



**Artur Aleksiejuk**

The Christian Theological Academy in Warsaw, Poland

ORCID 0000-0002-5827-6048

## **Slavophiles-Westernizers discourse on education in the mid-nineteenth century – introduction to the research and mapping the research field**

**Słowianofilsko-okcydentalistyczny dyskurs o wychowaniu w połowie  
dziewiętnastego wieku – wstęp do badań i mapowanie  
pola badawczego**

**Abstract:** A necessary step in pedagogical research is the mapping of the field research activity, i.e. drawing a map of the directions of development of pedagogical thought and their characteristics, as well as ordering events and initiatives of educational practice. due to the fact that the vast majority of contemporary pedagogical phenomena have their historical antecedents, an analysis of the current educational reality, from which depends on forecasting and designing actions for the future, can not do without indications of their sources, genesis and factors, which had an impact on their course. Such actions are all the more necessary when it concerns little directions, phenomena and facts, and even completely unknown ones, whose reception still has an impact on theory and practice of education. which have an impact on their course. Such actions are all the more necessary when it concerns small directions, phenomena and facts, and even completely unknown ones, whose reception still has an impact on theory and practice of education. Such a little-known area of research as Poland despite its geographical proximity, is not currently the object of detailed pedagogical explorations, in comparison to Russian pedagogy. The main aim of the article is to draw attention to the important dimension of such studies. In the light of the conducted explorations, it will be possible to understand, what ideas and their pedagogical

implementations have an impact on the formation of maps of mental values of modern Russians. This is extremely important, especially in the context of the current war in Ukraine, which is one of the elements of the implementation of what is known as the Russian world (Russian: "*Russkij mir*"). The subject of research mapping will be the Slavophile-Westernizers ideological discourse in Russia in the mid-nineteenth century and the exploration of the possibilities of its philosophical-pedagogical reconstruction. Admirers of education in the spirit of the Russian world in justifications for their educational proposals often refer to the views of the its main participants. Among them, Slavophiles should be mentioned such as Ivan Kireyevsky and Alexei Khomyakov, as well as representatives of the pro-Western school: Peter Chaadaev, Vissarion Belinsky, Alexander Herzen, Nikolai Chernyshevsky and Nikolai Dobrolyubov. The article will pose research questions, specific goals of exploration and methodology, the core of which is pedagogical hermeneutics and biographies. The article is part of a research project carried out by the author in the Christian Theological Academy in Warsaw.

**Keywords:** slavophilic pedagogy, westernizers pedagogy, history of education in Russia, Russian pedagogy of the nineteenth century.

## Introduction

Studies of the history of pedagogical thought clearly show that each generation develops certain resources of knowledge about upbringing, which are present in theory and practice (Nowak, 2008, pp. 5-6). This is because upbringing, as a process formation of human personality, is an inseparable component of the social form of life and Development. According to Krzysztof Konarzewski, a scientific reflection on education can be carried out in two ways, namely as a fact and as a task. An inseparable element of such an approach is to look at different epochs historical and social history, as well as the assumption that the set of educational practices are "spatially diverse and historically variable" (Konarzewski, 1987, pp. 5-6). Analyses that refer to facts focus mainly on the practical issues. If, on the other hand, we consider education as a task to be performed, then we must focus more on the description and the plan of action, of course taking into account the costs to be incurred for planned activities (Konarzewski, 1987, p. 6). The task-oriented understanding of education requires the researcher to understand both the educational present, as well as knowledge of its past (Majorek, 2002, pp. 51-53).

History always makes sense today because it is written by modern people. Human thinking and acting, however, is not only determined by the present, but also by past. This is also true about literature on education (van der Dunk, 1982, p. 7; Majorek, 2002, p. 47). An analysis of contemporary educational reality, i.e. forecasting and designing actions for the future cannot therefore be dispensed with -without "a narrative about the past (events, states, facts, phenomena, processes, etc.) conditions, effects, relationships, etc.) (Hejnicka-Bezwińska, 2006, p. 23). Even if it refers to common knowledge, it can be a source of extremely valuable conclusions, both theoretical and practical (Maruszewski, 1986; Holowka, 1986; Trzebiński, 1992; Leppert, 1996). As Czesław Majorek notes, "many historically well-established patterns of practical behaviour should still be cultivated" (2002, p. 52). both theoretical and practical (Maruszewski, 1986; Holowka, 1986; Trzebiński, 1992; Leppert, 1996). This has already been stated by Sergius Hessen, according to whom historical cognition, and thus also historical-pedagogical cognition, should be "the apprehension of absent things by reason as if they were present," that is, in is not a direct participant in the events which are the subject of his research (Hessen, 1931, p. 297). It can, however, "grasp" the past by undertaking an intellectual-cognitive effort, which aims to discover its connections to the present (Marrou, 2011, p. 51). The primary object of interest of the historian are the so-called facts. Some of them relate to the reality that direct investigator participation is not possible.

Facts about the past, the cultural content of which the historian must reconstruct and build in their relationship with each other, cannot be the subject of direct observation. He has at his disposal only "monuments", i.e. material signs (...) of which he should derive their cultural content, the meaning of the cultural achievements are given material remains and testimonies (Hessen, 1931, p. 297).

The view that historical facts exist as elements of consciousness scientific expertise of the researcher, is often confronted with an approach that recognises that they can be only those facts which can be regarded as elements of objective social life (Marrou, 2011, p. 49). While a comparative analysis of the two approaches goes beyond the subject matter of this paper, it is worth noting that the values presented by them cognitive, widely described in the literature on the subject, are of significant importance from the perspective of research conducted in this study. A peculiar synergy of these approaches, in a special way valuable in the field of historical-pedagogical research, is the approach signalled by the Sergei Hessen. While a comparative analysis of

the two approaches goes beyond the subject matter of the deliberations, it is worth noting that the cognitive values presented by them widely described in the literature on the subject are of significant importance from the perspective of research conducted in this study. A peculiar synergy of these approaches, in a special way valuable in the field of historical-pedagogical research, is the approach signalled by the Sergei Hessen. In his book "Fundamentals of Pedagogy" the Łódź pedagogue wrote:

Individuality is the proper object of historical knowledge. (...) The Concept of individuality is broader than what is usually meant by individuality. An individual can be not only a human being, (...) but also an event (...) and a geographical location (...), the average type of man (...), class (...) and party (...). It is possible thanks to the individual principle to which it strives and of which it is a specific symptom (Hessen, 1931, p. s. 287).

The Hessenian understanding of historical cognition allows us to understand that in reflection on the pedagogical heritage of the past, it is very important to concentrate on the cognitive of the individual character of facts/phenomena. In this way, thanks to guaranteeing their connection to the present, in particular with regard to the implications of the conclusions, it makes sense to keep track of them. What makes these phenomena "individual", i.e. "irreplaceable units in their valuable specificity", are "a timeless values" by which they are rooted in a culture understood as "whole timeless tasks of humanity" (Hessen, 1931, p. 288). The values in question, without time and place are invariably valid although they manifest themselves in new times, places and conditions through new forms and means of expression. It will not therefore be a question of treating the facts in an idiographic manner that is historically pedagogical and pedagogical like "bricks in the wall", but about extracting the value that gives them "the mark of uniqueness in its kind" (Hessen, 1931, pp. 286-287). The fundamental asset of facts created by man and/or altered by him depends significantly on the non-perfunctory, but unconditional, educational value" (Hessen, 1931, p. 287), that being the freedom of man as a person. Its status is due to the fact that that it is constituted in the "super-individual principle to which it strives and which it is a peculiar symptom" (Hessen, 1931, p. 287). This principle is human nature, the integral part of which is the element is free will, which is the natural force that makes possible the realization of what is nature and encompassing all its essential properties. Thanks to it, "it is possible that the individual can be irreplaceable in his value" (Hessen, 1931, p. 287), because he is representative of human

nature (Boethius, 1847, col. 1343C). The concept of freedom as “inalienable quality of human nature” is central to the analysis of human existence and life (Berlin, 1991, p. 187). In searching the essence of the facts, it is therefore impossible to ignore the reflection on man, because the manifestation of natural free will is personal freedom, expressed in thoughts, words and deeds of man, that is, the elements by which its formation is carried out his person. Education is always an influence on man’s free will and freedom. Discovering the truth about the human person, his way of being and fulfillment, is a fundamental a constitutive element of the upbringing of the “man in man” as an ontologically free creature (Pirogov 1914, p. 87; Tarnowski, 1993). A man who is not free is not truly himself. That is why autonomy in pedagogy is treated as the goal of education, understood as “assistance and dialogue between equal parties, the right of free choice, self-directed learning, developing a strong and mature personality by leaving complete freedom A man who is not free is not truly free. That is why autonomy in pedagogy is treated as the goal of education, understood as “assistance and dialogue between equal parties, the right of free choice, self-directed learning, developing a strong and mature personality by leaving complete freedom limited only by the freedom of others, the development of a sense of value, the awakening of feelings of understanding of freedom and integrity of other people, a sense of self-confidence and safety, the ability to interact with others” (Jezierska, 2003, p. 246).

In the light of the foregoing considerations, it is quite understandable why historical research in the field of pedagogical sciences are extremely attractive and interesting scientific and research undertakings. This is because they make it possible to identify these universal values that have always been important to man, have determined his actions, thoughts, feelings, material and spiritual creativity, both in the individual and in the social and civilisational level. In this way, they foster a fuller understanding of human being as a subject of education. Without a doubt, freedom is such a value, because where there is freedom, so there is education (Sztobryn, 2009). In this sense, mapping of research fields in order to find “islands of resistance” – an asylum of freedom in the space of education and discourse (Śliwerski, 2008, pp. 19-24) takes on an essential role. In terms of contemporary historical-pedagogical notions, research is served by ideas of education, pedagogical doctrines/ideologies of education and discourse analysis in a specific place and time (Hejnicka-Bezwińska, 2006, pp. 21-22). Russia was in such a place and epoch in the middle of the nineteenth century, and the discourse was an ideological dispute between Slavophiles and Westernizers, within which

parties were formed in pedagogical disputes. These were peculiar “islands of resistance” to the state ideology of the so-called “the Triad”<sup>1</sup> and therefore, their analysis, not only in the context of the ideology of the Russian world, but in any oppressive context, is of such importance.

### **Significance and problems of research**

According to Grzegorz Żuk, there are moments in history when reminding readers of values is extremely necessary due to serious socio-cultural crises (2016, p. 7). It's hard to disagree with this statement. The current period in the history of Europe, in particular the region, which has been called the middle-eastern, is in an extremely difficult period. The events of recent years, and above all, Russia's aggression in Ukraine in February 2022, compels the reader to prompt reflections for the reasons of this state of affairs. Searching for answers to questions about the motives behind the decisions taken by the authorities of the Russian Federation, can be carried out at many levels. One of them, which is currently enjoying great interest, is from the geostrategic perspective. Its important element, in connection with the geographical location of Russia, is a multi-aspect analysis of the conditions of its historical and cultural development which has influenced the formation of the modern mental maps of the power elites over there.

In the last two decades, an important component of victory in the fight against the West is to expand its sphere of cultural influence. According to Aleksander Dugin –the main ideologist of Russian neo-imperialism and neo-Eurasianism - Russia is a country that remains faithful to traditional Christian values and values vision of its society as a community in which spiritual values take precedence. In turn, the West is an organism in the process of advanced social and moral decay, where moral relativism, egoism, extreme individualism, consumerism and laxism prevails. In his opinion, Russia is carrying out an historical mission entrusted to it by Divine Providence. It consists of the promotion and implementation of a civilization model that is a response to disintegration coming from the West (Składanowski, 2020). This vision requires implementation and consolidation of all native national-patriotic forces around one idea, which is the so-called Russian world and pedagogy of the spirit of Russian society.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Triad «Orthodoxy, tsarist autocracy, nationality» (Russian: *pravoslaviie-samoderżavie-narodnost'*) – the official ideological-state doctrine, was formulated in 1833 by the Minister of Education, Sergei Uvarov (1786-1855).

What is Russian world (Russian: “*Russkij mir*”)? Currently, there is no need to explain the meaning this ideology in detail. It is enough to mention that in Russian social and political thought, this category has a rich past. Its sources should be sought in the idea of “Holy Russia” and “Moscow-Third Rome”, which over time evolved into the Russian version of Pan-Slavism – a vision of the unification of all Slavic nations. In contemporary socio-political discourse, the term “*Russkij mir*” appeared in 2005 as the name of a project aimed at creating an eastern Slavic civilizational pole consolidated around Russia as an alternative to the integration into Western civilization and the popularization of the broadly understood concept of the Russian cultural heritage by supporting scientific activities and conducting educational activities. Although in the concept of Russian Mir, the words “*Russkij*” should not be identified with “Russian”, but in practice the activities of the community are concentrated not so much on promoting an alternative but a confrontational vision viz. the Western worldview. Not only the heritage of the history and culture of Russia is used instrumentally for this purpose but also of other Slavic nations.

Without a doubt, the system of education in the spirit of the Russian world has a structured character and has all the essential aspects of the educational process: support, correcting, preventing and shaping. In modern Russia, state education is, as in the tsarist and Soviet times, an essential component of social engineering. Cadet schools – elite military schools – are exemplary examples of secondary schools, in which future officers of the Russian army and employees of the Russian civil service are trained. (Jastrzębski, 2012; Boy, 2022; Sydorenko, 2022). Although the upbringing of Russian society, in the spirit of the Russian world, is now benefiting from a favourable political situation, its promoters, at least for the sake of appearances, must expect criticism within the context the concept, especially if it is supported by insightful source research. One of the ways to deal with the ideology of the Russian world in the field of education is to undertake reliable historical-pedagogical research, which will focus on the analysis of ideological discourses to which its admirers refer. Such an area is the analysis and reconstruction of the Slavophile-Westernizer discourse in Russia in the mid-nineteenth century. Proponents of education in the spirit of the Russian world in justifying for their proposals often fall back to the classics of Slavophilic thought. To prove their point, they do not shun the reflections of the Westernizers, also known in Russian as “*zapadniki*”, i.e. “the people of the West” (Russian: “*Zapad*” = “the West”). Therefore, recognizing themes, values and dimensions of this dispute, which has as yet unexplored pedagogical

references. it is of great importance not only in Russian but also in European pedagogical thought. Therefore, recognizing themes, values and dimensions of this dispute, which has as yet unexplored pedagogical references, they are of great importance not only in Russian but also in European pedagogical reflections. It can be argued that it is precisely from the polemical discourse of Westernizer and Slavophilic meta-pedagogy that the pedagogy emerged of Leo Tolstoy, Nikolai Pirogov and Konstantin Ushinsky, who is considered the father of scientific pedagogy in Russia.

The importance of figures such as Tolstoy, Pirogov and Ushinsky in the development of the pedagogical humanistic reflections is not up for debate. Their views and activities were not only – to use Bogusław Śliwowski's term – a kind of "islands of resistance" to the official pedagogy of the state, but expressed the necessity of moving from pedagogical abstractions to practice. Their theoretical considerations and proposals for specific changes in educational practice emphasize the importance of the category of freedom in education. It turns out that many valuable thoughts and proposals in this regard can also be found in the work of thinkers who Although they were not strictly engaged in pedagogical activity, they were nevertheless concerned with the issues of education and upbringing. Among them, Slavophiles should be mentioned such as Ivan Kireyevsky and Alexei Khomyakov, as well as representatives of the pro-Western option: Peter Chaadaev, Vissarion Belinsky, Alexander Herzen, Nikolai Chernyshevsky and Nikolai Dobrolyubov. Only the latter was a pedagogue by education. Their lives and work were marked by a constant effort to recognize the current needs of Russian society, concern for its development and a better future. In evaluating their achievements and development, opportunities often came from opposing conclusions, especially when compared to the Western European heritage and civilisation. They agreed, however, that a constitutive condition for the development of social and individual evolution is the freedom and subjectivity of every human being. Therefore a kind of magnetic needle in the test field of a mapping compass is the category of freedom, which was the central theme of the epoch and thus the object of their pedagogical concerns.

Their views, at the time in which they were written, could not be expressed in a way that due to the ruthless censorship, the real threat of arrest and even exile to the Siberia existed. The narrative of freedom in the context of upbringing was scattered in their texts, which they managed to publish in spite of everything. This became possible because it was deeply hidden in the maze of philosophical considerations, literary criticism analyses, considerations of aesthetic problems, as well as in letters and memoirs



dealing with the problems of everyday life. The authors often used mental shortcuts, metaphorical and symbolic language, and even intelligent ironies that seemed to be commendable, which made it difficult to read their assessment of Russian reality by tsarist censors. It is possible that the difficulty of initiating studies of the work of these thinkers by contemporary historians of thought resulted for the reasons mentioned above. In addition to identifying, describing and analysing the understanding of the category of freedom in pedagogies Slavophilic and Westernizer studies are also an opportunity to look at their understanding of the categories of individual, social, national and social subjectivity and identity and their importance for educational formation. This all constitutes a rich material for a critical analysis of the pedagogy of the Russian world, as well as the “island of resistance” of resistance to ideologization of Slavophile and Westernizer reflections in their classical approach. Worth At this point, it should be emphasized that this discourse should be seen primarily as a dispute between two historical worldviews, and therefore characterized by an openness and freedom in the exchange of ideas, while at the same time being actively involved in the visions with the strongest possible argumentations. It could not have been otherwise, because, as Sergei Hessen wrote:

A worldview is an awareness of oneself, a feeling of the foundations of one's own being. It lies in the personal and historical existence of man, in the type of his personality and historical specificity of the situation in which a person lives. It is the root that binds man's consciousness to his ontological basis. (...) The deepest principle of education is a view of the world that does not detach itself from life and shut down, but is always ready to overcome itself. For this reason, overcoming such a worldview is about a duty to the world by all true educational action (Hessen, 1997, pp. 53, 57).

It should be emphasized that Slavophiles and Westernizers, emphasizing the issue of freedom have made it clear that their pedagogies are built on their foundations of worldviews, and are not ideological. The goals of education formulated by them were not the implementation of a strategy ‘mining’. It can therefore be assumed that both are interested in such a personality-forming upbringing that makes the individual more mature and free and open to inspirations emanating from as many sources of knowledge as possible. Emphasizing these qualities, both in the face of ideological oppression of the Russian world and the equally oppressive aversion to Russia, and Russians in general, is very much needed today.

### **Chronological framework and the state of research**

Defining the time frame is an important step in the historical-pedagogical mapping of exploration. Firstly, they should encompass space-time, which is a kind of terra incognita or is relatively little examined. Both the issues of research and the development of Russian pedagogical thought in a period of interest to the researcher, putting to one side Russian history in the so-called Nikolaev era (the years of the reign of Nicholas I, 1825-1855), was not so far as Poland is concerned a subject of detailed historical-pedagogical analyses. By no means, however, are the lives and works of the persons whose views on education completely unknown in Poland. Knowledge of Russian thought and the philosophical and social aspects of this period is known due above all to the work done by Andrzej Walicki (1959\_1, 1959\_2; 1961; 1962; 1964/2002; 1973; 1995).

Among the researchers dealing with Russian philosophy and philosophical culture of this period, it is also necessary to mention Adam Bezwiński, Andrzej de Lazari, Łucjan Suchanek, Janusz Dobieszewski, Grzegorz Przebinda and Jacek Uglik. None of the above-mentioned researchers, apart from Walicki, who in several places mentioned when referring to upbringing when analyzing Russian social thought in the middle of the nineteenth century referred to the views of Slavophiles and Westernizers from the perspective of pedagogical content contained therein.

In the Polish literature on the history of education, a brief description of selected views of thinkers include, above all, monumental studies by Stefan Wołoszyn and Łukasz Kurdybacha. The first mentioned author devotes relatively little to them in the agapite paragraph of the text (Wołoszyn, 1964, pp. pp. 304-305), and in the work entitled „History of Education” edited by Łukasz Kurdybacha, their author is the Soviet historian Nikolai Goncharov (1967). In studies by Stefan Możdżeń, Jan Draus and Ryszard Terlecki, Krystyna Bartnicka and Irena Szybiak, Mirosław Krajewski, as well as Stanisław Kot - the doyen of Polish historical and pedagogical thought - information about Russian pedagogical thought in the period under study, they are also very scarce or non-existent. Most of their works, due to interpretations of their views in the light of communist ideology, were translated into Polish and were published in PWN series “Library of The Classics of Philosophy”. In the context of education, most attention was paid to Alexander Herzen’s views (Shabayeva, 1952; Łubnicki, 1954). In textbooks on the history of education, the Slavophiles (Kirieevsky, Khomiakov) are not mentioned at all. It should therefore be considered that a reflection on upbringing, which was one of the aspects of the ideological dispute that had great importance

for intellectual life in the mid-19th century is in Polish discourse practically unknown in historical and pedagogical contexts. Only recently have they been published in works devoted to the pedagogical reflections of Slavophiles and Westernizers written by this researcher (Aleksiejuk, 2022a; Aleksiejuk, 2022b; Aleksiejuk, 2021, Aleksiejuk, 2020; Aleksiejuk, 2019).

The situation is slightly better, although very unsatisfactory -in research by Russian academics. Based on a review of extensive literature on history of pedagogy in Russia, it is surprising to say that in the period of the reign of Nicholas I, little has been written. Detailed research and analysis of Russophone publications, including tracking current research, leads to these important conclusions:

1. Mostly Russian researchers of education only notice the achievements of Western thinkers and define them (following the example of Soviet researchers) as representatives of the revolutionary democratic direction in Russian pedagogy of the nineteenth century;
2. Historians of education in Russia have not yet conducted in-depth research, which would be devoted to the views of Slavophiles on upbringing, although their names appear in some academic textbooks in chapters discussing trends in the development of pedagogical thought in the mid- nineteenth century;
3. Failure to take into account the importance of the Westernizer-Slavophile ideological dispute for the development of Russian thought on education makes it difficult to understand values, development contexts and interpretation of views and pedagogic activities of Leo Tolstoy, Nikolai Pirogov, Konstantin Ushinsky and his successors.

It follows from the above that the Slavophile thread is omitted in Russian pedagogical historiography constitutes a serious gap. That's why you should be surprised by the fact that this issue has not been addressed either from a philosophical or pedagogical point of view. Vide: Boris Bim-Bad, Bronislavas Bitinas, Igor Borzenko, Boris Gershunski, Eduard Gusinski, Anna Kudishin, Valery Kuvakin, Tamara Sergeeva, Yulia Turchaninova, Andrei Zhelobov) nor paradigmatic-pedagogical perspective such as Shalva Amonashvili, Larisa Baikova, Mikhail Boguslavsky, Evgenija Bondarevska, Irina Fomicheva, Oleg Gazman, Eduard Gusinsky, Irina Kolesnikova, Grigory Kornetov, Valentin Pilipowsky, Oleg Prikot, Zakhar Ravkin, Yevgeny Shiyanov, Vitaly Slastionin. These authors are silent on this subject in publications on the humanization of education in Russia (Larissa Baikova, Mikhail Berulava, Aleksandra Gavrlina, Nadezhda Guseva, Lydia Kulikova,

Valery Lezhnikov, Vyacheslav Meyder, Yevgeny Shiyanov, Vitaly Slaktionin), the pedagogy of cooperation (Szalva Amonasvili, Evgeny Ilyin, Igor Ivanov, Vladimir Karakovsky, Sofia Lysenkova, Viktor Shatalov, Mikhail Shchetin, Igor Volkov), the pedagogy of dialogue (Vladimir Bibler, Valentina Gorshkova, Sergei Kurganov), the pedagogy of peace (Antuanetta Kozlova, Vladimir Maralov, Vyacheslav Sitarov), the pedagogy of individuality (Oleg Grebenyuk, Tatiana Grebieniuk, Tatiana Shershniova). Even modern researchers dealing with history of pedagogy in Russia before 1917, including for example Vladimir Blinov, Elena Voroshilova, Olga Pimenova, as well as Grigory Kornetov, only provide general knowledge on the subject. The paucity of research in this respect makes the views of representatives of this trend an object of overinterpretation/manipulation, Especially in the ideological narratives of the pedagogy of the Russian world. In addition, the research ought to make a significant contribution to historical and comparative analyses; that is Russian and Polish pedagogical reflections in the period under study, in particular the philosophy of Bronisław Trentowski.

In the context of the justification for the adoption of a timeframe covering the Nikolaev period it is worth emphasizing that the years with which we close the period under consideration carried out in this work, it has a symbolic meaning. The first uprising of the Decembrists, which was the first uprising of freedom in Russia in nineteenth century in 1825 broke out in St. Petersburg. At the root of the rebellion against the authoritarian rule of the Tsar was a belief in ideals of humanism.

They brought with them a completely new semantic system of words such as freedom (Russian: *svoboda/volâ*), citizen (Russian: *obyvatel'/graždanin*), law, homeland, state. Their propagators were representatives of the nobility, called the Decembrists, that is after December 14, 1825. The ideas they proclaimed were the basis for the actions aimed at the transformation of values and the realization of the idea of progress. The Decembrists honored the ideas they had learned in word and deed (Abassy, 2013, p. 370).

The suppression of the uprising by Nicholas I, was a clear warning to all those who demanded progressive social reforms and a new political system in Russia. Repressions after the fall of the uprising also affected education: censorship was introduced. All student associations were banned. Freedom of research was radically reduced. Schools and universities implemented strict rules on disciplinary provisions, covering both pupils and students as well as teachers/lecturers.

The year 1855 also has a symbolic meaning. In that year, the main work of Alexei Khomyakov on education entitled „On education of social society in Russia” was published, and in the periodical “Maritime Almanac” an article entitled “Issues of Life” by Nikolai Pirogov was accepted for publication dedicated to the education of young people. At the same time, Nikolai Dobrolyubov wrote an article called “On the Importance of Authority in Education”, in which he sharply criticized the authoritarian education system in Russia and the use of corporal punishment. At the Institute of Orphans in Gatchina near St. Petersburg, Konstantin Ushinsky began his first significant article called “On the Benefits of Pedagogical Literature”, in which he analysed the notes of the former director of the Library<sup>2</sup>. A year later, he wrote the text „On the roots of public education.” However, both works saw the light of life as late as 1857. They were published in the journal “Žurnal dlâ Vospitaniâ (Journal of Upbringing)” in which Ushinsky worked closely. The year 1855 therefore seems groundbreaking by all standards. It can be assumed that it marks the symbolic end of abstract humanism and the beginning of practical humanism in Russian pedagogy.

The changes that took place in Russian education in the second half of the nineteenth century could not however, exist without the revaluations that have taken place in the space of social life in Russia after its defeat in the Crimean War (1853-1856). After the death of Tsar Nicholas I in March 1855, his successor, Alexander II, accepted the proposals for peace presented to him in December of the same year. In Russia, the time of analysing the causes of the defeat began with the post-Nikolai “thaw”, which exposed all the weaknesses of the tsarist empire as a authoritarian and civilisationally backward state. The shock of losing the war was so enormous, that on an unprecedented scale in Russia, it caused a wave of widespread social dissatisfaction. The new tsar was faced with the necessity of carrying out social reforms and most importantly was the enfranchisement reform of 1861. The atmosphere in the late 1850s, due to the lowering of censorship restrictions, made it possible for many to express their views openly. In the following years, a number of important publications proclaimed the necessity of changes in

---

<sup>2</sup> The journal “Žurnal dla Vospitania” (“Journal of Upbringing”) was one of the first Russian pedagogical and pedagogical journals. The newspaper was published in St. Petersburg between 1857 and 1859. Later, the name of the journal was changed to “Vospitanie” (1860-1863), and then “Žurnal dla Roditelej i Nastavnikov (Journal for Parents and Teachers)” (1864-1865). Overall twelve issues of the journal “Žurnal dlâ Vospitaniâ” were published.

education. They were deeply rooted in the Slavophile-Westernizer debate on upbringing, conducted in the first half of the nineteenth century

To determine the chronological framework of research undertaken for the years 1825-1855 still requires one important addition. Source research has shown that there is a convergence of topics observations by Alexander Radishchev – one of the most important thinkers during the decline of the Enlightenment in Russia. Radishchev is an iconic figure of the Decembrists and Raznochyns<sup>3</sup>, a writer and philosopher who, in his literary works and articles on social issues, devoted a lot of place for education and freedom as the fundamental category of civic formation. Words from his “Letter to the dearest friend A.M.K.” (Radiszczew, 1954, pp. 5-6) were considered by Nikolai Berdyaev to be an act of the birth of the Russian intelligentsia (Berdyaev, 1987, p. 40), and his novel “Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow”, although forbidden by censorship, circulated in hundreds of copies. The memory of Radishchev, who remained faithful to his ideals until his death, was nurtured among of the Russian progressive intelligentsia of the 1920s and 1930s, from whom the Westernizers and Slavophiles emerged. In this sense, references to his work, and in particular to his reflections on education and freedom, is of vital importance for the analyses carried out and to omit it would be a serious oversight.

### Database for research

Mapping for a research field should be preceded by a detailed query of sources understood as recorded and preserved for traces of thoughts, actions, human life and his or her environment which make it possible to reconstruct these manifestations of social life of the past. Sources used in the work, on the basis of which the study will be carried out will be a reconstruction of the Slavophile-Westernizers discourse on education in the mid-nineteenth century. In each of the selected groups there is data on life, work, views and their inspiration and the fate of the people concerned. In terms of quality, especially when it comes to studies, they are quite varied. Scientific integrity however, is required by getting to know them as well. In the absence of studies of the views of the pedagogical thinkers of the Slavophile school, and the clear ideological “contamination” by the Soviet pedagogues of the

---

<sup>3</sup> Raznochyns (representatives of various classes)– representatives of the Russian intelligentsia in the mid-nineteenth century, coming from various estates (Russian: “iz raznyh činov”), i.e. from impoverished or declassed nobility, bourgeoisie, lower officials, clergy, as well as peasants.

Westernizers school, from the perspective of the conducted analyses, the most important were personal materials, i.e. autobiographies, memoirs, letters, and above all, publications of the above mentioned writers. These materials have mostly been digitalized and are available in the open access formula, which significantly facilitates the familiarisation of analysis of them. However, this applies mainly to Russian-language works. In particular, in addition to the collected works, anthologies of their works on pedagogical topics deserve attention, which were published as part of the publishing series of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the USSR entitled "The Pedagogical Library" ("Pedagogičeskââ biblioteka"). It is also worth mentioning anthologies: "The hrestomatiâ of the history of schools and pedagogy in Russia" (Egorov, 1986), "The anthology of pedagogical educational thought in Russia in the first half of the nineteenth century (until the reforms of the 1960s)" (Lebedev, 1987), "History of pedagogy in Russia: hrestomatiâ" (Egorov, 1999).

In Poland, starting from the mid-1950s, but before 1989, texts were published by thinkers with views that were thought to promote the ideas of socialism. In the series "Library of Classics of Philosophy" (PWN) for example, philosophical writings" were published by Belinsky (1956), Herzen (1965, 1966), Chernyshevsky (1961) and Dobrolyubov (1958), as well as "The Anthropological Principle" in Chernyshevsky's Philosophy (Chernyshevsky, 1956). Also noteworthy are his texts in the field of aesthetics and historical journalism (Chernyshevsky). Between 1952 and 1969 they published very valuable perspectives of biographical research, a five-volume "Things Past and Meditations" (1952-1969) by Alexander Herzen. In addition, a number of smaller brochures have been published on of these writers. In the context of the conducted research, it is also necessary not to ignore their literary works, especially Chernyshevsky's novel "What to do?" (1951) and "Short stories" by Herzen (1951, 1952). After 1989, there were no reprints of the above and there have been no new translations of other texts by them. The same pertains to representatives of Slavophilia. In addition to excerpts from their writings, anthologies from the scope of Russian social thought edited by Andrzej Walicki (Walicki, 1961), only a few complete translations have been published, such as "On the Character of the Enlightenment of Europe" and his attitude to the Enlightenment of Russia by Ivan Kireyevsky (1998) and "On social education in Russia" by Alexei Khomyakov (2022).

A second very important source of research in this work were the so-called foreign materials, and works describing the lives and activities of the writers we are concerned with. The vast majority of them are Russian-language sources. They include memoirs, diaries and diaries of people

in close or distant relationships with them, not always as well as elaboration. They include memoirs, diaries and reminiscences of people in close or distant relationships with them, not always friendly as well as elaborations. These also include items constituting peculiar “testimonies of the epoch” that described Russia in the mid-nineteenth century, such as “Letters from Russia” by Astolphe Marquis de Custine (2021), as well as other memoirs, also Polish authors, such as Joachim Lelewel, Henryk Dembiński, Zygmunt Feliński and others. In the analysis of biographies and views of both of them, the following can be very helpful: Polish-language studies on the history of Russian philosophy and social thought by, for example, Andrzej Walicki, Leonid Stolovich, Georgy Plekhanov and Yuri Lotman, as well as the works of historians dealing with the history of Russia: Ludwik Basilov, Richard Pipes, Jan Kucharzewski, Andrzej Andrusiewicz, Wiktoria Śliwowska, Katarzyna Błachowska, Władysław Serczyk, Andrzej Nowak and others.

## **Conclusions**

Summarizing these considerations, it is worth trying to formulate the following research questions:

1. What philosophical, anthropological, axiological and epistemological inspirations underly their thinking about upbringing?
2. What were the essence, purpose and meaning of education as understood by Westernizers and Slavophiles, both in relation to the individual and to society/nation?
3. What was the originality of the Westernizers’ approach and that of the Slavophiles to the problem of upbringing and their opposition to the official ideology of state education?
4. Whether and why the category of freedom can be considered as the primary category in the Westernizer and Slavophile pedagogies?

The above questions will be part of the network, which the researcher will endeavour to resolve regarding the heritage of the universal discourse, that in Russia in the mid-nineteenth century the Slavophiles and Westernizers fought amongst themselves. The researcher hopes that from the sea of their views, it will be possible to pick out those ideas, postulates and proposals which, in their understanding, were serve the primary purpose of educating man, i.e. educating to freedom, subjectivity and love of truth.



## References:

- Abassy, M. (2013). Dekabryzm w świetle słów-kluczy w dokumentach programowych i poezji członków tajnych stowarzyszeń. *Slavia Orientalis*, LXII, 3, 369-390.
- Aleksiejuk, A. (2022a). Wolność i wychowanie w refleksji filozoficzno-społecznej Aleksandra Radiszczewa (1749-1802). *Ruch Pedagogiczny*, 1, 95-117.
- Aleksiejuk, A. (2022b). Wychowanie według Aleksieja S. Chomiakowa (1804-1855). *Przegląd Pedagogiczny* 1, 9-29.
- Aleksiejuk, A. (2021). Rozwój osobowości integralnej jako nadrzędny cel pedagogii historiozoficznej Iwana Kiriejewskiego (1806-1856). *Rocznik Teologiczny*, LXIII, 4, 1345-1380.
- Aleksiejuk, A. (2020). Edukacja i formacja duchowa w ujęciu Aleksieja S. Chomiakowa (1804-1860). W: A. Fidelus, J. Michalski (red.), *Człowiek, duchowość, wychowanie. Impulsy myśli o. Anselma Grüna* (pp. 180-197). Warszawa: Difin.
- Aleksiejuk, A. (2019). Odpowiedzialność za siebie i innych w rosyjskiej pedagogice humanistycznej połowy XIX wieku. W: R. Nowakowska-Siuta, T. J. Zieliński (red.), *Odwaga odpowiedzialności. Demokratyczne przemiany życia społecznego w refleksji pedagogicznej* (pp. 257-277). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe ChAT.
- Aleksiejuk, A. (2022). Wychowanie według Aleksieja N. Chomiakowa (1804-1860), *Przegląd Pedagogiczny*, 1, 9-29.
- Berlin, I. (1991). *Dwie koncepcje wolności i inne eseje*. Warszawa: ResPublica.
- Bielinski, W. (1956). *Pisma filozoficzne*. T. 1-2. Warszawa: PWN.
- Bierdiajew, M. (1987). *Rosyjska idea*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo „Frona”.
- Boethius. (1847). Liber de Persona et Duabus Naturis Contra Eutychem Nestorium. In: J. P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Latina* (pp. 1337-1354D). T. 64. Parisiis.
- Chłopaś, M. (2022). Dziecięca armia Putina. *Newsweek Polska*, 18.04.2022. Pobrano z: <https://www.newsweek.pl/swiat/dziecieca-armia-putina-czyli-jak-wyglada-rosyjskie-wychowanie-militarne/2dx7fs> (dostęp: 3.01.2023).
- Custine de, A. (2021). *Listy z Rosji. Rosja w 1839 roku*. Łódź: Editions-Spotkania.
- Czernyszewski, M. (1951). *Co robić? Z opowiadań o nowych ludziach*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Czernyszewski, M. (1961). *Pisma filozoficzne*. T. 1-2. Warszawa: PWN.

- Czernyszewski, M. (1956). *Zasada antropologiczna w filozofii*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Dobrolubow, M. (1958). *Pisma filozoficzne*. T. 1-2. Warszawa: PWN.
- Dunk van der, H. W. (1982). The treatment of Contemporary History in Its Scientific Aspects. In: *The Place of Significance of Contemporary History in Textbooks and Secondary Education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Egorov, S. F. (1986). *Hrestomatiâ po istorii školy i pedagogiki v Rossii (do Velikoj Oktâbrskoj socialističeskoj revolucii)*. Moskwa: Izdatel'stvo „Prosvešenie”.
- Egorov, S. F. (1999). *Istoriâ pedagogiki v Rossii. Hrestomatiâ*. Moskwa: Izdatel'stvo „Akademiâ”.
- Gonczarow, N. (1967). Oświata rosyjska w czasach panowania Mikołaja I. In: Ł. Kurdybacha (ed.). *Historia wychowania*. T. 2. (pp312-327). Warszawa: PWN.
- Hejnicka-Bezwińska, T. (2006). Teraźniejszość w dialogu z edukacyjną przeszłością (po roku 1989). In: S. Sztobryn, J. Semkow (ed.). *Edukacja i jej historiografia. W poszukiwaniu twórczego dialogu* (pp. 21-41). Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Hercen, A. (1952). *Opowiadania*. Warszawa: PIW.
- Hercen, A. (1965-1966). *Pisma filozoficzne*. T. 1-2. Warszawa: PWN.
- Hercen, A. (1952-1969). *Rzeczy minione i rozmyślenia*. T. 1-5. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Hercen, A. (1951). *Sroka-złodziejka, Z nudów, Czyja wina?* Warszawa” Spółdzielnia Wydawniczo-Oświatowa „Czytelnik”.
- Hessen, S. (1997). *O sprzeczności i jedności wychowania*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo „Żak”.
- Hessen, S. (1931). *Podstawy pedagogiki*. Warszawa: Nakładem «Naszej Księgarni» Sp. Akc, ZNP.
- Hołówka, T. (1986). *Myślenie potoczne. Heterogeniczność zdrowego rozsądku*. Warszawa: PIW.
- Jastrzębski, W. (2012). Wschodni model współczesnego wychowania państwowego na przykładzie rosyjskiego korpusu kadetów. Zarys problemu. *Biuletyn Historii Wychowania*, 28, 145-151.
- Jezierska, B. (2003). Autonomia w pedagogice. W: T. Pilch (red.). *Encyklopedia pedagogiczna XXI wieku* (246). T. 1. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”.
- Kiriejewski, I. (1998). O charakterze cywilizacji Europy i jej stosunku do cywilizacji Rosji. In: J. Dobieszewski (ed.), *Wokół słowianofilstwa* (pp. 76-109). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo WFiS UW.

- Konarzewski, K. (1987). *Podstawy teorii oddziaływań wychowawczych*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Kostkiewicz, J. (1998). *Wychowanie do wolności wyboru. Ponadczasowy wymiar pedagogiki F. W. Foerstera*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej.
- Lebedev, P. A. (1987). *Antologija pedagogičeskoj mysli Rossii pervoj poloviny XIX v. (do reform 60-h godov)*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo „Pedagogika”.
- Leppert, R. (1996). *Potoczne teorie wychowania studentów pedagogiki*. Bydgoszcz: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna.
- Łubnicki, N. (1954). Ewolucja światopoglądu Aleksandra Hercena. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska. Sectio F, Nauki Filozoficzne i Humanistyczne*, 9, 1-84.
- Majorek, C. (2002). Najnowsza historia edukacji wobec potrzeb pedagogiki. In: R. Kwieciński, S. Kowal (eds), *Edukacyjne drogi i bezdroża*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej.
- Marrou, H.-I. (2011). *O poznaniu historycznym*. Kraków: Znak.
- Maruszewski, T. (1986). Wiedza potoczna jako reprezentacja rzeczywistości. In: T. Maruszewski (ed.), *Filozofia – poznanie – psychologia* (pp. 39-70). Warszawa-Poznań: PWN.
- Nowak, M. (2008). *Teorie i koncepcje wychowania*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Pirogov, N. (1914). Novosele liceâ. Reč na toržestvennomakte Rišel'skogo licea v Odesse, 1 sentâbrâ 1857 goda. W: *Soči-neniâ N. I. Pirogova v dvuh tomach* (81-90). T.1. Kiev: Izdanie Pirogovskago Tovarišestva.
- Radiszczew, A. (1954). Do najmilszego Przyjaciela A.M.K. W: *Podróż z Petersburga do Moskwy* (5-6). Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich-Wydawnictwo.
- Składanowski, M. (2020). *Cywilizacja rosyjska według Aleksandra Dugina. Studia historiozoficzno-antropologiczne*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Sydorenko, W. (2022) *Rosja militaryzuje krymskie dzieci*. Pobrano z: <https://sdp.pl/wolodymyr-sydorenko-rosja-militaryzuje-krymskie-dzieci/> (dostęp: 3.01.2023).
- Szabajewa, M. (1952). *Hercen o wychowaniu*. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.
- Sztobryn, S. (2009). Jaka wolność taka edukacja. In: M. Zalewska-Pawlak (ed.), *Sztuka wobec zakresów wolności człowieka liberalnego. Pedagogiczne rozważania i doświadczenia* (pp. 43-55). Łódź: Wydawnictwo UŁ.
- Śliwerski, B. (2005). *Współczesne teorie i nurty wychowania*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.

- Śliwerski, B. (2008). *Wyspy oporu edukacyjnego*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Tarnowski, J. (1998). *Jak wychowywać?*. Warszawa: ATK.
- Trzebiński, J. (1992). *Narracyjne formy wiedzy potocznej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo „Nakom”.
- Walicki, A. (1959\_1). *Osobowość i historia. Studia z dziejów literatury i myśli rosyjskiej*. Warszawa: PIW.
- Walicki, A. (1959\_2). Słowianofile i okcydentaliści. Z dziejów problematyki narodu i problematyki historyzmu w myśli rosyjskiej pierwszej połowy XIX wieku. In: *Archiwum Historii Filozofii i Myśli Społecznej* (pp. 151-215). T. 4, Warszawa: PWN.
- Walicki, A. (1961). *Filozofia i myśl społeczna rosyjska 1825-1861*, Kraków: PWN.
- Walicki, A. (1962). Rosyjskie słowianofilstwo a filozofia heglowska. In: *Archiwum Historii Filozofii i Myśli Społecznej* (pp. 53-99). T. 8. Warszawa: PWN.
- Walicki, A. (1964, 2002). *W kręgu konserwatywnej utopii. Struktura i przemiany rosyjskiego słowianofilstwa*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Walicki, A. (1973). *Rosyjska filozofia i myśl społeczna od oświecenia do marksizmu*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Walicki, A. (1995). *Filozofia prawa rosyjskiego liberalizmu*. Warszawa: Instytut Studiów Politycznych PAN.
- Wołoszyn, S. (1964). *Dzieje wychowania i myśli pedagogicznej*. Warszawa: PWN, Warszawa 1964.
- Żuk, G. (2016). *Edukacja aksjologiczna. Zarys problematyki*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.