Genetics and World Science. London: Ghatto and Windus, 1949.

Jordan, W. G. Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought. Edinburg: T. Clark, 1909.

Kalashnikov, A. G. Tridsat' Let Sovetskovo Prosveshcheniia. (Thirty Years of Soviet Education). Moscow: 1947.

Kandel, I. L. (ed.) Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teacher's College. New York: Columbia University, 1927.

Kersetz, Stephan. (ed.) The Fate of East-Central Europe. Paris: University of Notre Dame, 1956.

Klimov, S. Vseoobshchee Obuchenie i Politekhnizatzia Selskoi Shkoli. (Universal Education and Polytechnization of Agricultural Schools). Moscow: 1931.

Koestler, Arthur. The Sleepwalkers. London: Hutchinson of London, 1959.

Korbel, Joseph. The Communist Subversion of Czechoslovakia 1938-1948. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1959.

Korol, Alexander. Soviet Education for Science and Technology. London: Chapman & Hall Ltd., 1957.

Krupskaya, N. Izbrannye Pedagogicheskie Proizvedenia. (Collected Pedagogical Works). Academy of Pedagogical Sciences RSFSR, 1955.

Lalande, André. Vocabulaire Technique et Critique de la Philosophie. Paris: P.U.F., 1947.

Lehkuhl, Augustinus SJ. Casus Conscientiae. n.p., n.n., 1903.

Lenin, V. I. Protiv Abstraktnykh Rassuzhdenii o Polytekhnisme. (Against Abstract Decisions on Polytechnism). Moscow: 1920.

_____. Sochinenia. (O Polytechnicheskom Obrazovanii - zametki potezisam N. Krupskoi) (Works - Polytechnical Education - notes on N. Krupskaya's thesis). 3rd ed., Vol. III.

Lisiieux. Censure de l'Apologie Pour les Casuistes. Paris: 1659.

Makarenko, Anton. A Book for Parents. Moscow: 1954.

_____. Learning to Live. Moscow: 1951.

_____. O Kommunisticheskom Vospitanii: Izbrannye Pedagogicheskie Proizvedenniia. (Writings on Communist Education: Selected Pedagogical Works). Moscow: 1952.

_____. The Road to Life. Moscow: 1953.

Maritain, Jacques. True Humanism. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1940.

_____. Scholasticism and Politics. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1940.

Marx, Karl. Kapital. Chicago: Charles Kerr & Co., 1915.

_____. Selected Works. New York: International Publishers Co., 1939.

_____. Thesis on Feuerbach. New York: International Publishers Co., 1939.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. Manifesto of the Communist Party. New York: International Publishers, 1955.

Mason, Edward. The Paris Commune. New York: n.n. 1930.

Melnikov, M. A. and Shatkin, M. (eds.) Politekhnicheskoye obuchenie v obshche obrazovatelnoi shkole. (Polytechnical training in the General Education School). Moscow: Academy of Pedagogical Sciences RSFSR, 1953.

Meyenberg, M. Die Katolische Moral als Angeklagte. n.p., Stanz, 1904.

Monnerot, Jules. Sociology and Communism. London: n.n., 1953.

Nikodimov, I. O Polytekhnicheskom obrazovanii v SSSR. (Polytechnical Education in the U.S.S.R.) Munich: Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., 1957.

Omelyanovsky, M. E. Filosofskie Voprosy Kvantovoi Mekhaniki. (The Philosophical Problems of Quantum Mechanics). Moscow: 1956.

Pascal, Blaise. The Provincial Letters. Trans. Thomas M'Crie, New York: Modern Library, 1941.

Pasternak, Boris. Doctor Zhivago. Trans. Max Hayward and Manya Harari. London: W. Collins Sons & Co., Ltd., 1958.

Perovski, E. Sovetskaya Polytekhnicheskaya Trudovaya Shkola. (Soviet Polytechnical Labour School). Moscow: Gos. Izd., 1931.

Pinkevitch, Albert. The New Education in the Soviet Republic. New York: John Day Co., 1927.

_____. Science and Education in the U.S.S.R. London: Victor Gollanz, 1935.

Pirot, George. Apologie Pour les Casuistes Contre les Calomnies de Jansénistes. Paris: 1657.

Pousson, Leon B. The Totalitarian Philosophy of Education. Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1944.

Rostow, W. W. The Dynamics of Soviet Society. USA: New American Library, 1954.

Russell, Bertrand. Science and Metaphysics. London: Sheed and Ward, 1958.

Saburov, M. Report on the Directives of the 19th Party Congress. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1952.

Saintebeuve De, Jacques. La Morale et le Discipline de l'Eglise. Lyon: Jean Coutavoz, MDCCII.

Seligman, R. A. (ed.) The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930.

Shevkin, V. S. Pedagogika D. Duii na Sluzhbe Sovremennoi Amerikanskoi Reaktsii. (The Pedagogy of J. Dewey in the Service of Contemporary American Reaction). Moscow: Uchpedzig 1952.

Shore, Maurice. Soviet Education. New York: Philosophical Library, 1947.

Shulgin, N. V. Marx i Engels v ikh Pedagogicheskikh Vizkazivnizkh. (Marx and Engels in their Pedagogical Citations). Moscow: Rabotnik Prosveshchenia, 1925.

Simmons, Ernest J. Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.

_____. Slovar Sovremennovo Ruskovo Yazika. (Dictionary of Contemporary Russian Language). Moscow: Academy of the Sciences, 1956.

Thamin, Raymond. Un Problème Moral dans l'Antiquité. Paris: 1884.

Treadgold, Donald. Twentieth Century Russia. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1959.

Tulle, P. Lettre Pastoral Censurant l'Apologie Pour les Casuistes. Paris: 1658.

Vittrant, Jean - Benoit, SJ. Théologies Moral. Paris: Beauchesne et ses Fils, MCMXLI.

Wetter, Gustav. Dialectical Materialism. Trans. Peter Heath. London: Routledge and Paul Kegan, 1958.

Whitehead, A. N. Science and the Modern World. Cambridge: 1953.

Wilson, Edmund. To the Finland Station. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1953.

Articles and Periodicals

DeWitt, Nicolas. "Basic Comparative Data on Soviet and American Education", Comparative Education Review, Vol. 2, No. 1 (June 1958).

_____. "Polytechnical Education and the Soviet School Reform", Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 39, No. 2, (Spring 1960).

Bouquillon. "Moral Theology at the End of the 19th Century", The Catholic University Bulletin, April 1899.

Brunetiére, J. "Une Apologie de la Casuistique", Revue des Deux Mondes, Paris, January 1885.

Imeridze, I. "The Crisis in Secondary School Education in the Georgian SSR", Caucasian Review, No. 3, 1956, Munich, Institutefor the Study of the USSR.

Karcha, R. "Education at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party", Caucasian Review, No. 4, 1957, Munich, Institute for the Study of the USSR.

Kommunist (Communist) (bi-weekly), 1953-1958.

"Konkretno Rukovodit Delom Polytekhnicheskovo Obrazevania", (To Organize Concretely the issue of Polytechnical Education), Uchitelskaya Gazeta. (Teacher's Journal), No. 14, 1956.

Komsomolskaya Pravda, 21. 6. 1959.

"Leninskie Mysli o Polytekhnichskom Obrazovanii", (Lenin's ideas on Polytechnical Education), Uchitelskaya Gazeta. (Teacher's Journal), 23. IV. 1955.

Naumenko. "Pervyii Opyt Proizvodstvennovo Obucheniya", (First Trials of Labour Education), Uchitelskaya Gazeta. (Teacher's Journal), 24. III. 1956.

"O Nedostatkakh Polytekhnicheskovo Obycheniya", (On the Weaknesses of Polytechnical Training), Pravda. No. 24, 1954.

"O Polytekhnicheskom Obuchenii", (On Polytechnical Training). Uchitelskaya Gazeta. (Teacher's Journal), No. 64, 1955.

"Otchot o Sessii Academii Pedagogicheskikh Nauk RSFSR: Doklad Kairova. (A report on the Sessions of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences: Kairov's Speech). Trud. (Labour), 6. I., 1956.

"Povyshat' Kachestvo Raboty Sovetskoi Shkoly", (Augmenting the Quality of Work in the Soviet School). Pravda, No. 4, 1953.

Pravda. Nos. 3, 4, 94, 1953 and Nos. 24, 244, 1954 (Articles on National Education).

"Programma Kommunisticheskovo Vospitania Molod'ozhi", (The Program for the Communist Education of the Youth). Uchitelskaya Gazeta. (Teacher's Journal), No. 79, I. X. 1955.

Review Annuelle. No. 2, 1956, Munich: Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R.

Skatkin, I. "Nekotorye Voprosy Polytekhnicheskovo Obrazovaniya", (Some Problems of Polytechnical Education), Sovetskaya Pedagogika, No. 8, 1951.

_____. "O Polytechnicheskom Obrazovanii v Obshcheobrazovatelnoi shkole", (On Polytechnical Education in the General Education School). Sovetskaya Pedagogika. No. 6, 1946.

Skatkin, L. and Bulatov, N. "O Polytekhnicheskom Obrazovanii v Prepadavanii Fysiki", (Polytechnical Education in the Teaching of Physics). Fysika v Shkole. (Physics in School), No. 3, 1951 and No. 1, 1953.

Shabalov, S. "O Polytekhnicheskom Obrazovanii", (Polytechnical Education). Sovetskaya Pedagogika. (Soviet Pedagogy), Nos. 5-6, 1954.

_____. "O Polytekhnicheskom Obuchenii v Srednei Obsecheobrazovatelnoi shkole", (On Polytechnical Education in the Secondary General Education School). Sovetskaya Pedagogika. (Soviet Pedagogy), No. 11, 1952.