

https://dspace.org/

The two widows: a comparison of the educational influence of Krupskaya, wife of Lenin and Chiang Ch'ing, wife of Mao

Rootenberg, Suzanne Eva

2015-08-18
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/18259

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

The two widows : A comparison of the educational influence of Krupskaya, wife of Lenin, and Chiang Ch'ing, wife of Mao.

Suzanne Eva Rootenberg

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Education, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Education.

Johannesburg, 1982.

Abstract

This dissertation studies the educational influence of two women. One of these women is Nadezhda K. Krupskaya (1863 - 1936), wife of Lenin who was Premier of the U.S.S.R. The other woman is Chiang Ch'ing (born in 1914 and still alive today), third wife of Mao Tse-Tung who was Chairman of the People's Republic of China. Both Krupskaya and Chiang Ch'ing had Marxist backgrounds, and both carried out the political ideologies of their husbands.

Krupskaya was a pedagogist who stressed especially the need for polytechnical education in the school. She believed that this type of learning would contribute greatly towards fulfilling the social and economic requirements of a communist society. Chiang Ch'ing, in contrast to Krupskaya, had little education. While assisting Mao in implementing his reforms in the schools during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, her greatest influence was in the area of China's national culture. Having gained supreme authority in this sphere, she turned the performing arts into a vehicle for Mao's ideas which were to serve proletarian politics.

Krupskaya's polytechnical concepts are today stressed at every stage of the Russian educational system. Despite this, however, it has been found that Russian schooling produces an inegalitarian society, which is in conflict with the ideals postulated.

After Mao's death, Chiang Ch'ing, with the other members of the 'Gang of Four' of which she was ringleader, was arrested and imprisoned. The new leaders, while systematically restoring pre-Cultural Revolution policies, used the 'Gang of Four' as scapegoats in their political campaign. Chiang Ch'ing has been denounced as a traitor, and all vestiges of her influence have been eradicated.

Declaration

I declare that this dissertation is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted in partial fulfillment for the Degree of Master of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other University.

Suzanne Eva Rootenberg

28th day of August, 1982

Acknowledgment

I thank Dr. Paul Butterfield for his encouragement and supportiveness in guiding and helping me complete this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

1. Introduction 1

2. An Outline of N.K. Krupskaya's Life and Work 3

3. An Outline of Chiang Ch'ing's Life and Work 8

4. Educational ideas of Krupskaya 13

   I Historical and ideological background 13
   II The Doctrines of Marx and Lenin 14
   III Public Education and Democracy 15
   IV Origins of Polytechnical Education 17
   V Krupskaya and Polytechnical education 19
   VI The Unified Labour School 20
   VII Krupskaya's arguments on professional education 22
   VIII Concrete example of Krupskaya's ideas on polytechnism 24
   IX Problems for polytechnical education 24
   X Summary 25

5. Educational ideas of Chiang Ch'ing 30

   I Historical background 30
   II Mao, Marxism and Leninism 31
   III Pre-Cultural Revolution Period 1949-1965 32
   IV The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and its reforms. 33
   V Chiang Ch'ing's reforms in the performing arts 35
   VI Chiang Ch'ing's achievements 41

6. The educational influence of Krupskaya 46

   I The return of polytechnism 46
   II The Kruschev Reforms 46
   III The extent of Krupskaya's influence today 48
   IV Education and Social Stratification 49

7. The Educational influence of Chiang Ch'ing 55

   I Overthrow of the 'Gang of Four' and their condemnation ... 55
   II Changes since the 'Gang of Four' 61
      (i) Educational policies at schools and universities ... 61
      (ii) The cultural sphere 63

8. Conclusion 69

Bibliography 73

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Two posters that appeared in Canton in October, 1976 proclaiming the downfall of the 'Gang of Four' 56

2. As above 57

3. A Canton poster of November, 1976 58

Publication of these posters by permission of Dr. Roxane Witke, author of Comrade Chiang Ch'ing Little, Brown & Co., Boston, Toronto 1977.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

There can be no doubt that during the twentieth century, two extraordinary women exerted great educational influence in their respective countries. One of these women was Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya (1863 - 1936), a pedagogist and the wife of Lenin who dominated the Soviet Union from 1917 till his death in 1924.

The second woman was Chiang Ch'ing, a radical Marxist-Leninist-Maoist activist and the wife of Mao Tse-Tung, Chairman of the Republic of China from 1949 to 1976. Chiang Ch'ing was born in 1914 and is still alive today.

A remarkable co-incidence about these two women is that the implementation of their respective educational policies affected two countries, one of which (Russia) covers the largest area in the world, whilst the other (China) has the largest population in the world. What is more remarkable about both women is that they emerged in patriarchal dominated societies to such positions of influence.

A great deal of controversy surrounds the role of Chiang Ch'ing. After the death of Mao Tse-Tung in 1976, and with the re-organization of the political hierarchy in China, Chiang Ch'ing, together with Wang Hung-wen, Yao Wen-yuan and Chang Ch'un-Ch'iao, the 'Gang of Four', has been denounced for her disruptive and distorting influence on Marxist educational ideology. It is necessary to attempt to establish whether this assumption is correct or whether Chiang Ch'ing has been used as a scapegoat for the new regime's political ends.

In Russia, Marxist educational systems began to be instituted in 1917. In contrast, Marxist-dominated educational systems in China, differing from those in Russia, were institutionalized much later - the important epoch starting in 1949. Therefore an investigation into the differing interpretations of Marxist philosophy of education has been discussed in order

that the influential changes in Russia and China can be seen in a relevant persepctive.

One reason for comparing the influence of the two women on education is the different backgrounds of each revolution, the proletariat and the peasants. Marxism-Leninism had to be modified by Mao in order to lay stress upon the vital necessity of having the support of the peasants prior to initiating the revolution. Lenin and Stalin both regarded the peasants as useless. Thus, Krupskaya belonged to the Russian proletariat, but both Mao and Chiang Ch'ing originated from peasant backgrounds, even if those backgrounds were not the most impoverished.

Although definitive works have compared the different kinds of Marxist educational systems implemented in Russia and China, to the author's knowledge, no authoritative comparison has yet been made of the influence of Krupskaya and Chiang Ch'ing on the differing interpretations of Marxism in these educational systems. Therefore there should be an attempt to highlight the different aspects of education in which these two dominant women established their ascendancy. This has required an investigation into the disparate backgrounds of Krupskaya and Chiang Ch'ing in order to delineate the ideologies which manifested themselves in both the theory and practical application of their work.

There is a paucity of both primary and secondary source material on the dominant role played by these two women in their respective countries. This research project, therefore, is based on journal articles, an unpublished thesis on Krupskaya's educational philosophy, and a published biography based on a series of interviews with Chiang Ch'ing by the writer, Roxane Witke. Using this material, another aim has been to try and define the influences of Marxism and Leninism on Krupskaya and Chiang Ch'ing in creating new types of education for Russia and China respectively; and then to establish whether or not their contributions have had any lasting significance on education in the 1980s.

CHAPTER 2

An outline of N.K. Krupskaya's life and work

Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya was born in St. Petersburg on February 23, 1869. Her parents were of noble birth, but very poor. Her father was a minor government official, who became a political suspect because of his sympathy toward such revolutionary groups as the Nihilist, Narodnik and People's Will movements.[1] Krupskaya was reared in a revolutionary environment and era.

Early in childhood, Nadezhda came to hate the Russian autocracy, landowners, and factory owners. After her father's death, economic conditions required some additional means of support for the family. The teachers of the gymnasium where Krupskaya was a student were able to find several positions for her as a tutor for the children of rich families. She developed a deep hatred for the upper classes.

When St. Petersburg Higher Courses for women were reopened in 1889, Nadezhda enrolled in the mathematics division. She believed that the university was not connected with life and vital activities; consequently she was disappointed with college instruction.

In 1890, she joined the university students' Marxist circle. Some of her friends were able to procure 'Das Capital' from a library in St. Petersburg for Krupskaya to study. It was in these activities that Krupskaya was introduced and converted to Marxism. She taught in the Sunday evening school of Smolenskoe Village from 1891 to 1896. Here she secretly taught workers and peasants Marxist doctrines and interpretations. It is also probable that she became more sympathetic to the workers' movement.[2]

At a St. Petersburg Marxist meeting in 1893, Vladimir Il'ich Ulyanov (Lenin) and Krupskaya met for the first time. She was impressed by his spirit, organizational ability, cunning and broad knowledge of Marxism. Both became active in stirring social and political unrest in the St. Petersburg area. Krupskaya joined the St. Petersburg 'Union of the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class', a creation of V.I. Lenin, in 1895.

For taking part in the 1896 weavers' strike in St. Petersburg, she spent seven months in jail and three years in exile at Shushenskoe, Siberia. Lenin and Krupskaya spent part of their sentence together in Siberia. They were married in 1898 in exile. From 1902 onwards, after her release, she began to study the works of the great educationists of the past.[3] She studied in particular the educational ideals of Marx and Engels, and went systematically into the organization of Russian and foreign school systems.

From 1901 to 1917 Krupskaya was secretary of the Bolshevik section of the Social Democratic Party. During the Russian revolution of 1905-1907, Krupskaya returned to St. Petersburg with Lenin and aided in conducting party work in an attempt to overthrow the Tsarist regime. After the unsuccessful end of this revolution, Lenin and his wife emigrated to England, France, Switzerland and Germany for nine years. It was during this period of exile that the basic research for the book 'Public Education and Democracy' was being done by Krupskaya at the suggestion of Lenin.

Lenin and Krupskaya returned to Russia in April of 1917 to engage in the struggle for power which finally led to the establishment of the First Workers' Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Thus, after twenty years of secret, illegal work of agitating for a proletarian revolution, Krupskaya was now ready to devote her life to building Communism through education. Krupskaya engaged in almost every form of educational endeavour in the Soviet Union between 1919 and 1939. An exception to the unwritten rule against women in high offices, Krupskaya achieved positions of leadership in both Party and educational organizations.

From 1920 until her death, Krupskaya was head of the all-important Political Education Department of Narkompros. It seemed is if Lenin would trust none other than his wife and ideological companion as the head of the moral and political education of the country. Narkompros, the Commissariat of Public Education, had complete control over educational activities in the U.S.S.R. to fulfill the plans laid down by the Communist Party. Education in the Soviet Union was not limited to formal education. All aspects of education, both formal and informal, were included. Thus, from the nursery to the grave, Krupskaya directed the rearing of Soviet children, politically and ethically.[4] As the director

of Political Education, Krupskaya was also a member of the Narkompros Collegium, which was the policy-making body for carrying out the educational directives of the Central Committee.

In 1929, she was made the vice-commissar of Public Education in the R.S.F.S.R. (Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic). This was an extremely important post, because most of the other republics followed the leadership and practices of this, the largest, republic. She was made a doctor of pedagogical science of the R.S.F.S.R., and a teacher training institute in Moscow was named in her honour. In 1931 she received the highest possible honour in Soviet education, because she was elected a member of the Academy of Sciences. Membership of this organization represented the zenith of the educational hierarchy. Her work in applying the theories and principles of Marxism to education, which was started in 'Public Education and Democracy' was continued as the first president of the Society of Marxist Educators (1930).

Among her varied educational activities, Krupskaya was Chairman of the Scientific Council of Education which prepared the first curricula for the Unified Labour School. Polytechnical education was one of Krupskaya's main interests, because her Theses of 1920 were based on this principle, and she had the honour of opening the first all-Russian Congress on Polytechnical Education in August, 1930. Her work in the reduction of illiteracy, pre-school education, adult education, methods of instruction, development of curricula, theories of education, history of Marxist education, out-of-school activities and training, and the struggle for women's equal rights were of great importance, too. One of the activities which delighted her the most was the work of the Young Pioneers; 'true Leninists', she called them.[5]

Krupskaya was against the teaching of any kind of trade at school. She believed that school should give children the taste for work and make them understand its essential role for the benefit of the community, but not set out to train specialists for any branch of the economy. She maintained that the organization of polytechnical education, which gives the pupil a knowledge of the main branches of production and the scientific principles on which these depend, and accustoms him to handling common tools and instruments of labour, should be linked closely to the development of a planned national economy.[6]

Her political activities were just as important. From 1927 she was a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, which was a small group 'elected' by Party members to rule the Party and the country. One of its sub-committees directed the organization of education according to the control figures for the entire economy. In 1929, she was made a candidate-member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. She was a participant in thirteen Party congresses (missing only the first and fifth). From 1924 to 1934 Krupskaya was a member of the Central Control Commission which was the highest organ of Party control up to 1934. Its aims were to strengthen the Unified Bolshevik Party and to maintain iron discipline within the Party ranks.

The most important pedagogical magazine of the period, 'On the Road to the New School', was edited by Krupskaya. She wrote numerous articles and delivered major speeches at Labour, Party, Komsomol, Women's and Pioneer Congresses. Some of her writings have been translated into English, such as 'Memoirs of Lenin' (1930); 'Soviet Women' (1937) and 'On Education' (1957).

In 1933 Nadezhda K. Krupskaya was awarded the Order of Lenin and the Order of the Red Labour Banner for her work in education. She died on February 27, 1939 in the Kremlin. Millions of Soviet citizens who had come to love and honour her mourned her death. One of the honours bestowed upon her during her life was the fact that she was referred to as Krupskaya rather than Mrs. Lenin. This indicates honour and respect for a woman in Russia.

The role played by Krupskaya as organizer of public education has been described as follows : "To us, the educators, she is particularly dear also by having been a remarkable theoretician of the Marxist-Leninist pedagogy, and one of the founders of the Soviet School."[7]

References to Chapter 2

1. Zepper, J.T. — A Study of N.K. Krupskaya's educational philosophy. D.Ed. Dissertation. University of Missouri, 1960, p.62.

2. Ibid, p.64

3. Goncharov, L. and Kunetskaya, L. — Nadezhda K. Krupskaya, Founder of Soviet Public Education. School and Society. April, 1971. Vol. 99 No. 2333. p.266

4. Zepper, J.T. — Op. Cit. p.67

5. Ibid, p.71

6. Goncharov, L. — Op.Cit. p.237

7. Smirnov, A.A. — Science Session devoted to the 90th Anniversary of N.K. Krupskaya's birthday. Soviet Education June 1969. p.65

CHAPTER 3

An outline of Chiang Ch'ing's life and work

In the absence of documentary information on her origins and early years, a few writers and biographical services have yielded to the temptation to supply a past for Chiang Ch'ing; one compounded of the reminiscences of former friends and enemies, hearsay and sheer speculation.[1] So says Dr. Roxane Witke, author of the book 'Comrade Chiang Ch'ing', who based her biography on personal interviews conducted in Peking and Canton in 1972. These interviews lasted some sixty hours, stretching over the better part of seven days and nights. Dr. Witke chose to represent Chiang Ch'ing largely as she revealed herself in these interviews.

Chiang Ch'ing entered the world as Li Chin in March 1914. Her first home was in the town of Chu Ch'ang in the province of Shantung. Living standards in Shantung, China's second largest province, were abysmal. Even without famine, the ordinary people often ate but one or two full meals a week. "I grew up", she said, "in the old society ... not only did I hate the landlords of China, but I also felt a spontaneous sense of resistance against foreign countries, because foreign devils from both East and West used to bully us ..."[2] Chiang Ch'ing maintained that her early years had been spent in an era of great tension that left a stamp of threat and uncertainty on her consciousness.[3]

From the early 1920s on, the rise of imperialism, warlordism and urban industrialism, in the treaty ports of Shanghai and Tsingtao pricked the political consciousness of the young May Fourth generation. Communist and National Party agents, seeking to promote revolution by stirring up urban insurrection, made clandestine contact with workers in foreign-owned factories, disseminated Marxist propaganda and fomented strikes protesting at the physical abuse of labourers, long hours and the employment of children.

Chiang Ch'ing left school at the age of fifteen and was admitted to the Shantung Provincial Experimental Art Theatre at Tsinan. This was an art school where she studied mainly modern drama, but also some classical music and drama. Here she read dramatic literature, learnt to sing

traditional opera and perform modern drama, as well as being introduced to a variety of musical instruments.

In spring 1931, she was admitted to Tsingtao University (changed to Shantung University in 1932) where she joined the staff as a library clerk, while staging plays and presenting herself at certain lectures. Soon after, she and some fellow dramatists set up the Seaside Drama Society. Its purpose was to make theatrical propaganda against the Japanese at schools and factories and in the rural districts. In the Republican Era it was not unusual for a poor student to attend University classes as an auditor, doing the same work as a regular student, but with no right to a degree. As an auditor, Chiang Ch'ing gained her first exposure to intellectuals as personalities and as fresh sources of ideas. Although she would later repudiate open-ended academic inquiry, at the age of seventeen she was exhilarated by the free play of thought in a university environment.

Summing up the cultural significance of her Tsinan and Tsingtao years,[4] Chiang Ch'ing said that she had spent one year (1929-30) at an arts academy, and two years in the 'upper strata of culture' referring to the intellectual group of Tsingtao University and the cultural circle of the Seaside Drama Society. In those years she developed a love of novels and poetry. But in the 1930s she decided that writing poems and essays was far less important than actively making revolution. As for formal education, counting five years of primary school, in all she had but eight years. Her real learning, like Mao's was 'social education in the school of experience'[5], and in 1933 that was just beginning.

As Chiang Ch'ing explained her youthful experience to Roxane Witke from the vantage point of the seasoned communist, her group's initiation into the countryside drama cast a forward reflection toward Mao Tse-Tung's formula for the popular promotion of literary and art works; all art is political and must serve the people.

In 1933, Chiang Ch'ing joined the Communist Party. Like Krupskaya, she taught factory workers at night. In that year she was kidnapped and detained for eight months by the Kuomintang (K.M.T.) - the ruling party of the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-Shek. In 1934 the Long March

of the Red Army to Yenan began, having retreated after a defeat from five encirclement campaigns mounted by the K.M.T. from 1930 - 1934 against the Central Soviet Districts in the South East.

With the renewal of the Japanese attack in 1937, Chiang Ch'ing joined the exodus of young radicals from Shanghai to Yenan where Mao and other beleaguered survivors of the Long March had settled the year before. There she underwent a rigorous course in military arts and Marxist politics, taught drama at the Lu Hsu'n Academy of literature and art, and married Mao. For the next eight years she was his companion and secretary.

In 1942 Chiang Ch'ing participated in the Yenan Forum on Literature and the Arts, in which Mao set forth proletarian cultural standards for all. In the late 1940s she participated in the Liberation Wars. Soon after Liberation, she participated anonymously in the arduous and often violent movements of land and marriage reform. For the next twenty years Chiang Ch'ing involved herself in studying the performing arts with the purpose of making drastic changes. As Mao's closest associate she was embroiled in the public debates over films, plays and novels that allegedly upheld a disfiguring mirror to leading personalities of their times.

In the early 1960s, Chiang Ch'ing began an independent investigation of the performing arts - opera, modern drama, music and film. Paradoxically, the flourishing of these popular genres indicated to her the extent to which the Chairman's (i.e. Mao's) diktat on the creation of a proletarian culture had been largely forgotten in the wake of material progress. She was also convinced of the ultimate insubstantiality of previous rectification movements against intellectuals.

Having begun her attack against the feudal and bourgeois conventions in art and literature, she continued opera and ballet reform while stimulating other Arts Festivals. Working alongside musicians, performers, directors and cultural administrators, few of whom were eager instruments of change, she initiated a r[illegible]ment to proletarianize the cultural environment in accordance wi[illegible] political principles and her own aesthetic sensibilities.[6] In that spirit she authorized the creation of

the Yang-pan-hsi, the small repertoire of model operas and ballets that stand as palpable evidence of the Cultural Revolution she helped to institute in the mid-1960s.

In August 1966 she was named adviser to the People's Liberation army on cultural work just after the commencement of the Cultural Revolution, thereby confirming her full censorial control over the arts.[7] She was also appointed Secretary of the Standing Committee of the Politburo. In 1967 she headed a subgroup which was responsible for the nation's literature and arts. Throughout the mid-1970s she continued to revise revolutionary operas, ballets and musical compositions introduced in the 1960s. In July 1974 she was extolled as an 'expounder of Mao Tse-Tung thought' for her super-structural achievements.[8]

Chiang Ch'ing was the first woman in Chinese history to assume an authoritative role in the development of the nation's cultural policy; one focused on the performing arts but extending to literary criticism and education at all levels. After the death of Mao in September, 1976, Hua Kuo-feng was proclaimed Mao's successor as Party Chairman. A clear distinction began to be made between Mao and the Cultural Revolution on the one hand, and the 'Gang of Four' (Wang Hung-wen, Chiang Ch'ing, Chang Ch'un-ch'iao and Yao Wen'yuan) with their radical ideology on the other hand. Chiang Ch'ing was blamed for many of the failures of policies during the Cultural Revolution, and in October 1976 she was arrested with the other members of the 'Gang of Four'. A nationwide campaign against them and their followers continued into the 1980s.

References to Chapter 3

1. Wolf, M. & Witke, R. — Women in Chinese Society
Stanford University Press, 1975. p.169

2. Witke, R. — "Comrade Chiang Ch'ing"
Little Brown & Co. Boston, Toronto
1977. p.46

3. Wolf & Witke — Op.Cit. p.177

4. Ibid. p.189

5. Ibid. p.189

6. Ibid. p.191

7. Witke, Roxane — Op.Cit. Chronology. p.xxi

8. Ibid. p.xxiii.

CHAPTER 4

Educational ideas of Krupskaya

I. Historical and ideological background

Up to 1905 the Czar was the absolute monarch in Russia. He possessed all executive and judicial powers and was aided by the government departments and by the Russian Orthodox Church. Despite the Revolution of 1905, there was no improvement for the common people who were illiterate and lived in poverty. In 1917 the October or Bolshevik revolution (led by Lenin and Trotsky) led to the formation of a Soviet government which took control three years after war had exhausted Russia.[1] Having overthrown the Imperial Government, the Bolshevik group of the Communist Party has maintained power ever since.

The Bolsheviks, after defeating the white armies in the Russian Civil War, found themselves in power in a country that regressed further back to poverty and backwardness. As late as 1926, 42% of the population was still illiterate in European Russia. The task of building from the ruins of the Russian Empire a modern, industrial and socialist society was expedited with a ruthlessness that is well known.[2] The Bolsheviks turned to education to unify their vast empire. The dominant factor in all educational development was, and is, the communist ideology. The instruction by indoctrination and propaganda permeates every aspect of life.

Lenin asserted that the task of the Bolsheviks was to overthrow the bourgeoisie. He believed that the school, apart from life and apart from politics was a lie and a hypocrisy.[3] However, he stated that without teaching there was no knowledge, and without knowledge there was no communism.[4]

How class divisions were to be abolished, how education was to be accessible to all, and especially how the value of polytechnical education was to be stressed, were all formulated by Krupskaya, in her many articles and books on these subjects. These ideas originated from the Marxist-Leninist doctrines.

II. The Doctrines of Marx and Lenin

According to Marxist-Leninist philosophies, antagonism between mental and physical labour is a trait of capitalist society that overlaps the transition to socialism, therefore antagonism between mental and physical labour exists in a socialist society as a vestige of capitalism.[5] Its origin in capitalist society is seen in the exploitation of factory workers by the mental workers who manage them. In contrast to the lack of esteem for physical labour that Marx and Engels perceived in capitalist society, they regarded manual labour as a factor of major significance in the process of human development. For them labour "is the prime basic condition for all human existence, and this to such an extent that, in a sense, we have to say that labour created man himself."[6]

A fundamental problem of physical labour as it relates to the growth of modern industry is that of the worker whose job becomes obsolete as a result of automation. Marx recognized the dangerous potential inherent in this problem for the worker, and outlined its solution in the following terms : "... Modern Industry ... through its catastrophes imposes the necessity of recognizing, 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 ..."[7] Thus, the aspect of Marx's thought important for education is the concept of unity of theory and practice. Marx believed all knowledge came into being in response to the requirements of man's practical life. With the emphasis on practice, it becomes possible for man not only to know the world but to change it. The constant interaction of theory with practice therefore makes possible the conditions for society's material and technical progress. Said Marx "... the mode of production in material life determines the general characteristics of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, their social existence determines their consciousness."[8] The relationship between mental and manual labour became one of the most important pedagogical principles held by Marxists. Communist educators attribute the first valid systematic statement of the theory of polytechnical education to Marx and Engels. "In our view, there are three aspects of education ... third, polytechnical training which imparts the general scientific principles of all production processes and, simultaneously initiates the child ... in the practical use and manipulation of the

elementary instruments of industry."[9]

Lenin very quickly accepted Marx's analysis of polytechnical education and recognized it as a medium whereby mental and manual labour could be unified as would theory and practice. Thus an early draft of Lenin's programme for education stressed both the need for technical as well as general education. The report finally issued in 1918 by the first Commissioner Lunacharski, contained seven basic principles. (1) Labour as the basis of teaching and education; (2) early fusion of productive labour; (3) polytechnical education meaning all-round development of the individual; (4) the school as a productive commune; (5) manual labour as a part of every day school life; (6) productive, creative and artistic endeavours; (7) emphasis on the child as a 'social creature'.[10]

III Public Education and Democracy

The joint activities of Lenin and Krupskaya were of exceptionally great importance in the elaboration of the theoretical platform for the revolutionary restructuring of the school.[11] This goal was served by a number of studies carried out by Krupskaya with the support and aid of Lenin in the early twentieth century and during the years of World War I. These studies included 'Public Education and Democracy'; 'On the Question of the Free School'; 'Two types of school organization'; 'The question of the Labour School at the Berlin Congress of Teachers' and many others.

Of special significance was 'Public Education and Democracy'. This is a pamphlet or small book written as a history of labour education, which is a communist interpretation of Western educational practices. Consequently Krupskaya searched for earlier examples involving work activities for a justification of a polytechnical type of education. Only certain educators and certain practices were chosen by Krupskaya to develop this thesis. Because of her strong belief in the class struggle, she criticized any experiment or theory which she considered a "weapon" of the capitalist society. Moreover, she attempted to explain the failures of labour education experiments by declaring that the founders were unwilling pawns in advancing class differences.

At the time this book was published, Americans as well as Russians noted her contributions to education "... finally, in 1916, there appeared from her pen 'Public Education and Democracy' a crystallization of her experiences in teaching and in political work, a fine preparation for leadership in helping to create the new schools in Russia."[12]

Krupskaya, in this first Marxist monographic essay on the history of the labour school, for the first time generalized the pronouncements of the Marxist classics on polytechnical education and revealed the basic trends in the development of the school and pedagogy during the era of imperialism. As a result, she came to the following conclusion "As long as school organization is in the hands of the bourgeoisie, the labour school will be an instrument directed against the interests of the working class. Only the working class can make the labour school 'An instrument for the transformation of modern society'".[13]

The preface to the first edition stated that the author's purpose was to trace the origin and development of the need to unite productive labour with intellectual development in public education "... A labour school, however, cannot rest upon those principles upon which the academic school rested. It demands the development of independence in students and the development of a student's individuality..."[14] Thus polytechnical education was an attempt to produce an educational system different from that prevailing in the West where the élitist secondary schools (Lycée in France, Gymnasium in Germany and Grammar School in England) all stressed classical studies which were of no use practically. However, it is generally accepted that Mathematics, firstly, and Classics, secondly, are the two school subjects requiring the greatest intelligence for success. Therefore they tend to indicate an élite. Thus Krupskaya's ideas can be seen as countering this unjustified (except by tradition) Western bias towards classics with its development of an élite society.

Lenin and Krupskaya had originally proposed 'Public Education and the Working Class' as the title of her pamphlet. This was much more descriptive of its content, but the censorship of socialist writing in Imperial Russia would have prevented the publication of the pamphlet under such a

title. Therefore, in this context, democracy means workers' or working class democracy.

In 'Public Education and Democracy' N.K. Krupskaya has revealed the forces which helped create her educational philosophy. Fundamental theories on the labour school, polytechnical education, socially useful work, the scientific emphasis in education, co-operation between the school and industry, the need to balance theoretical and practical education, and progressivism as a basis of social reconstruction contained in this pamphlet, found expression in early Soviet practices. With her works becoming more and more popular in the Soviet Union currently, these theories and practices may be re-emphasized.

The significance of this book is discussed in several reviews written in 1959. N.V. Zikeyev[15] quotes the journal 'Vestnikzhizni' (Herald of Life) - "Krupskaya's splendid book ' Public Education and Democracy' introduces the history of labour school ideas ... the pedagogical reforms attract with their enthusiasm ... Marx and other leaders of labour democracy are discovered and interpreted for educators almost for the first time. The analysis of the later evolution of labour school ideas and their penetration into life convinces with its completeness and accuracy."

Another review quoted by Zikeyev is that published in a journal of the Western oblasts. This journal is impressed by the whole series of striking examples whereby Krupskaya shows the close dependence on economic development of various stages in the development of the idea of the labour school. In this way the socialist school is conceived as a labour school, corresponding to the labour character of the socialist organization. The journal quotes from the book "'Only Labour democracy can make the school of labour a weapon for the transformation of modern society' - Comrade Krupskaya so ends her extremely interesting book".[16]

IV Origins of Polytechnical Education

One of the fundamental aspects of Soviet education is polytechnism. In theory, polytechnical education has always been a part of the Soviet

title. Therefore, in this context, democracy means workers' or working class democracy.

In 'Public Education and Democracy' N.K. Krupskaya has revealed the forces which helped create her educational philosophy. Fundamental theories on the labour school, polytechnical education, socially useful work, the scientific emphasis in education, co-operation between the school and industry, the need to balance theoretical and practical education, and progressivism as a basis of social reconstruction contained in this pamphlet, found expression in early Soviet practices. With her works becoming more and more popular in the Soviet Union currently, these theories and practices may be re-emphasized.

The significance of this book is discussed in several reviews written in 1959. N.V. Zikeyev[15] quotes the journal 'Vestnikzhizni' (Herald of Life) - "Krupskaya's splendid book ' Public Education and Democracy' introduces the history of labour school ideas ... the pedagogical reforms attract with their enthusiasm ... Marx and other leaders of labour democracy are discovered and interpreted for educators almost for the first time. The analysis of the later evolution of labour school ideas and their penetration into life convinces with its completeness and accuracy."

Another review quoted by Zikeyev is that published in a journal of the Western oblasts. This journal is impressed by the whole series of striking examples whereby Krupskaya shows the close dependence on economic development of various stages in the development of the idea of the labour school. In this way the socialist school is conceived as a labour school, corresponding to the labour character of the socialist organization. The journal quotes from the book "'Only Labour democracy can make the school of labour a weapon for the transformation of modern society' - Comrade Krupskaya so ends her extremely interesting book".[16]

IV Origins of Polytechnical Education

One of the fundamental aspects of Soviet education is polytechnism. In theory, polytechnical education has always been a part of the Soviet

educational system. But in practice, it has existed during only two periods in the development of Soviet education, from 1920 to 1932 and from approximately 1952 to the present date. The closing date of the first period and the commencement of the second period are difficult to determine because of the gradual fading and gradual introduction of polytechnical education.

The primary source for the early concept of polytechnical education was Marx's 'Great Principle of Education'; this was intellectual education combined with the manual and technical bases of productive labour. In Marx's opinion, this type of education was to 'win its place' among the educational systems of the world. Marx asserted the inevitability of this trend, but how this was to be done was not elaborated by him. Thus, the details and means of implementing polytechnism were left to the experimentation and theorizing of Marx's followers.[17]

In the U.S.S.R., Lenin and Krupskaya took the lead in advocating, creating, initiating and directing the course of polytechnical education in the Unified Labour School. They undoubtedly utilized the experience developed in the preparation of 'Public Education and Democracy' to give form to their theories for Communist education in Russia. Both had stressed the need for and inevitability of polytechnization of schools for the working masses before the successful Revolution of 1917. They had indicated that this principle was to be included in the 'new' schools of the 'new' Russia.

The decree "Regulations concerning the monolithic labour school" of August 1918 marked the beginning of the polytechnical era. In November 1920 Lenin and Krupskaya elaborated the basic documents on Glavpolitprosvet, the agency into which the extra mural department of the People's Commissariat for education was organized.[18] They fully realized that political propaganda had to be very closely related to general cultural work as a whole. While directing the development of culture and education, Lenin and Krupskaya devoted particular attention to propagandizing and further adapting the Marxist concept of polytechnical education to the theory and practice of the Soviet Labour School. Krupskaya subsequently recalled that Lenin had given very specific orders on questions dealing with polytechnical education and that he was dissatisfied with the extremely

slow pace at which the polytechnical organization of the school was proceeding. In her words : "The years 1920 - 1921 were years when, more than ever before, Vladimir Il'ich's attention was focused on production, propaganda and on the polytechnical school".[19]

V. Krupskaya and polytechnical education

Before describing Krupskaya's concepts of polytech education, it is necessary to have a generally accepted definition of the term as a working concept. Elizabeth Moos[20] used a definition which has the fundamental elements agreed upon by the majority of scholars writing in this area of Soviet education; "... It is a word used by Soviet educators to describe a school programme in which theoretical studies are related closely to practical work. Pupils are given a minimum understanding of the techniques and processes underlying agriculture and industry, taught skills and habits, and given experience in actual labour. Polytechnical education must not be confused with vocational or professional training, in the sense in which we use the term."

In analysing the concept of polytechnism, Krupskaya believed there were two important causes;

(1) Social causes

Lenin believed that the polytechnical school would help to lay the foundation of a classless society. Polytechnism is a requirement for a classless society which was to grow out of the proletariat. All members of a communist society must possess a new attitude towards physical labour. Favourable attitudes toward labour can be developed only in a polytechnical school which has work activities as the basis of its curricula. This was the view of Krupskaya on the social causes of polytechnical education which are as valid in the Soviet Union today.

(2) Economic causes

Communism bases its economy on a scientific plan. Workers by the millions take part in building the national economy of the socialist state. Each labourer must be able to understand the national economy and his part in this economy, in order to work intelligently for its fulfillment. A 'new' type of education is required to accomplish these ends. This is polytechnism. Krupskaya wrote "Polytechnical education must be part of the

Soviet School to understand what a planned economy is. Marx, Engels and Lenin gave us a series of statements on polytechnism ..."[21]

In describing the aims of polytechnical education, Krupskaya returned repeatedly to its role in making people "masters of industry". In 1918 and 1920 she used the phrase emphasizing the importance of 'broad knowledge' as opposed to 'narrow, purely mechanical skills'. She wrote "the aim of the polytechnical school includes the preparation of a new generation of people who would be workers and masters of industry in the complete sense of the word."[22]

VI. The Unified Labour School

Krupskaya's plan for the Unified Labour School centred around work activities and knowledge of the nation's productive capacity. In keeping with the maturational levels of children, vocational education was not to begin too early. A background of general skills was to be developed and utilized in the curriculum during the early years of a child's formal education. Vocational education from a polytechnical point of view became part-time study and part-time work experience on the upper levels of the Unified Labour School.

Krupskaya distinguished two different stages of the schooling process. In 1920 she described the first stage of the Unified Labour School (polytechnical school for children from 7 - 12 years) as only a preparatory stage for conscious participation in production.[23] The task of the first stage, she said, was to give children the opportunity to accustom themselves to humanity's ideas and life through books. The task was, moreover, to teach them to use a book, the ability to write and to have the mathematical and graphic competence as work tools: "... To use every means of observation, of studying trades, of free creativity to develop the constructive abilities of children ... But the most important task of the first stage is in training the ability to live and work collectively ..." [24]

The second stage (from 12 to 16 years inclusive) was to be established on participation in production. Soviet secondary education was to increase the ability of students to orient themselves to life. A deeper and more systematic study of man's labour activities in relation to his physical and social environment was to make this orientation possible. "Stage two must have an especially important significance. The experience of factory schools, vocational schools and peasant-youth schools must be studied carefully for the middle theme of the programme which embraces problems of labour and its organization to mould practical, newly organized, and possibly mechanized work. This is not a one day job. But life demands that we should not put off any further to the future the problem about work in the school."[25]

In all polytechnical schools, the last year of the second stage was devoted to a study of the economy of the nation as a whole. Integration of experiences in the three branches of the national economy (Domestic, Agricultural and Industrial) took place during that year. The two general aims of polytechnical education were consistent with Marxist theory; therefore, all Soviet schools must become polytechnical. These general aims were : "Polytechnical education gives an understanding of the bases and general work skills of modern technology. Polytechnical education is an insurance against unemployment in the future"[26] and "Polytechnical education gives the ability to adjust easily to different branches of labour in the city and in the country, and it gives a general grasp of work and a general ability to undertake work."[27]

Since actual participation in labour processes was part of secondary education and many students were not able to attend school above the elementary level, factory-plant schools and factory-plant semiletkas were to become a practical solution to the problem. All students were to attend the polytechnical school and participate in labour activities. This was necessary so that everyone would develop a Communist attitude toward manual labour. No special groups, schools or classes could be allowed to develop.

Krupskaya included the gifted and highly talented students in this training too. Talented children, she believed, should not be pampered or

The second stage (from 12 to 16 years inclusive) was to be established on participation in production. Soviet secondary education was to increase the ability of students to orient themselves to life. A deeper and more systematic study of man's labour activities in relation to his physical and social environment was to make this orientation possible. "Stage two must have especially important significance. The experience of factory schools, vocational schools and peasant-youth schools must be studied carefully for the middle theme of the programme which embraces problems of labour and its organization to mould practical, newly organized, and possibly mechanized work. This is not a one day job. But life demands that we should not put off any further to the future the problem about work in the school."[25]

In all polytechnical schools, the last year of the second stage was devoted to a study of the economy of the nation as a whole. Integration of experiences in the three branches of the national economy (Domestic, Agricultural and Industrial) took place during that year. The two general aims of polytechnical education were consistent with Marxist theory; therefore, all Soviet schools must become polytechnical. These general aims were : "Polytechnical education gives an understanding of the bases and general work skills of modern technology. Polytechnical education is an insurance against unemployment in the future"[26] and "Polytechnical education gives the ability to adjust easily to different branches of labour in the city and in the country, and it gives a general grasp of work and a general ability to undertake work."[27]

Since actual participation in labour processes was part of secondary education and many students were not able to attend school above the elementary level, factory-plant schools and factory-plant semiletkas were to become a practical solution to the problem. All students were to attend the polytechnical school and participate in labour activities. This was necessary so that everyone would develop a Communist attitude toward manual labour. No special groups, schools or classes could be allowed to develop.

Krupskaya included the gifted and highly talented students in this training too. Talented children, she believed, should not be pampered or

spoiled. Krupskaya became angry when she heard that the building of the Association of Old Bolsheviks had been turned into a palace for exceptional children. Universal education and universal productive labour were obligatory for everyone in a Communist society. "We should not impress on talented children that they are extraordinary, or give them privileges. We should see to it that they get an all-round education. That will not harm them. On the contrary, when they grow up it will help them to choose a profession that suits them in every way. Deciding for a girl that she will be a ballerina or for a boy that he will be an engineer is a bad thing."[28]

VII. Krupskaya's arguments on professional education

Krupskaya's arguments on secondary education were put forward by her in April 1920. She told an all-Russian Congress of Trade Unions that from their point of view, professional education must not cripple a man by making him a narrow specialist from an early age, - it must not narrow his horizon, but must help all aspects of his whole development. Professional education, she said, must prepare not only the executant, the mechanical worker - it must also prepare the worker to become master (khozyain) of industry.[29] Referring to the thesis of Comrade Kozelev she said that his main weakness was the approach to questions of professional education which co-incided with the approach of the specialist who was interested only in industry and not at all in the worker. Comrade Kozelev, she said, proposed putting all general education on the lowest priority and giving all attention to professional-technical education Krupskaya argued "However he forgets that professional technical education at any depth requires a certain general educational preparation." Students must be properly literate, know at least elementary mathematics and have a more or less basic knowledge of history and geography."[30]

In 'Pravda', 23 February, 1921, Krupskaya entered into a similar controversy with O. Schmidt, the head of Glavprofobr, the chief political department (later administration) of the Commissariat of Communications.[31] Decrying Schmidt's anti-polytechnical views, she said that it was in the interests of the national economy that there should be the greatest possible

number of capable people and the smallest number of people imagining themselves to be specialists and not able to take a single step. She said "If O. Schmidt were slightly interested himself in questions of the history of the labour school, he would know that the labour school has proved in practice that it raises the general work-capability of pupils, and thanks to it the leading industrial countries have begun to compete among themselves on this common ground. But what has that to do with O. Schmidt!"[32]

One other advantage of this type of education which Krupskaya mentioned a number of times was that it would "as nothing else, reveal youths' physical and intellectual abilities and allow them to choose a conscientious speciality by 16 - 17 years of age."[33]

Krupskaya was at pains to distinguish between polytechnical education and technical training. Vocational training, she said, must not begin too early because accustoming a child to this or that vocation from early childhood meant that the discovery and development of his creative abilities were prevented and that the spirit within him was killed.[34] She also believed that working at a machine from childhood made man inattentive to his surroundings. Concentrating all his attention on the machine, he knew only how to work under another's order.[35]

In the preface to a brochure on 'Progressive Schools in the Struggle for Polytechnism' in 1931 Krupskaya attempted to outline the relation between the factory and the school. She said that schools still faced vast work under polytechnical conditions. It was necessary to establish exactly in what sequence children were to be evoked to work at a plant, how they were to be evoked to study at a plant, which skills were required, how they were to be aroused. It was necessary, she said, to interpret their work and the whole labour organization at the plant. "In school and in the plant, children's work must be co-ordinated in the closest possible way. It is necessary to reconstruct all curricula, to revise all schedules, and to rationalize all school work. Interest in technology and striving to master it must be enkindled in children."[36]

VII. Concrete example of Krupskaya's ideas on polytechnism

The precise flavour of Krupskaya's thought comes out in her description of teaching sewing. She wanted to show that training for any work can have a vocational or polytechnical character. She described how sewing could be taught in a variety of ways. It could teach how to make even stitches or how to make button holes by the hours. This training, she said, would be a handicraft. But it was possible to provide an entirely different training. Sewing instruction could be established so that it would be linked with the study of material and tools. This should be done in such a way, she said, so that it would become clearer to a child that a different instrument was needed for different materials for production in the very same process. One needle was needed to sew muslin, another type for broadcloth, leather needed an awl to sew, while it was unnecessary to sew paper together because it could be pasted. Wood was not sewn, but knocked together. It was not only possible to permit individual work, but collective as well : in two's, three's, in succession, - introducing rhythm in work, sometimes retarding, sometimes accelerating, and then performing a series of movements rhythmically to a song. "Sewing can be taught differently on a machine. You can show only how to run the wheel, insert the shuttle etc. Or study of the sewing machine can be connected with study of the machine itself and analagous machines. By such methods sewing as a vocation can be taught by combining this training with the analysis of materials, tools, motors etc. - this will be polytechnical education."[37]

IX Problems for polytechnical education

In October 1931 Krupskaya wrote an article for 'Vestik Komakademia' (Herald of the Communist Academy) in which she raised the question of Communist Academy Assistance to the Society of Marxist Educators in working out actual problems in Soviet pedagogy as regards polytechnical education. The entire article , taken from the archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, was printed in the periodical Soviet Education of May 1959.[38] Krupskaya wrote that while continuing to devote most

serious attention to problems of the polytechnical school, the S.M.E. (Society of Marxist Educators) must put in the foreground problems of programmes and methods. Methodological assistance to the rank and file teacher was the task of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party set before the S.M.E. "... to peer into life, to link both the school work and the activity of the children's communist movement, as well as the political education work closely with all its kinds and forms with the current political tasks standing before the country - on this the society has to work in full swing ..."[39]

The problems of carrying out these ideals concerning polytechnical education continued to manifest themselves. In 1936, in a letter to M.P. Malyshev of the Department of Schools of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, she complained that the school had turned out to be a school isolated from life which made the organization of socially useful work difficult.[40] She complained that useful, productive, labour was reduced to mere production of useful objects for school studies. She felt that usefulness of this type of work was very relative, and that useful labour should go beyond the school walls. For example, she said, useful things should be made for kindergartens or for neighbourhood organizations such as rest houses for the aged. She went on to emphasize the educational side of such work. "The work plan in shops must be thought through especially from a pedagogical point of view. It cannot be accidental, it must be particularly polytechnical. Here it is especially important to avoid hackwork."[41]

X Summary

Krupskaya began to expand her theories on polytechnism in her book 'Public Education and Democracy'. To her, the Unified Labour School had to be polytechnical to fulfill the social and economic requirements of a Communist society. As she saw it, polytechnical education was to impregnate the entire school programme. Schooling was to give a gradual emphasis to a broad type of vocational training and to become more closely tied to production as the children matured, but it was not to be a narrow specialization before seventeen years of age. Children had a chance to

discover and develop their abilities and interest in the polytechnical school because of the balance and variety of activities. Thus Krupskaya was concerned with the whole child.

At the upper levels of instruction, all students were to participate in productive labour. In a democracy, polytechnism was necessary to prevent the rise of a class society. Thus, polytechnical education was an attempt to build a socialist, universal, classless, collective, proletarian school, and not just to supply qualified workers.

Krupskaya's life work in the field of polytechnical education can be summarized by one of her own passages : "We will fight for a school which, while taking a child's productive labour as its starting point, will be able to illuminate this work with the light of knowledge and will lead to an understanding of nature's phenomena and the life of humanity."[42]

References to Chapter 4

1. Cramer J. & Browne G. — Contemporary Education
Harcourt Brace & World Inc. 1965
N.Y. Chicago, San Fransisco, Atlanta
p. 170

2. Ibid. p.170

3. Ibid. p.173

4. Grant, N. — Soviet Education
Penguin Books, 1979. p.25

5. Klein, Margrite — The Challenge of Communist Education
Columbia University Press, N.Y.
1980 p.57

6. Ibid. p.57

7. Ibid. p.57

8. Hawkins, John N. — Mao Tse-Tung and Education
Linnet Books 1974 p.10

9. Klein, Margrite — Op.Cit. p.57

10. Hawkins, John N. — Op.Cit. p.15

11. Klarin, V. — Lenin & Krupskaya in the struggle for Public Education.
Soviet Education Oct. 1970. p.58

12. Zepper, John — A Study of N.K. Krupskaya's educational philosophy p.75

13. Klarin V. — Op.Cit. p.59

14. Zepper, John — Op.Cit. p.84

15. Zikeyev, N.V. — N.K. Krupskaya's work on the book 'Public Education and Democracy'
Soviet Education May 1959 Vol I. p.59

16. Ibid. p.59

17. Zepper, John — Op.Cit. p.123

18. Klarin, V. — Op.Cit. p.61

19. Ibid. p.62

20. Zepper, John — Op.Cit. p.135

21. Ibid. p.138

22. Price, R.F. — Marx and Education in Russia and China
Croom Helm London 1977. p.187

23. Ibid. p.189

24. Ibid. p. 189

25. Zepper, John — N.K. Krupskaya on Complex Themes in Soviet Education.
Comparative Education Review
Feb. 1965. p.35

26. Zepper, John — A Study of N.K. Krupskaya's Educational Philosophy. p.144

27. Ibid. p.144

28. Ibid. p.155

29. Fitzpatrick, Sheila — The Commissariat of Enlightenment
Soviet Organization of Education and the Arts under Lunacharsky
October 1917 - 1921
Cambridge University Press 1970 p.66

30. Ibid. p.67

31. Ibid. p.212

32. Ibid. p.212

33. Zepper, John — Op.Cit. p.242

34. Price, R. — Op.Cit. p.188

34. Price, R. Op.Cit. p.188

35. Zepper, John Op.Cit. p.254

36. Price, R. Op.Cit. pp. 188-189

37. Zepper, John Op.Cit. p.248

38. Krupskaya, N.K. Communist Academy Aid to the Society of Marxist Educators in Putting into Effect the C.C. Decision on the Primary and Secondary Schools. Soviet Education May, 1959 Vol. I No. 7 p.58

39. Ibid. p.58

40. Price, R. Op.Cit. p.191

41. Ibid. p.191

42. Zepper, John Op.Cit. p.164

34. Price, R. Op.Cit. p.188

35. Zepper, John Op.Cit. p.254

36. Price, R. Op.Cit. pp. 188-189

37. Zepper, John Op.Cit. p.248

38. Krupskaya, N.K. Communist Academy Aid to the Society of Marxist Educators in Putting into Effect the C.C. Decision on the Primary and Secondary Schools. Soviet Education May, 1959 Vol. I No. 7 p.58

39. Ibid. p.58

40. Price, R. Op.Cit. p.191

41. Ibid. p.191

42. Zepper, John Op.Cit. p.164

CHAPTER 5

Educational Ideas of Chiang Ch'ing

I. Historical Background

China has the largest population of any nation on earth. It has had a long and turbulent history of wars and conquests. In 1911 the old Manchu dynasty was overthrown by the Nationalists under San Yat-sen who attempted to establish a republican government. This was just five years after the abolition of the Civil Service examinations which extinguished the last vestiges of the 2000 year old Confucian civilization.[1] The country was devastated by internal strife for years, warlords ruled the disintegrated sub-world, each supreme for a time in his own realm, while the power and influence of the Kuomintang (K.M.T. National Party) led by Chiang Kai-Shek began to grow. A full scale war erupted between Japan and China in 1937 and conflicts between the K.M.T. and the Chinese Communists increased (finally developing into nationwide civil war in 1946). Social conditions were chaotic and government control of education as well as other areas of society weakened and declined.[2]

The K.M.T. retreated to those cities which were not harassed by the Japanese and adopted a more pro-Western stance which affected the educational system. When the K.M.T. did have control of education, nationalism and patriotism remained the primary content of the curriculum and students continued to be divorced from the realities of agricultural and rural life. The Chinese Communists, led by Mao Tse-Tung and other disillusioned ex-K.M.T. officials after Japan was defeated in 1949, fought a civil war against the K.M.T. led by Chiang Kai-Shek until it was expelled from the mainland in 1949. The Communist People's Republic of China was inaugurated in October of that year. The founding of the People's Republic of China brought Mao Tse-Tung from the caves of Yenan (where he had lived and worked for the past twenty years in the rural regions organizing peasants and a peasant army) into the position of leader of a state of over 600 million people.[3]

II. Mao, Marxism and Leninism

A theme of Marx's which Mao believed important for education was the concept of the unity of theory and practice. Marx included practice as the basis and purpose of the cognitive process. It follows that knowledge can only be truly attained in man's relation to his environment especially his labour. The constant interaction of theory with practice therefore makes possible the conditions for society's material and technical progress. In his major statement on the origin of knowledge "Where do correct ideas come from?" from ' Four Essays on Philosophy' Mao reaffirmed the primary importance of practical activities. Where do correct ideas come from? ... They came from three kinds of social practice, the struggle for production, the class struggle and scientific experiment. It is man's social being that determines his thinking. Once the correct ideas characteristic of the advanced class are grasped by the masses, these ideas turn into a material force which changes society and changes the world."[5]

Summed up in this succint statement are many of the pedagogical assumptions which characterize a Marxist approach to education and knowledge : philosophical materialism; the relationship among politics (class struggle, production and theory) the transformational nature of education (education for social change).

Hinton[4] believed that Mao had only a limited knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, although he has been called a 'natural Leninist'. Mao easily found it congenial to think, as Leninists do, in terms of social classes and class struggle, a two-stage revolution ('democratic' and 'socialist'); the 'democratic centralist' Communist party as the leading political force in revolution, and a worldwide revolutionary struggle supported and guided by the Soviet Union against 'imperialism'.

As for development of strategy, Mao wanted ideological and political considerations in command over purely economic ones. Thus Marxism-Leninism had to be modified because he needed the peasants' support in order to initiate his revolution. Lenin did not regard the peasants as important for his revolution. While stressing the importance of polytechnism for a classless society, it was also necessary for an understanding of the bases and general work skills of modern technology.

Although Mao did not consider himself anti-technological, he popularized the slogan 'red over expert' (that is, it is better to be ideologically sound than technically expert).[6]

"All departments and organizations should shoulder their responsibilities in ideological and political work. This applies to the Communist Party, the Youth League, government departments in charge of this work, and especially heads of educational institutions and teachers. Our educational policy must enable everyone who received an education to develop morally, intellectually and physically and become a well-educated worker imbued with socialist consciousness".[7]

III Pre-Cultural Revolution Period 1949 - 1965

The emphasis on politics or 'redness' and education (aimed at the peasants) remained as Mao's basic pedagogical position. Mao stressed that the primary aim of education was to "... serve proletarian politics and be integrated with productive labour. It is necessary to make intellectuals identified with the labouring people and vice versa".[8] These aims found expression in the reforms of the period known as the Great Leap Forward in 1958. This period was a prelude to the Cultural Revolution of 1966.

As part of their programme in 1958 the Central Committee of the Communist Party (C.C.P.) in China issued a directive that provided a close integration of schools and work; schools were required to set up farms and factories, while farms and factories were required to establish schools. Banners were everywhere saying 'Education must be combined with productive labour'. In an attempt to educate a new intelligentsia, the Chinese People's University in Peking was open to train workers and peasants to be administrators.

The Greap Leap Forward programme did not survive the setbacks which immediately followed. A series of natural disasters, shortcomings in the economic policies of the movement, and the withdrawal of Soviet technicians in 1960 all contributed to the abandonment of policies in the early 1960s. By 1962 the old type of privileged schools had been established again.[9]

However, by the mid-1960s political events were changing, gradually reaching a climax as Mao encouraged all schools to look to the People's Liberation Army rather than to the Party for political leadership. Support for the policy of government by the expert and emphasis on individual material incentives was condemned under the term 'revisionism.'

IV. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution

In August, 1966 the Party Central Committee issued a directive closing schools at all levels, informed students to go into the streets to make revolution, and prescribed certain changes in the structure of the system to make it conform to a new vision of revolutionary society. In their new role as Red Guards, students (mainly from the middle schools and universities) took to the streets to destroy the 'Four Olds' (old ideas, old customs, habits and culture).[10] Schools at all levels were closed as students accused teachers and administrators of supporting a system that had turned away from the revolutionizing values of the Great Leap Forward.

Formal administration did not exist at any level. After two years, Mao issued a call for the reopening of all levels of education from primary school to university and encouraged students and teachers to begin a concrete reform programme. By 1968 order had been restored. The future organization and administration of education encompassed, according to Mao, a more complete form of working class leadership, decentralized to the levels of the schools themselves.

The major contours of the Cultural Revolution reforms, in which Chiang Ch'ing supported her husband and involved herself to a great extent, can be summarized as follows. The period of schooling at all levels was reduced while an important dimension of the new programme was expressed in 'Open-Door Education'. There was a marked increase in the importance of moral-political education. Education was no longer a bookish undertaking, politics was to be placed at the core of the curriculum. This meant a great deal of emphasis on the study of the works of Mao Tse-Tung and other classics of Marxism-Leninism.

More important, political-moral education was linked once again to direct participation in productive labour. To facilitate this, the system of

However, by the mid-1960s political events were changing, gradually reaching a climax as Mao encouraged all schools to look to the People's Liberation Army rather than to the Party for political leadership. Support for the policy of government by the expert and emphasis on individual material incentives was condemned under the term 'revisionism.'

IV. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution

In August, 1966 the Party Central Committee issued a directive closing schools at all levels, informed students to go into the streets to make revolution, and prescribed certain changes in the structure of the system to make it conform to a new vision of revolutionary society. In their new role as Red Guards, students (mainly from the middle schools and universities) took to the streets to destroy the 'Four Olds' (old ideas, old customs, habits and culture).[10] Schools at all levels were closed as students accused teachers and administrators of supporting a system that had turned away from the revolutionizing values of the Great Leap Forward.

Formal administration did not exist at any level. After two years, Mao issued a call for the reopening of all levels of education from primary school to university and encouraged students and teachers to begin a concrete reform programme. By 1968 order had been restored. The future organization and administration of education encompassed, according to Mao, a more complete form of working class leadership, decentralized to the levels of the schools themselves.

The major contours of the Cultural Revolution reforms, in which Chiang Ch'ing supported her husband and involved herself to a great extent, can be summarized as follows. The period of schooling at all levels was reduced while an important dimension of the new programme was expressed in 'Open-Door Education'. There was a marked increase in the importance of moral-political education. Education was no longer a bookish undertaking, politics was to be placed at the core of the curriculum. This meant a great deal of emphasis on the study of the works of Mao Tse-Tung and other classics of Marxism-Leninism.

More important, political-moral education was linked once again to direct participation in productive labour. To facilitate this, the system of

school management was decentralized with communes, production brigades and production teams taking control of all units in the countryside, and factories assuming control of urban units.[11]

Mao's exhortation that political input was a fundamental aim in the educational process was stated thus : "All work in schools is for the purpose of transforming the schools ideologically. Political education is a link of the centre, and it is undesirable to teach too many subjects. Class education, party education and work must be strengthened."[12]

In 1968 Mao expressed this statement on the nature of socialist educational aims and basic principles :[13] "We must still run physics and engineering colleges but the period of schooling ought to be shortened, the education (curriculum) revolutionized, proletarian politics put in command, and the way of training personnel from the ranks of the workers advocated by the Shanghai Machine-Tool Factory adopted. Students must be selected from workers and peasants with practical experience, and after their study at school for several years, they should return to practical production."

Examination criteria for movement between the different levels of the system were abolished and students were permitted to advance essentially on the basis of political fitness as evaluated by the revolutionary committee.[14] Children of workers and peasants were admitted almost automatically to the schools in an attempt to make the student population more reflective of the class composition of Chinese society generally.

A final thread that ran through all of the reforms was the idea of 'collectiveness' in all areas of school operation. Discussions regarding curriculum were to be the consensus of the collective leadership of the revolutionary committee, as were decisions concerning admission and graduation. The Cultural Revolution reforms struck at China's colleges and universities with particular force, for it was at the post-secondary level that heterodox modes of thinking and practice were considered to be most apparent.[15] The most significant change involved the composition of the student body and the teaching staff. Students could no longer proceed from upper middle school to college or university. They were first required to 'undergo tempering' on farms or in factories for at east

three years before admission could be granted. Also, it was not the university that determined who would be admitted, but the ' masses' in the production unit.

Although Chiang Ch'ing aided Mao, it was Mao who was credited with instituting these reforms during his life. However, after his death, it was Chiang Ch'ing, as one of the 'Gang of Four' who was discredited and made responsible for instituting these very policies.

A point of interest at this juncture is a comparison of Mao's and Chiang Ching's Marxism with that of the Soviet Union. V.Z. Klepikov of the Institute of the Theory and History of Pedagogy, U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences,[16] claimed that the 'Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution' had nothing to do with genuine cultural revolution, accomplished in the socialist countries on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory, but was purely a political campaign aimed at confirming the authority of Mao Tse-Tung's thoughts. He believed that the Cultural Revolution in China radically contradicted the principles of Marxism-Leninism, with its pro- [illegible]d respect for the culture of the past and its attempt to use the achievements of mankind to create a new, socialist culture. Klepikov went on to say that the ringleaders seized Mao's works 'without destruction there is no creation' and began to assert the need for destruction of the 'bourgeois' educational system and the creation of a 'proletarian' system. By 'bourgeois' or 'revisionist' they meant the system of education that existed in the U.S.S.R. and in other socialist countries as well as the system established in China after the liberation. Moreover, writes Klepikov, by 'proletarian' they meant a system based on the thoughts of Mao Tse-Tung and not on the accumulated human knowledge of the laws of nature and society.[17]

V. Chiang Ch'ing's Reforms in the Performing Arts

It was mainly in the field of the performing arts that Chiang Ch'ing expended her energies and exerted her power and influence. Mao had suggested that literature and art, like all subject matter, have specific functions which must be understood by those individuals engaged in producing such materials. The first important factor concerned the question of social class - that meant who was the material intended for?

Mao's answer is consistent with Marxist ideology - the proletariat and the peasant masses. Artists and writers therefore were inveighed to 'learn the language of the masses' and work with them in order to understand how to write and create for them. Art and literature, as well as other intellectual endeavours, should not seek to become the bastions of a new élite, but rather should draw their inspiration from the masses and be produced by and for the masses. Mao summed up his views on the relation of politics to culture and art (including education) as follows.[18]
"In the world today all culture, all literature and art belong to definite classes and are geared to definite political lines. There is in fact no such thing as art for art's sake, art that stands above classes or that which is detached from or independent of politics."

These were the precepts followed by Chiang Ch'ing. She emerged in 1962 as the champion of the orthodox Maoist line in music, the graphic arts, literature and the theatre. She fought a bitter battle against stubborn resistance for control of the Capital Opera Troupe, the premier company presenting traditional Peking operas. She demanded total submission in every technical and artistic detail, for she was determined to reshape both traditional and modern works to her views.

The Maoists' ultimate weapon in the ostensible debate on aesthetics, literature and pedagogy, however, was the People's Liberation Army which they believed to be securely controlled by Lin Piao. The final objective of their assault on literature, education, the stage, music and the graphic arts was to 'seize power' from the non-Maoist opposition. Therefore the Forum on Literature and Art in the Armed Forces was a major battle. Chiang Ch'ing presided over the 18-day conference which began on February 2, 1966. She selected all the participants and she drafted the ten-point conclusion that totally repudiated all established forms and organizations.[19]

1) An acute struggle has been fought on the cultural front since the liberation.
2) A revolution has taken place in drama and all the arts during the past three years, producing many fine works of art which serve the workers, peasants and soldiers.
3) The enemy is plotting to corrupt the armed forces through literature and art.

4) The People's Liberation Army (P.L.A.) must play an important role in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.
5) The myths surrounding literature and art of the 1930s as well as Chinese and foreign classical literature, should be shattered.
6) Democratic practices should be upheld in literary and art works.
7) Mass literary and art criticism should be promoted.
8) Revisionist literature should be criticized and repudiated.
9) Revolutionary realism and revolutionary romanticism should be combined in imaginary writing.
10) Literary and art cadres should be re-educated and literary and art forces should be recognized.

The report of the February Forum appointed Chiang Ch'ing as the sole aesthetic and propaganda arbiter of the Liberation Army and the nation.

In November, 1966 Chiang Ch'ing was the focus of attention at a rally attended by 20 000 persons described as 'militants in the field of literature and art'.[20] At this rally, it was announced that Peking's principal opera companies, the Red Guard Troupes of their respective schools, the Central Philharmonic Society, and the Orchestra and Ballet troupe of the Central Song and Dance Ensemble were all to become constituent parts of the People's Liberation Army, and that Chiang Ch'ing had been named its adviser on Cultural work. At this rally Chiang Ch'ing made a speech which she regarded as a major philosophic statement. In this speech she said that imperialism was 'moribund capitalism' - parasitic and rotten. She believed that modern revisionism was a product of imperialist policies and a variant of capitalism, and that no good works could be produced. Furthermore, she claimed that although capitalism had a history of several centuries, it had only a pitiful number of 'classics'. The capitalist writers, she said, had created some works modelled after the 'classics', but these were stereotyped, no longer appealed to the people and were therefore completely on the decline. "On the other hand, there are some things that really flood the market, such as rock-and-roll, jazz, strip-tease, impressionism, modernism - there's no end to them ... In a word, there is decadence and obscenity to poison and corrupt the minds of the people."[21]

Chiang Ch'ing challenged the huge contingent of dramatists by asking "How can we critically assimilate ghosts, God and religion?" She claimed that that was impossible because they didn't believe in ghosts and Gods.

Such superstitions, she continued, were used by the landlord class to exploit the people. "To sweep away all the remnants of the system of exploitation of old ideas, culture, customs and habits of exploiting classes is the fundamental challenge of our Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution."[22]

In 1966, Chiang Ch'ing and her revolutionary group had dragged out ringleader Chou Yang and his 'Black Gang'. Destruction of their good names and works of thirty years was designed to 'dig up old roots of the Black Line on bourgeois literature and art of the 1930s" and to expose the "capitulationist character" of their old slogan "national defense literature" which covered a multitude of pro-Kuomintang sins.[23]

At one of their interviews, Chiang Ch'ing remarked to Roxane Witke "If you want to write about the arts first you must 'grasp' the correct political, economic and social analysis of Chinese society. Then you'll understand how the arts function within the superstructure."[24]

'Superstructure', the Marxian term she used so frequently, is roughly equivalent to our widest concept of culture : art, literature, education, science and ideas and values generally. Communist theoreticians have asserted that the superstructure must complement the economic base; if history moves on the correct course, the superstructure keeps pace with changes in the base.

(3) Theatre

By the mid-1960s revolutionary theatre had a long proletarian and communist tradition. Chiang Ch'ing said that of all the purposes of revolutionary theatre, entertainment was the least important. Demonstration of ideology in action, of the rise of the working class, and of the triumph of Communist Party leadership is dominant. Re-enactment of high points in revolutionary history is featured. God and bad models for the people are presented throughout. Chiang Ch'ing started a crusade against all theatre evocative of a useless past. In Marxian language, she had denounced "ghost plays" (animated by superstition and folk religion) and plays about feudal society and the bourgeoisie as superstructural elements

Such superstitions, she continued, were used by the landlord class to exploit the people. "To sweep away all the remnants of the system of exploitation of old ideas, culture, customs and habits of exploiting classes is the fundamental challenge of our Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution."[22]

In 1966, Chiang Ch'ing and her revolutionary group had dragged out ringleader Chou Yang and his 'Black Gang'. Destruction of their good names and works of thirty years was designed to 'dig up old roots of the Black Line on bourgeois literature and art of the 1930s" and to exposa the "capitulationist character" of their old slogan "national defense literature" which covered a multitude of pro-Kuomintang sins.[23]

At one of their interviews, Chiang Ch'ing remarked to Roxane Witke "If you want to write about the arts first you must 'grasp' the correct political, economic and social analysis of Chinese society. Then you'll understand how the arts function within the superstructure."[24]

'Superstructure', the Marxian term she used so frequently, is roughly equivalent to our widest concept of culture : art, literature, education, science and ideas and values generally. Communist theoreticians have asserted that the superstructure must complement the economic base; if history moves on the correct course, the superstructure keeps pace with changes in the base.

(i) Theatre

By the mid-1960s revolutionary theatre had a long proletarian and communist tradition. Chiang Ch'ing said that of all the purposes of revolutionary theatre, entertainment was the least important. Demonstration of ideology in action, of the rise of the working class, and of the triumph of Communist Party leadership is dominant. Re-enactment of high points in revolutionary history is featured. God and bad models for the people are presented throughout. Chiang Ch'ing started a crusade against all theatre evocative of a useless past. In Marxian language, she had denounced "ghost plays" (animated by superstition and folk religion) and plays about feudal society and the bourgeoisie as superstructural elements

not fitting in with China's emerging socialist base. "The grain we eat is from the peasants, the clothes we wear and the houses we live in are all made by the workers, and the People's Liberation Army stands guard at the fronts of the national defence for us, and yet we do not portray them on stage. May I ask which class stand you artists do take? And where is the artist's 'conscience' you always talk about?" [25] As Chiang Ch'ing raised revolutionary standards over the new political order, she was conscious of the need to stimulate heroism both in the people and their leaders. Speaking of the drama in 1966 she said "We should not confine ourselves to actual persons and events. Nor should we portray a hero only after he is dead. In fact there are many more living heroes than dead ones."[25]

Chiang Ch'ing said that all theatrical works should be submitted to the masses for their opinions. Their good opinions were to be acted upon, their erroneous ones rejected, and those which could not be put into effect immediately were to be set aside temporarily. "We call that democratic centralism on a broad scale."[27]

(ii) Music

In her discussions on revolutionary music with Roxane Witke, Chiang Ch'ing said that the desire to strengthen state music through selective borrowing from foreign sources and from China's past was never more intense than on the eve of the Cultural Revolution. The Chinese used to scorn their own musical heritage - whenever they heard a piece of Western music they assumed unthinkingly that it was superior to their own. Chiang Ch'ing admitted that she had not listened extensively to Western music. "With hammer in hand," she announced to Witke[28], "I set out to attack all the old conventions."

She began to educate herself musically and worked at arousing the musicians' interest and eliciting their commitment to turn music into a revolutionary medium. She instructed Li Te Lun (conductor of the Central Philharmonic Orchestra) and Yin Ch'eng Chung, his prize pianist, that both Chinese and foreign conventions be broken down. As she waged that campaign single-handedly, she would appear unannounced at rehearsals of the Central Philharmonic Orchestra. In time, Li Te Lun presented Chiang Ch'ing with new works by 'master composers' who had been recruited from among his co-workers.

Their offerings included draft versions of Yellow River Piano Concerto and the Shachiapang Symphony - the two major pieces of music to be produced during the Cultural Revolution.

(iii) Film

Chiang Ch'ing also experimented with film. Those people with evident literary talent she persuaded to assist her in the composition of film scripts, a task new to them all. But their naiveté as screen writers, the actors' poor skills before the camera, and the enemies' invidious obstructionism resulted in her failing to turn out even one good feature film during the Cultural Revolution.[29]

(iv) Opera

As far as opera was concerned, Chiang Ch'ing supervised the composition of the entire musical score of "The Red Lantern". She personally wrote the music and lyrics for Scene 8 called "Struggle on the Execution Ground". The opera, "The Red Lantern" depicts trials in the Party underground. In contrast, the opera "Tiger Mountain" shows the P.L.A. contesting with the "mountain strongholdism" of bandits. After Chiang Ch'ing saw this modern opera in 1963 she began revising it until it was deemed representative of Mao's military thought.

(v) Ballet

There had been absolutely no precedent for using ballet to show military history. Chiang Ch'ing was confident of her power to turn a film "The Red Detachment of Women" into a revolutionary ballet. To educate her dancers in the way of the military, she decided to send them down to live with a P.L.A. unit for some months. She also updated "White-haired girl" making it a 'proletarian ballet' to be stripped of its earlier romanticism and naturalism, and to be suffused with class struggle ideology. Unquestionably, the Cultural Revolution had destroyed the Classical ballet.

Roxane Witke spoke to Lin Yang-yang, one of Chiang Ch'ing's cultural loyalists, ballet master and political commissar for his troupe. He said that Comrade Chiang Ch'ing was responsible for starting the cultural

Their offerings included draft versions of Yellow River Piano Concerto and the Shachiapang Symphony - the two major pieces of music to be produced during the Cultural Revolution.

(iii) Film

Chiang Ch'ing also experimented with film. Those people with evident literary talent she persuaded to assist her in the composition of film scripts, a task new to them all. But their naïveté as screen writers, the actors' poor skills before the camera, and the enemies' invidious obstructionism resulted in her failing to turn out even one good feature film during the Cultural Revolution.[29]

(iv) Opera

As far as opera was concerned, Chiang Ch'ing supervised the composition of the entire musical score of "The Red Lantern". She personally wrote the music and lyrics for Scene 8 called "Struggle on the Execution Ground". The opera, "The Red Lantern" depicts trials in the Party underground. In contrast, the opera "Tiger Mountain" shows the P.L.A. contesting with the "mountain strongholdism" of bandits. After Chiang Ch'ing saw this modern opera in 1963 she began revising it until it was deemed representative of Mao's military thought.

(v) Ballet

There had been absolutely no precedent for using ballet to show military history. Chiang Ch'ing was confident of her power to turn a film "The Red Detachment of Women" into a revolutionary ballet. To educate her dancers in the way of the military, she decided to send them down to live with a P.L.A. unit for some months. She also updated "White-haired girl" making it a 'proletarian ballet' to be stripped of its earlier romanticism and naturalism, and to be suffused with class struggle ideology. Unquestionably, the Cultural Revolution had destroyed the Classical ballet.

Roxane Witke spoke to Lin Yang-yang, one of Chiang Ch'ing's cultural loyalists, ballet master and political commissar for his troupe. He said that Comrade Chiang Ch'ing was responsible for starting the cultural

warfare that transformed the ballet from a 'bourgeois classical art' to a 'sinified popular art'.[30]

VI. Chiang Ch'ing's achievements

Thus, out of the havoc wrought by Chiang Ch'ing and her defenders who banned all available entertainments - music, drama and film to begin with - a select corpus of model works known as yang-pan hsi was born. The evolving use of yang-pan (mould or model) had political significance. During the late 1950s Yang-pan referred to demonstration fields - model farms constructed for general emulation during the Great Leap Forward. The term yang-pan hsi - 'model theatre' extended the metaphor from the base to the superstructure. The message was that styles of public entertainment no less than agriculture, should fit a mould but change with the demands of revolutionary leaders and their times. By 1968, eight yang-pan hsi had been produced including four operas and two ballets. Chiang Ch'ing and her corps of expert assistants were clearly the leaders of radical cultural change; they felt compelled to destroy lingering faith in the bourgeois notion of the individual and to foster in its stead the proletarian ideal of mass creation.

Chiang Ch'ing's type of Marxism may again be compared with that of the Soviet Union. In this respect V.Z. Klepikov[31] quotes Lenin : "Proletarian culture is not something that has sprung from no one knows where; it is not an invention of people who call themselves specialists in proletarian culture. This is all utter nonsense. Proletarian culture should be the law-governed development of those reserves of knowledge that mankind has amassed under the yoke of capitalist society, landowning society, bureaucratic society". Klepikov claims that the Red Guards' destruction of works of art and of classics of world literature has nothing in common with this characterization of Lenin.

By the fall of 1975, the reconstructed Ministry of Culture was sanctioning events authorized by Chiang Ch'ing alone in the years when the name of her corporate authority was the Cultural Revolution Group of the Central Committee. Under the Ministry's auspices another handful of films and dramas was released. All were straightforward celebrations of contemporary

political actions, including the training of barefoot doctors and the production of torpedo boats and ocean vessels.

One may ask oneself, viewing Chiang Ch'ing from a cultural distance, how aware she was of the fundamental revolutionary nature of her actions. Defended by few, she "rushed against the tides not only of Chinese but also of world history".[32] On the premise that drama shapes consciousness, she sought supreme authority over the performing arts and ultimately over the national culture. Her overall goal was control of - or better "revolutionization of" people's minds. Witke believed that at the time of her interviews, Chiang Ch'ing was, regardless of the Chinese government's restrained publicity about her, the most powerful woman in the world.[33]

References to Chapter 5

1. Elegant, Robert S. — Mao's Great Revolution — Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971 p.xiii

2. Hawkins, J. — Mao Tse Tung and Education p. 32

3. Ibid. p.68

4. Hinton, Harold — An introduction to Chinese politics — 1973. Redwood Press Ltd. Great Britain. p.103

5. Hawkins, J. — Op.Cit. p.73

6. Ibid. p.109

7. Mao Tse Tung — Five Essays on Philosophy On the correct handling of contradictions among people. Feb. 1957. Foreign language press. Peking 1977. p.110

8. Hawkins, J. — Op.Cit. p.71

9. Ibid. p.73

10. Montaperto, Ronald N. — China's Schools in Flux — MacMillan Press Ltd. 1979 Ch.I p.30

11. Ibid. p.31

12. Hawkins, J. — Op.Cit. p.76

13. Ibid. p.78

14. Montaperto, Ronald N. — Op.Cit. p.32

15. Ibid. p.33

16. Klepikov, V. — Suvietskaia Pedagogia 1968 No.8
The Fate of Public Education in China
Chinese Education Winter 1968/9
Vol 1 Part 4. pp 42 - 43

17. Ibid. p.45

18. Hawkins, J. — Op.Cit. p.86

19. Elegant, Robert S. — Op.Cit. p.134

20. Rice, Edward E. — Mao's Way
University of California Press.
1972 p.270

21. Witke, R. — Comrade Chiang Ch'ing p.325

22. Ibid. p.385

23. Ibid. p.327

24. Ibid. p.382

25. Ibid. p.310

26. Ibid. p.407

27. Ibid. p.392

28. Ibid. p.387

29. Ibid. p.403

30. Ibid. p.432

31. Klepikov, V.Z. — Op.Cit. p.43

32. Witke, R. Op.Cit. p.380

33. Witke, R. Op.Cit. p.4

CHAPTER 6

The Educational influence of Krupskaya

I. The return of polytechnism

A feature which is stressed in the U.S.S.R. at every level today is the place of labour in society, that is the requirement that each individual has some specialized skill so that he is able to participate in the industrial development of the nation. The implementation of this aspect of labour and polytechnical education originated with the Kruschev reforms, many of which echo the ideas of Krupskaya.

The need for educational reform in the 1950s was first voiced by the 19th Communist Party Congress (1952), the last one to be held in Stalin's lifetime. Reflecting the realization that the secondary school had become too academic, the Congress advocated a gradual transition to universal polytechnical education. This was a revival of an idea that goes back to Merx and subsequently Krupskaya. The 19th Commurist Party feared that the intellectuals were beginning to see themselves as a class apart. The 10-year school had been set up in the 1930s in a period when the regime urgently needed a supply of highly trained specialists to carry out its intensive industrial build up.[1] In a country where for forty years, the industrial worker had been extolled as the most 'progressive' element in society, manual labour was despised, and only intellectual achievement was being honoured. These attitudes stood in direct contradiction to the official ideology on which the communist party based its claim to power - the Marxian ideology of egalitarianism . The Kruschev school reform, announced in 1958 was devised to deal with these problems. In his article on the Kruschev Reforms, Boitier writes "It may be stated at the outset that the significance of the reform lies not so much in the manner in which the original structure of Soviet schools is to be juggled, as in the effect it will have on the academic careers and aspirations of millions of individual Soviet students and educators."[2]

II. The Kruschev Reforms

A brief summary of these reforms will illustrate the similarity of their aims to the aims and goals of Krupskaya which were in essence

to strengthen the link between school and life :

The compulsory eight-year 'General Education, Labour and Polytechnical School' was instituted. The extra year was accounted for by activities described as 'polytechnical studies'; home economics for girls, school workshops for boys, lectures on labour, work experience projects, visits to plants, field trips, physical education and youth organization activities. The Soviet authorities still define polytechnical education as an education based on the fundamentals of industrial production, distinct from trade training which involves the acquisition of a particular vocational skill. This is an echo of Krupskaya's ideas. Instituting labour after the eighth year is what Boitier calls the heart of the reform.[3] This meant the necessity for all students to take part in socially useful labour both in town and country. As the theses state "This will create more equal conditions with regard to labour education for all citizens."[4] After the eighth year, the student had a choice of three paths : Firstly there were the part-time schools for working and rural youths. Secondly, there were the Secondary Education, Labour and Polytechnical Schools with production training. In these schools the academic curriculum was to be combined with polytechnical education and a type of factory or agricultural profession. The place and time of the 'socially useful work' (as advocated by Krupskaya) was to depend upon a profession.

A third type of school was the technicum which was to turn out technicians. Finally there were to be uchilischcha, professional-technical schools. As for higher education, it was decreed that the vast majority of future students enrolling in higher education would be required to complete the first two years of the normal five year course by evening or correspondence work. During these two years, they would continue working in a full time job in production. The ultimate test of enrollment was the requirement that it be wielded "so that really the best people will be selected, those who will be capable of successfully applying in production - after a brief period of time - the knowledge they have gained."[5] Here is evidence of a direct expression of Krupskaya's aims. According to Boitier[6], the real impetus behind Kruschev's school reform seems to come from ideological and social rather than economic considerations. The 'Theses' dwell at length on the more purposive aims which should permeate all school activities in the future. The most explicit

general goals set forth by the C.P.S.U. (Communist Party of the Soviet Union) is the ideological preparation of the rising generation to live under communism. These goals, too, were explicitly stated by Krupskaya.

Soon after the new law was put into effect, complaints in the press began to appear; teachers and pupils complained of repetitive and pointless work in factories, while factory managers were all too often at a complete loss as to what to do with all the extra hands suddenly put at their disposal. It was strongly argued, however, that there were deficiencies of organisation, not principle.[7] A process of gradual dismantling of the 1958 school reform was begun. After 1966, only one third of the country's secondary schools - those with factories - continued with external practice.[8] The provision requiring a two-year work period before admission to higher education institutions was abandoned. The new rules for admission allowed every institution to decide for itself how many candidates would be admitted directly form the secondary schools.

III. The extent of Krupskaya's influence today

Since the 1960s the polytechnical concepts have gradually come back.[9] Although the emphasis is towards more general education, polytechnical education and general work training remain an important element of the curriculum. Grant[10] maintains that what has happened so far has not been a rejection of the principle of linking general education with practical work, but a reappraisal of the best ways of putting it into practice.

If one is to consider the extent of Krupskaya's influence on Russian education today, it appears evident that in theory her polytechnical concepts abound. V. Klarin writes "Lenin's and Krupskaya's pronouncements on the relation between education and productive labour, on polytechnical education and on the vocational training of young people are also timely in our day. A creative utilization of the principles they expressed promotes the elimination of shortcomings in the labour training of pupils and the strengthening of the ties between school and life "[11] and "Lenin and Krupskaya's works are a model of Marxist research on the most important problems in the theory and practice of education. Their role in the party's struggle for the revolutionary transformation of the school and for the indoctrination of the working people is truly inestimable."[12]

In 1981 Dr. N. Dumchenko[13], a corresponding member of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences who directs the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Vocational and Technical Education discussed polytechnical education today. He writes that today's vocational and technical training schools turn eight-year (incomplete) and ten-year (complete) secondary-school graduates into skilled workers according to plan. He claims that the country is developing a network of secondary vocational-technical training schools in which young people acquire a blue collar occupation and a general secondary education. He continues by saying that in his notes on the theses of his wife Krupskaya on polytechnical education, Lenin writes of the need to link vocational training with general and polytechnical knowledge, to avoid transforming it into narrow job or trade training, while he stresses the importance of expanding general education subjects in all vocational-technical training schools.[14] Dumchenko makes this significant statement, "With the advent of universal secondary education, the general education school is participating actively in the realization of this task by improving the labour and polytechnical education, and by promoting the blue-collar occupations. From year to year, the ranks of the working classes are multiplying, the vocational and technical sophistication of workers is increasing, and we are seeing the fulfillment of Lenin's dream that unity and continuity among generations of working people might become a powerful factor in our society's successful climb up the ladder of social progress."[15] From the above, it is evident that Krupskaya's goals for education in terms of a classless society are identical with the goals stressed by influential sources in 1981.

It is necessary to question, however, whether Lenin's dreams are being fulfilled, or whether the concrete application of his ideology is in fact a myth. In order to ascertain whether Krupskaya's goals are being achieved, one must examine the social situation in the U.S.S.R. today.

IV. Education and Social Stratification

Joseph Zajda[16] has examined the role that education plays in social mobility in the U.S.S.R. He says that although the official view of Soviet sociologists is that Soviet society is classless, since all Soviet citizens are equal possessors of the means of production, other objective criteria

(education, wealth, occupation, power etc.) which contribute to the existence of social stratification in a given society are not considered. One is led to believe that all classes and strata of Soviet society are equal possessors of the above status symbols.[17]

Zajda says that upward mobility is a paradoxical feature of the egalitarian and supposedly classless Soviet society. Of the five million matriculants in 1977, almost 50% wished to enter tertiary institutions, competing for one million places available, but less than 10% wanted to enter trade colleges. In this sense, Soviet tertiary education is more meritocratic than egalitarian and leaning towards contest and sponsored mobility. Contemporary Soviet students equate tertiary education with white-collar occupations and, more specifically, with jobs of high social status and prestige. Blue collar occupations are not as popular and because of this there is a chronic shortage of semi-skilled and skilled workers in the U.S.S.R. "Soviet Marxism, for the first time had to face up to dilemmas and contradictions characteristic of capitalist societies - division of labour, undue specialization and separation of intellectual from physical labour, to a socialist society beset by similar problems."[19]

It has become apparent that many Soviet matriculants pay lip service to the ideology of "socially useful labour". In a series of major sociological surveys between 1963 and 1973, Shubkin, a well-known Soviet sociologist at the University of Novosibirsk, has found that career aspirations of school leavers did not correspond to the needs of the Soviet economy when he analyzed social mobility.[20]

Shubkin discovered that in Marxist sociology, governed by the principles of socialism, the traditional criteria defining school stratification were no longer applicable. He claimed that Soviet youth valued income, power and status. It was also found that the concept of socially useful work found its strongest supporters among the more educated respondents. Workers appeared to be thinking more about salaries than about the concept of social usefulness.

Further, it was found that higher education plays an important role in stratification and mobility in the U.S.S.R. today. The Baskkir survey

(1975)[21] showed that parents' socio-occupational status, income, educational level, family income, place of residence and so on affected the child's performance at school. On the basis of this survey, Popov was able to conclude "the social differences that continue to exist today make for inequality in the cultural and technical levels of workers, white-collar people, and professionals, and this in turn affects their attitude toward education and their ability to help their children with the schoolwork".[22]

Zajda concludes that the Soviet educational system seems to have a dysfunctional effect on Soviet society.[23] On the one hand, it promotes social mobility between various lower strata groups, but on the other hand, by its bias towards the intelligentsia students, it bars them from entering the 'élite stratum'. Thus, it seems that only lip service is being paid to Krupskaya's concept of socially useful labour and Marxist egalitarianism.

Another area which has deviated from Krupskaya's Marxist ideology of egalitarianism and compulsory polytechnical education is that of the special schools. In a seminar given at the University of the Witwatersrand on 15 June, 1981 Professor W. Brickman (of the Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania) stated that the development of these special schools was one of the most important changes in the educational policy of the U.S.S.R. after Kruschev. This change involved the emphasis on selection and identification of the gifted child.

In 1963 an experimental special school for young scientists was created under the jurisdiction of the Novosibirsk branch of the Academy of Sciences of the R.S.F.S.R. There are now four of these boarding-type special schools under the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. and almost five hundred more sponsored by the Ministries of Education of the various republics. Professor Gerald Read[24] says that these schools are a direct challenge to the Marxist dogma of an educational egalitarianism. Innovation, newness, experimentation, creativity and decentralization take on much greater importance than do routine ideological and political concerns. Krupskaya had specifically stated that talented children should not be given privileges, believing that universal education and universal productive labour was obligatory for everyone in a Communist society.

Despite these deviations from Marxist ideology, the need for polytechnical education is stressed at every stage of the Soviet educational system.

(1975)[21] showed that parents' socio-occupational status, income, educational level, family income, place of residence and so on affected the child's performance at school. On the basis of this survey, Popov was able to conclude "the social differences that continue to exist today make for inequality in the cultural and technical levels of workers, white-collar people, and professionals, and this in turn affects their attitude toward education and their ability to help their children with the schoolwork".[22]

Zajda concludes that the Soviet educational system seems to have a dysfunctional effect on Soviet society.[23] On the one hand, it promotes social mobility between various lower strata groups, but on the other hand, by its bias towards the intelligentsia students, it bars them from entering the 'élite stratum'. Thus, it seems that only lip service is being paid to Krupskaya's concept of socially useful labour and Marxist egalitarianism.

Another area which has deviated from Krupskaya's Marxist ideology of egalitarianism and compulsory polytechnical education is that of the special schools. In a seminar given at the University of the Witwatersrand on 15 June, 1981 Professor W. Brickman (of the Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania) stated that the development of these special schools was one of the most important changes in the educational policy of the U.S.S.R. after Kruschev. This change involved the emphasis on selection and identification of the gifted child.

In 1963 an experimental special school for young scientists was created under the jurisdiction of the Novosibirsk branch of the Academy of Sciences of the R.S.F.S.R. There are now four of these boarding-type special schools under the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. and almost five hundred more sponsored by the Ministries of Education of the various republics. Professor Gerald Read[24] says that these schools are a direct challenge to the Marxist dogma of an educational egalitarianism. Innovation, newness, experimentation, creativity and decentralization take on much greater importance than do routine ideological and political concerns. Krupskaya had specifically stated that talented children should not be given privileges, believing that universal education and universal productive labour was obligatory for everyone in a Communist society.

Despite these deviations from Marxist ideology, the need for polytechnical education is stressed at every stage of the Soviet educational system.

The view is taken that for the future citizen in an industrialized society there is a need for familiarity with industrial production. In this respect Krupskaya's educational philosophies prevail. Her influence, however, does not extend to the attainment of the goals envisaged. The result, in terms of social stratification and upward mobility in the U.S.S.R. is in direct contrast with the ideological aims of egalitarianism.

References to Chapter 6

1. Schlesinger, Ina — Soviet Educational Change
School & Society Vol.100 Jan. 1972 p.44

2. Boitier, A. — The Kruschev School Reform
Comparative Education Review Feb. 1959 p.4

3. Boitier, A. — Op.Cit. p.9

4. Theses of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.
The State Publishing House of Political Literature, Moscow, 1958. p.42

5. Boitier, A. — Op.Cit. p.13

6. Boitier, A. — Op.Cit. p.13

7. Grant, N. — Soviet Education, p.115

8. Schlesinger, I. — Op.Cit. p.45

9. Prof. G. Read
Professor of Comparative Education. State University Kent, Ohio. — Seminar held at University of the Witwatersrand.
23 July, 1981

10. Grant, N. — Soviet Education, 1971. p.117

11. Klarin, V. — Soviet Education, Op.Cit. Oct. 1970 p.63

12. Ibid. p.64

13. Dumchenko, N.I. — Realization of Lenin's ideas on vocational and technical education.
Soviet Education, Feb. 1981, p.77

References to Chapter 6

1. Schlesinger, Ina — Soviet Educational Change School & Society Vol.100 Jan. 1972 p.44

2. Boitier, A. — The Kruschev School Reform Comparative Education Review Feb. 1959 p.4

3. Boitier, A. — Op.Cit. p.9

4. Theses of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. The State Publishing House of Political Literature, Moscow, 1958. p.42

5. Boitier, A. — Op.Cit. p.13

6. Boitier, A. — Op.Cit. p.13

7. Grant, N. — Soviet Education, p. 5

8. Schlesinger, I. — Op.Cit. p.45

9. Prof. G. Read Professor of Comparative Education. State University Kent, Ohio. — Seminar held at University of the Witwatersrand. 23 July, 1981

10. Grant, N. — Soviet Education, 1971. p.117

11. Klarin, V. — Soviet Education, Op.Cit. Oct. 1970 p.63

12. Ibid. p.64

13. Dumchenko, N.I. — Realization of Lenin's ideas on vocational and technical education. Soviet Education, Feb. 1981, p.77

14. Ibid. p.80

15. Ibid. pp. 80 - 81

16. Zajda, J. Education and social stratification in the Soviet Union. Comparative Education Vol. 16 No. 1 March 1980. p.4

17. Ibid. p.3

18. Ibid. p.4

19. Ibid. p.5

20. Ibid. p.6

21. Ibid. p.8

22. Ibid. p.8

23. Ibid. p.10

24. Read, G. The Akademgorodok of Novosibirsk Intellect Vol. 101 No. 2343. Oct. 1972 p.55

CHAPTER 7

The Educational Influence of Chiang Ch'ing

I. Overthrow of the Gang of Four and their condemnation

Mao Tse-Tung had not been seen by the masses since May Day 1971, though over the last quarter century the media had made him the most familiar ruler in Chinese history. He died on September 9, 1976. The person who emerged as China's new strongman was Hua Kuo-feng. He became Party Chairman and by the middle of October Hua had won control over the press. On October 16, the national media made an announcement more stunning than the death of Mao Tse-Tung : the arrest of the 'Gang of Four'. These persons, who had been Mao's closest disciples were Wang Hung-wen; Yao Wen-yuan, Chiang Ch'ing and Chang Ch'un-ch'iao. Chiang Ch'ing was depicted as ringleader. Her own party had condemned her as "counter-revolutionary" when some thirty years earlier the K.M.T. had locked her up as a Communist Revolutionary. Chiang Ch'ing's enemies vowed to fight the 'Gang of Four' to the finish.

Chiang Ch'ing and her supporters were said to have abused principles and persecuted the people. They had tampered with Mao Tse-Tung's thought and had muddled people's thinking concerning the relationships between knowledge and practice, matter and consciousness, the leaders and the masses, the relations of production and the productive forces, the superstructure and the economic base, politics and vocational work, revolution and production, democracy and centralism, freedom and discipline. In simpler language; "They confused right and wrong theories and damaged both revolution and production. Waving the banner of Marxism-Leninism they sabotaged Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and policies and pushed an ultra-right counter-revolutionary revisionist line."[2]

Soon the China Peking Opera Troupe, which had created 'The Red Lantern' duly slandered the 'Gang of Four'. "Their crimes are so multitudinous that they should die a thousand deaths. ... they took possession of literature and theatre and created evil public opinion. They were the evil lords of literature and the theatre.[3] On December 25, 1976 Hua Kuo-feng himself labelled the 'Gang of Four' as 'ultra-leftists' and 'counter-revolutionary revisionists'. The central task he set for the country was "to deepen the





Chiang Ch'ing, her head crowned in a Confucian-style hat, poses in a frame labeled "official portrait." She wears the badge of Party Chairman, but "revisionism lies in her heart." "How does it look?" she asks Chang Ch'un-ch'iao, tagged "premier" (her punning question can also be read as "What sort of model?"). Yao Wen-yuan and Wang Hung-wen acclaim her from the left.

On the black flag upheld by a pen are the characters "chi-ting," referring to principles "laid down," words Chiang Ch'ing allegedly forged in order to make herself Mao's successor. Her official portrait, including a Western-style crown, sticks out of her handbag. The badge "student" — her special relation to Mao — adorns her breast. Beneath her foreign skirt, from left to right, are Wang Hung-wen, Chang Ch'un-ch'iao carrying a stack of hats, meaning "labels" to pin on people, and Yao Wen-yuan wearing the banner of a "genuine Marxist-Leninist."



Chiang Ch'ing appears as a smoking serpent with lipstick, rouge, and crimson fingernails. Wang Hung-wen, attired as a high military officer, offers her a golden crown, each point tipped with a skull. Her official tunic, decorated with a snake in its heart, hangs on a pen behind. Chang Ch'un-ch'iao, a bloody hatchet in his belt, paints an "official portrait" of Chiang Ch'ing in PLA costume. Salivating Yao Wen-yuan writes a "manifesto for opening the country" -- that is, national betrayal. A stack of hats bearing derogatory labels used by the Gang of Four stands to the left.



Witchlike Chiang Ch'ing is set aflight by Yao Wen-yuan and Chang Ch'un-ch'iao. Her broom reads, "Counterrevolutionary revisionist line in the art." Yao Wen-yuan's belt carries a hatchet labeled "literary critic." Chang Ch'un-ch'iao has the horn of "propaganda" slung over his shoulder. Wang Hung-wen poses as the "helicopter," because he rose to power so fast. All four have trampled over the Hundred Flowers Garden, meaning cultural freedom, where books, records of the [illegible] and musical scores are heaped. Vultures fly over.



A Canton poster of November 1976. Chiang Ch'ing offers Party and state secrets to a Western figure in exchange for an imperial crown. The four characters on the lower right read, "National betrayal in pursuit of glory."

great mass movement to expose and criticize the Gang of Four."[4] (See posters taken from Roxane Witke's book which bear testimony to the denouncement of Chiang Ch'ing).

At this point there emerges a clear division between Chiang Ch'ing and what was was called her 'ultra-leftist ideology' on the one hand, and Mao with his 'genuine cultural revolution' policy on the other hand. Previously it had been accepted that Chiang Ch'ing's pronouncements of early 1966 had been a logical extension of the position adopted in the early 1960s by Mao himself. Moreover, her statements and actions were considered to have been approved by Mao, and any criticism of them might have been taken as implicit criticism of the Chairman. However, it appears that the new leaders needed a focus in their political campaign for the latest ideological line change within the Party, and Chiang Ch'ing with the rest of the 'Gang of Four' served this end admirably. Suzanne Pepper[5] sees the campaign as part of a political power struggle. She discusses how during the entire first year and more following their arrest in October 1976 the two main charges contained in the official polemic against the 'Gang of Four' on the education front were that they had pushed the Party's policies to excess, and that they had sought to use education as a tool in their struggle for power. She writes "Their opponents seemed loath to admit they might actually be playing out the reality of the two-line struggle in a manner anticipated by the 'Gang's" own polemics before its downfall."

This clear distinction between Chiang Ch'ing who was condemned by the new leaders and Mao, who continued to be revered, is illustrated in the following interview between Chang Hsüeh-hsin (of the Higher Education Bureau of the Education Ministry in Peking) and Suzanne Pepper on 19 July, 1977[6]. Pepper quotes Chang Hsüeh-hsin : "This interference of the 'Gang of Four' in education was one of their greatest crimes. As a result, the level of education in any given class was not uniform ... This presented great difficulties for the teachers." Chang continued by saying that the 'Gang of Four' tried to abolish all technical secondary schools. They (the 'Gang of Four') said that they were training technicians and spiritual aristocrats and that this should be stopped. Further, Chang said that all of the departments were very much upset by the interference of the 'Gang of Four' in their attempt to determine the Four Modernizations. He went on to say that when the 'Gang of

Four' was in control, half of the schooling time was spent on manual labour and only half for knowledge and culture. He said that the students learnt very little. Chairman Mao, according to Chang, tried to raise academic standards, but the 'Gang of Four' would not allow standards to be raised.[7] Comrade Chang concluded the interview declaring that " of all the things the 'Gang of Four' did, what they did with education was the worst. We must hate and criticize them for it. They have spoiled two generations."[8]

Another apparent error of the Gang was in denigrating the necessity of scientific and technological research as well as rapid industrial development. A prominent and sophisticated advocate of Chinese technological progress, Vice Premier Fang Yi (who previously was minister of foreign trade and who currently heads the State Council's Office of Science and Technology) contends that because basic scientific and theoretical research in particular was done away with, the gap between China's level of science and technology and the world's advanced levels has widened. He argues "Science and education are lagging so far behind that they are seriously hindering the realization of the modernization of agriculture, industry, national defence and science and technology."[9] Many Chinese scientists assert that their research was only slightly behind the Japanese in the early 1960s and that the wide gap between Chinese and Japanese technology today can be blamed on the policies of the Cultural Revolution. Teachers recall that during the control of the 'Gang of Four', the physics course, for example, was reduced to the study of "three machines and one pump" - generators, diesel engines, electric motors and water pumps. Instruction in the basic knowledge of optics, electricity, mechanics, thermodynamics are now being restored to their 'rightful levels'.[10]

Moreover, the new leaders said that most of the responsibility should be assumed by the higher education and research centre, rather than by the primary and high schools, where the effects of the Cultural Revolution were much less drastic. With most high school graduates being resettled in the rural areas and almost no one being admitted to universities, students no longer were motivated to strive for academic achievement. The universities were the worst affected, and again selection policies were the predominant cause. Because universities, with rare exceptions, were not allowed to

screen the intellectual abilities of their applicants, many of those recommended for admission were not able to do college level work. Students continued to be graduated from high school even during the period when schools closed (from 1966 to 1969) so that many university freshmen actually received only one or two years post primary education.

Although official Cultural Revolution policies stipulated that those engaged in scientific research be exempted from political involvement, at most universities scientists were as battered by the storms of student strife as were their colleagues in the humanities and social sciences. The statistics are staggering[11]: of 177 full and associate professors at Peking University, 145 were punished and some were persecuted to death. The statement made by one of these professors in the film 'From Mao to Mozart' bears witness to these facts.

II. Changes since the 'Gang of Four'

(i) Educational policies at Schools and Universities

The changes now underway are as systematic as the Cultural Revolution's innovations were before it. So systematic has been the restoration of pre-Cultural Revolution policies that, according to Suzanne Pepper[12], one must question whether the restoration should not be seen more as a conservative challenge to the radical opposition, than as a pragmatic or moderate solution for China's education problems. Using education as a tool in their struggle for power, it would appear that they needed to make the 'Gang of Four' the scapegoats for all educational problems which had been encountered.

The general practice is to explain all of the revisions as being necessitated due to the excesses and distortions of the 'past' when the 'Gang of Four' was in control[13], while continuing to praise the Late Chairman Mao. An example of this is a statement made by Jiang Nanxlang, the Chinese Minister of Education[14]. When asked why China intended to lengthen the number of primary school years from five to six, Jiang replied "Fundamentally we think Chairman Mao's thought is still standing. We still uphold his thoughts as serving proletarian politics, serving seven modernizations, serving the combination

between theory and practice. The requirement for being both Red and Expert is still there. These bases for Mao's thought are still important, but some of Mao's ideas have to be re-examined..."

An authority on Chinese Education[15] lists the major policy changes since the overthrow of the 'Gang of Four'. Firstly there is a new emphasis on science and technology, especially theoretical research and training. The Universities are now engaging in more basic research. The Chinese see this renewed emphasis on basic research as re-establishing the correct 'theory-practice-theory' sequence. They now claim that the 'Gang of Four' promoted a self-defeating 'practice-practice-practice' approach which held back the country's progress.[16]

Secondly, the admissions policy to universities and colleges was based, as we have seen, on participation in production farms, factories etc. Now the performance in entrance examinations is an important aspect in screening for admission. The official answer as to whether the children of peasants, workers and soldiers receive preferential treatment is that this "has always been the case, and will continue to be so".[17]

Thirdly, during the Cultural Revolution, the transfer programme removed excess labour power from the cities and sent young people to live and work with the peasants, the idea being to break down some of the barriers between educated urbanites and country people. The cost of the programme was several million young people who never integrated with the peasants even though they have learned to live with them. Under the new administration, the transfer programme has reverted to its previous status as the least favourable of several alternatives for urban youth.[18]

Fourthly, one of the most controversial new policies is the re-establishment of the tracking system in which students are assigned, according to intellectual ability, to key point schools or to ordinary schools, and to fast, average or slow classes within schools. 'Pagodas' are being rebuilt at every academic level from university to kindergarten. The argument for the re-establishment of these key point schools, which are assigned the best qualified teachers, is as follows:[19] "How can educational quality be improved as quickly as possible? One important, strategic way is to run key universities and colleges and middle and primary schools well." Most teachers and administrators claim that

between theory and practice. The requirement for being both Red and Expert is still there. These bases for Mao's thought are still important, but some of Mao's ideas have to be re-examined..."

An authority on Chinese Education[15] lists the major policy changes since the overthrow of the 'Gang of Four'. Firstly there is a new emphasis on science and technology, especially theoretical research and training. The Universities are now engaging in more basic research. The Chinese see this renewed emphasis on basic research as re-establishing the correct 'theory-practice-theory' sequence. They now claim that the 'Gang of Four' promoted a self-defeating 'practice-practice-practice' approach which held back the country's progress.[16]

Secondly, the admissions policy to universities and colleges was based, as we have seen, on participation in production farms, factories etc. Now the performance in entrance examinations is an important aspect in screening for admission. The official answer as to whether the children of peasants, workers and soldiers receive preferential treatment is that this "has always been the case, and will continue to be so".[17]

Thirdly, during the Cultural Revolution, the transfer programme removed excess labour power from the cities and sent young people to live and work with the peasants, the idea being to break down some of the barriers between educated urbanites and country people. The cost of the programme was several million young people who never integrated with the peasants even though they have learned to live with them. Under the new administration, the transfer programme has reverted to its previous status as the least favourable of several alternatives for urban youth.[18]

Fourthly, one of the most controversial new policies is the re-establishment of the tracking system in which students are assigned, according to intellectual ability, to key point schools or to ordinary schools, and to fast, average or slow classes within schools. 'Pagodas' are being rebuilt at every academic level from university to kindergarten. The argument for the re-establishment of these key point schools, which are assigned the best qualified teachers, is as follows:[19] "How can educational quality be improved as quickly as possible? One important, strategic way is to run key universities and colleges and middle and primary schools well." Most teachers and administrators claim that

tracking is only a temporary measure, made necessary by the 'Gang of Four' whose policies had increased the intellectual disparities among students. Even more politically controversial than key point schools or tracking is the decision to return to the pre-Cultural Revolution system for selecting university students. During 1977, the central leaders decided to re-institute college entrance examinations. The 1977-78 selection procedures differ from those used before 1966 in that they pay almost no attention to school grades. One university administrator explained that because the Cultural Revolution disrupted schooling, course grades do not mean much today; in the future, as school quality is restored, academic records will once again be considered in selection[20]. The current line is that the 'Gang of Four' overemphasized family class background and turned it into a revolutionary 'blood heritage theory'[21]. In political evaluation, the policy is "taking into account of class origin, but not to the extent that it decides everything, while laying the emphasis on political behaviour."[22]

In summary, the new educational policies represent a return to the school system of the 1960-1966 era in which resources were concentrated on those with the greatest intellectual potential in order to provide the economy with expertise in the speediest, most efficient fashion. Then, as now, manual labour and political education were an integral part of the school curriculum, and students were selected by a combination of academic and political criteria. The leadership's political rationale for the restoration of 1960-1966 policies is that the pre-Cultural Revolution educational system did indeed represent Mao Tse-Tung's ideas and was not all bad; they argue that the 'Gang of Four' misled the people with their "Two assessments"[23], the assessment that the seventeen years of education before the Cultural Revolution were all bad, and the assessment that the ten years of education after the Cultural Revolution were all good. From the foregoing it appears that whatever was thought to have been done by the 'Gang of Four' with Chiang Ch'ing as ringleader, has been eradicated.

(ii) The Cultural Sphere

Chiang Ch'ing's influence in the broader educational sphere, that is her affect on the culture of the Chinese people, had been all-powerful.

Price[24] notes that it is one of the ironies of 1966-69 that a movement claiming to be a cultural revolution produced a cultural desert. Owing to Chiang Ch'ing's influence, people were reduced to seeing 'four good operas', two ballets and hearing one cantata; while those bookshops which remained open had to turn their books facewise on the shelves to give the semblance of stocks. The genuine problem of creating viable art forms which would really 'serve the workers and peasants' or the cause of moving towards a more communist society, were hardly formulated, much less solved.[24]

Writes Price "Small wonder, therefore, that the recent revival of what must be accurately described as 'bourgeois' ... has met with considerable enthusiasm from the entertainment-starved masses".[25] Chiang Ch'ing's influence in bringing about a cultural desert has disappeared. Spectacular changes have occurred in the performing arts. Gone are the days when 800 million Chinese were fed day-in and day-out on the standard fare of eight model operas.[26] In the arts, the cultural restoration has involved all fields. Local and Beijing operas have been revived to play to packed audiences. In the theatres, a growing repertoire of new plays includes for the first time the portrayal of party and government leaders such as Mao Tse-tung, Chou Enlai, Chu De and Mao's second wife, Yang Kachui.[27] Foreign films in great variety, have been screened in the major cities and on television. Youth have been seen learning ballroom dancing in the parks from Kunming to Beijing, and foreign guests have again been invited to such events. Publishing has burgeoned on a wide front, from science texts to novels, and dozens of new periodicals span the arts and sciences. The publication of some of these works, like the edition of the Encyclopaedia, Cihai, has been held up since as long ago as 1965.

Practically all pre-Cultural Revolution literary journals have resumed publications and some new ones have appeared. In addition to short pieces which appear in journals, a number of longer works have been published, of which Yao Xueyin's voluminous novel Li Zicheng (still to be completed) ranks amongst the best in modern Chinese fiction.[28] But of all the literary genres, it is the short story which has been the most prolific. It is here, according to Sylvia Chan[29] that one finds the most interesting trends in the cultural 'thaw'. Because of the comparatively short time involved in their creation, short stories easily lend themselves to the representation of topical themes. It is not surprising, therefore, that a recurrent themein

short story writing has been the fortunes of individuals during the period of the 'Gang of Four'. Says Chan "Though such a theme has important propagandist value, there is no doubt that its salience reflects the fact that, for many Chinese, the Cultural Revolution is still the most traumatic memory, and works which deal with that subject capture the popular imagination."

In August, 1977, a separate Academy of Social Sciences was established. Its institutes include Archaeology, Economics, Anthropology, History and Foreign Literature. The Institute for World Religions of this Academy held its first big meeting in April 1977, attended by some 110 academics. Another aspect of this Cultural restoration has been the sudden increase in contacts with other countries. Foreign language institutes and departments in tertiary education have again been recruiting staff on a big scale. Foreign specialists have been invited to give guest lectures at tertiary institutions. More than 480 students and academics from different institutions in China have gone abroad to study.[30]

Professor Emeritus T.H.E. Chen makes the distinction between conventional education, which is formal and structured and takes place primarily in the school setting, and revolutionary education in which the school is but one of the many agencies - formal and non-formal lines are blurred. This distinction illustrates the education in China today as compared with that under the influence of the 'Gang of Four' whose ringleader was Chiang Ch'ing. Professor Chen writes "Conventional education values the acquisition of knowledge, revolutionary education puts a premium on action. Conventional education defines in academic terms learning; revolutionary education is essentially non-academic and sees learning opportunities on the farm, in the factory, and in the streets ... Book knowledge is decried ... non-academic activities dominate: non-academic qualifications like production records and ideological-political acceptability carry more weight in the evaluation of achievement."[31]

The dual objective to date has been to eradicate the influences of Chiang Ch'ing and her 'Gang', (said to have been the perpetrators of evil during the Cultural Revolution) and to establish a new educational order that will directly contribute to the nation's four Modernizations in agriculture, industry, military defence and science and technology.

References to Chapter 7

1. Witke, Roxanne — Comrade Chiang Ch'ing. p.472

2. Ibid. p.475

3. Ibid. p.477

4. Ibid. p.477

5. Pepper, Suzanne — Chinese Education after Mao : Two Steps Forward, Two Steps Back, and Begin Again? The China Quarterly No. 81,March 1980. p.4

6. Pepper, Suzanne — An interview on changes in Chinese Education after the Gang of Four. The China Quarterly No. 70, Dec.1977 p.820

7. Ibid. p.821

8. Ibid. p.823

9. Shirk, Susan — Educational Reform and Political Backlash Recent Changes in Chinese Educational Policy : Comparative Education Review June 1979 Vo. 23; No.2; p.189

10. Pepper, Suzanne — Education and Revolution. The Chinese Model Revized. Asian Survey Vol. 18 No. 9 Sept. 1978 p.875

11. Shirk, Susan — Op.Cit. p.190

12. Pepper, Suzanne — Chinese Education after Mao. China Quarterly No. 81 March 1980 p.1

13. Pepper, Suzanne — Education and Revolution Asian Survey Vol.18 No. 9 Sept. 1978 p.886

14. Prof. Gerald Read — Notes Made on his Chinese Tour in July 1980

15. Shirk , Susan — Comparative Education Review June 1979 Vol. 23 No. 2; pp. 191-205

16. Zachariah, M. — Massliners vs. Capitalist Roaders Comparative Education Review Feb. 1977 p.109

17. Ibid. p.108

18. Pepper, Suzanne — Chinese Education after Mao China Quarterly No. 81 March 1980 p.58

19. Shirk , Susan — Op.Cit. p.196

20. Ibid. p.199

21. Ibid. p.201

22. Ibid. p.202

23. Ibid. p.205

24. Price, R. — Education - Why a Reversal? China Since the Gang of Four B. Brugger (ed.) Croom Helm, London 1980 p.221

25. Ibid. p.222

26. Chan, Sylvia — The Blooming of a 'Hundred Flowers' China Since the Gang of Four Ed. B. Brugger p. 191

27. Price, R. Op.Cit. p.222

28. Chan, Sylvia Op.Cit. p.191

29. Chan, Sylvia Op.Cit. p.191

30. Price, R. Op.Cit. p.223

31. Logan, John J. China's Fifth Modernization : Education
Phi Delta Kappa Vol. 62 No. 4
Dec. 1980 p.271

CHAPTER 8

Conclusion

After 1917 and throughout the 1920s a broad range of educational reforms were implemented in Russia. The major motivation for the reforms was the need to replace the previous system with one that would produce men imbued with social collectivism and a positive attitude towards labour and technical skills.

Nadia K. Krupskaya produced a large body of pedagogical literature aimed at achieving these goals according to Marxist-Leninist ideology. One of the most important themes expressed by Krupskaya was that of polytechnical education. This meant that labour and schooling would be intimately related, but that what was being developed was not so much specialized vocational skills as a general positive attitude toward labour and a wide variety of manual and technical skills. Krupskaya convincingly demonstrated the relation of the class struggle to the resolution of problems in the organization and curricular content of schooling, the attitude of the working class toward the bourgeois school, and the struggle of the revolutionary labour movement for democratic school reforms.

In 1958, with Kruschev's renewed emphasis on polytechnical education, Krupskaya, the main theoretician of polytechnism, received renewed interest. In 1959 D. Korneychik[1] investigated Soviet writings to determine the position which Krupskaya held among Soviet educational historians and theorists. He concluded that her work served as a model for the application of the Marxist-Leninist dialectical materialism to the history of education and educational theory. He also concluded that she applied Lenin's theories to education and contributed much to the method and techniques of Marxist-Leninist research while introducing such important Soviet pedagogues to Communist ideology as S. Shatskin, P. Blonskii, N. Chekhov and others. Since Krupskaya influenced so many of the early Soviet educators, she may be considered dean of communist educators in the U.S.S.R. Her closeness to Lenin, as his wife and co-worker, and her work in the field of public education made her the most important Russian educational theorist after the Revolution until the change to an academic type of education evolved.

Krupskaya's writings continue to have a place of importance in Soviet practices today. Her influence is still great in educational di sions as a precedent for practice, and her principles are emphasized in teacher training methods and history books. An example of her educational influence today is illustrated in an article in the periodical 'Soviet Education'. The writer[2], a member of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, says that Krupskaya's ideals for the working people of the U.S.S.R. are being realized, and that her concept of polytechnical education is the determining factor in the achievement of social progress.

It appears, however, that the reality of the situation in the U.S.S.R. today is not in accord with the Marxist-oriented ideals of a classless society. Soviet sociologists have found that the Soviet educational system seems to have a dysfunctional effect on society, making for inequality amongst the students, despite the fact that polytechnical education is stressed at every stage.

From 1966 onwards, and over the next decade, even more radical educational reforms than in the U.S.S.R. were instituted in China. These reforms, with the peasant population in mind, aimed at altering the curriculum to emphasize politics, labour and military training, while the content of schooling was to be more closely related to work problems and situations. Although these reforms originated from Marxist ideology, they later became imbued with Mao Tse-Tung's particular brand of thought, which the Soviets believed contradicted their principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Chiang Ch'ing, later known as one of the 'Gang of Four', assisted Mao in the implementation of the new educational policies. Her greatest influence and power, however, was in the cultural sphere where she gained full censorial control over the arts. In that capacity she turned the performing arts into a vehicle for Mao's ideas. Using the slogan "destruction must precede construction" she banned all literature, art, drama, ballet, music and films which did not have a proletarian theme, while ordering the composition of new operas, ballets and musical works which demonstrated the rise of the working class. With her increasing activity as a censor and reshaper of China's cultural politics, she

emerged as a nationally recognized leader during the Cultural Revolution.

After Mao's death in 1976, Chiang Ch'ing was chosen, along with three other principal allies of Mao, to be the sacrificial victims in the latest ideological-line change within the party.[3] Mao, the originator of the educational reforms, was exonerated. A political campaign needed a focus and the 'Gang of Four' was used to serve this end. In no field does the campaign appear to have been more pervasive than in education, where it has meant in practice the demise of virtually every reform introduced during the Cultural Revolution decade, while re-introducing systematically pre-Cultural Revolution policies. In the arts, the cultural restoration has involved all fields. The recent revival of pre-Revolution operas, plays, films and music, as well as the development of new literary and art works has been spectacular. All vestiges of Chiang Ch'ing's influence have been eradicated.

Both Krupskaya and Chiang Ch'ing were raised in patriarchal societies, and both were married to prominent men, thus enabling them to come to the fore, and giving them the opportunity of putting their educational ideologies into practice. It is important to stress that their influence in this respect was significant. However, it is ironic that the ideas of the widowed Krupskaya have been maintained in Russia, while those of the widowed Chiang Ch'ing have been eliminated in China largely on grounds of political expediency.

References to Chapter 8

1. Zepper, J. A Study of N.K. Krupskaya's educational philosophy. p.12

2. Dumchenko, N. Soviet Education February, 1981 p.77

3. Fraser, J. The Chinese : Portrait of a People Fontana, Collins 1980 p.53

Selected Bibliography

Books

Bereday, George, Brickman, W. & Read G. (Eds.) — The Changing Soviet School, Boston, 1960

Brugger, Bill (Ed.) — China Since the 'Gang of Four', Croom Helm, London, 1980.

Counts, George — Kruschev and the Central Committee Speak on Education, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1965.

Cramer, J. & Browne, G. — Contemporary Education, Harcourt, Brace & World Inc. 1965.

Elegant, Robert S. — Mao's Great Revolution, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1971

Fitzpatrick, Sheila — The Commissariat of Enlightenment, Cambridge University Press 1970

Fraser, John — The Chinese : Portrait of a People, Fontana/Collins. 1980

Grant, Nigel — Soviet Education, Penguin Books 1971

Hawkins, John — Mao Tse Tung and Education, Linnet Books, Connecticut, 1974

Hinton, Harold — An Introduction to Chinese Politics, Redwood Press Ltd. Great Britain, 1973.

Karnow, Stanley — Mao and China
MacMillan, 1972

Klein, Margrete — The Challenge of Communist Education
Columbia University Press, 1980

Mao Tse Tung — Five Essays on Philosophy
Foreign Language Press, Peking 1977

Pond, Elizabeth — Russia Perceived : A Trans-Siberian Journey
Victor Gollanz Ltd. London, 1981

Price, Ronald — Marx and Education in Russia and China
Croom Helm, London 1977

Rice, Edward E. — Mao's Way
University of California Press, 1972

Van Ginnekan, Jaap — The Rise and Fall of Lin Piao
Penguin Books 1976

Witke, Roxane — Comrade Chiang Ch'ing
Little, Brown & Co. Boston, Toronto 1977

Wolf, M. & Witke, R. — Women in Chinese Society
Stanford University Press, 1975

Zajda, Joseph — Education in the U.S.S.R.
Pergamon Press, 1980

Unpublished Material

Zepper, J.T. — A Study of N.K. Krupskaya's Educational Philosophy
University of Missouri, 1960
Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation

Periodicals

Boitier, A. — The Kruschev School Reform
Comparative Education Review February 1959

Cogan, John, J. — China's Fifth Modernization : Education
Phi Delta Kappa Vol 62 No. 4 Dec. 1980

Dumchenko, N. — Realization of Lenin's ideas on vocational and technical education
Soviet Education February, 1981

Goncharov, L. and Kunetskaya, L. — Nadezhda K. Krupskaya : Founder of Soviet Public Education
School and Society April 1971
Vo. 99 No. 2333 (p.235 - 237)

Klarin, V. — Lenin and Krupskaya in the struggle for Public Education
Soviet Education October, 1970

Klepikov, V.Z. — The Fate of Public Education in China
Chinese Education Vol. 1 Part 4
(pp 37 - 49) Winter 1968/9

Krupskaya, N.K. — Communist Academy Aid to the Society of Marxist-Educators in Putting into Effect the C.C. Decision on the Primary and Secondary Schools
Soviet Education Vol 1 No.7 May 1959

Munro, Robin — Settling Accounts with the Cultural Revolution at Beijing University 1977-8
The China Quarterly No. 82 June 1980

Pepper Suzanne — An Interview on Changes in Chinese Education after the Gang of Four
The China Quarterly No. 70 Dec. 1977

Pepper, Suzanne — Education and Revolution : The 'Chinese Model Revised'
Asian Survey Vol. 18 No. 9 Sept. 1978

Pepper, Suzanne — Two Steps Forward, two steps back, and begin again?
China Quarterly No. 81 March, 1980

Read, Gerald — The Akademgorodok of Novosibirsk
Intellect Vol 101 No. 2343 Oct. 1972

Schlesinger, Ina — Soviet Educational Change
School and Society Vol.100 January, 1972

Seybolt, Peter J. — The Yenan Revolution in Mass Education
China Quarterly No. 48 Oct-Dec. 1971

Shirk, Susan — Educational Reform and Political Backlash : Recent Changes in Chinese Educational Policy.
Comparative Education Review
Vol. 23 No. 2 June 1979

Smirnov, A.A. — Science session devoted to the 90th Anniversary of N.K. Krupskaya's birthday.
Soveit Education June, 1959

Sokolova, M.A. — The Content, Aims and Research Methods of Comparative Pedagogy
Soviet Education Vol XXI No. 7 - 8
May - June, 1979

Theses of the Cultural Committee of the Communist Party and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. The State Publishing House of Political Literature, Moscow, 1958.

Whyte, Martin K. — Educational reform : China in the 1970s and Russia in the 1920s. Comparative Educational Review Feb. 1974

Zachariah, M. — Massliners vs. Capitalist Roaders. Comparative Education Review Feb. 1979

Zajda, Joseph — Education and Social Stratification in the Soviet Union. Comparative Education Review Vol. 16 No. 1 March, 1980

Zepper, John T. — N.K. Krupskaya on complex themes in Soviet Education. Comparative Education Review Feb. 1965

Zikeyev, N.V. — N.K. Krupskaya's work on the book 'Public Education and Democracy'. Soviet Education Vol 1. May 1959

Author Rootenberg S E
Name of thesis The Two Widows: a comparison of the educational influence of Krupskaya, wife of Lenin and Chiang Chiing, wife of Mao 1982

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.