навчання;

- забезпечення можливості широкої громадськості зробити значний внесок у виробництво наукових знань в Європі.

Переваги відкритої науки полягають у підвищенні ефективності науки за рахунок зменшення дублювання та витрат на створення, передачу та повторне використання даних; підвищенні прозорості та якості у процесі підтвердження достовірності результатів досліджень; прискоренні передачі знань, сприяння швидшому переходу від досліджень до інновацій; збільшенні впливу результатів досліджень на економіку; ефективнішій відповіді на глобальні виклики, які вимагають скоординованих міжнародних дій; сприянні залученню громадян до досліджень, активної участі в наукових експериментах та зборі даних.

У цілому, розвиток відкритої науки в університетах, забезпечуючи обмін знаннями, даними та максимізуючи вигоди від вільного переміщення знань, дослідників та тих, хто навчається, визначає рух до п'ятої свободи в Європейському Союзі, яка доповнює свободи пересування товарів, послуг, осіб та капіталу

Завдання розвитку дослідницьких е-інфраструктур відкритої науки в Україні зумовлені низкою окреслених в довоєнний період стратегічних планів, які ще більше актуалізуються в умовах воєнного стану, та матимуть важливе значення для пришвидшення повоєнного відновлення нашої країни.

EDUCATION, ARCHITECTURE, AND CITIZENSHIP IN INDUSTRIALIZING SOCIETIES. A COMPARATIVE COMMENTARY ON THREE CASE STUDIES: ROBERT OWEN, CHARLES BRACE, AND ANTON MAKARENKO

Dimitris M. Moschos
Athens, Greece

I. Introduction

The passage from pre-industrial to industrial societies was not an easy one. Industrial societies, i.e., societies where the dominant form of production is mass industry, are usually accompanied by specific social phenomena, such as unplanned urbanization and social disparities. [15] Industrial work also requires a different set of social skills than in traditional agrarian or craftsman societies. Industrialization was closely linked with urbanization, and the urban environment also requires new traits of subjectivity, spatial orientation, collaboration, a sense of self-support, and individualized temporality that are different from the so-called traditional societies. These processes uprooted traditional rural communities and, so, gave rise to the problem of the relationship between the newly emerged individual worker-citizen and its forms of belonging to the social and political collective. [10] This anxiety for the individual was a common trait of industrializing European societies, where institutions of social coherence and habits are not fully yet facilitated. As such,

during industrialization, political and economic administrators faced specific societal problems arising from the contradiction between the new social and economic industrial requirements and a working mass coming mostly from an agrarian background. These heterogenous issues can be grouped into three specific eras: the issue of education (reforming agrarian or untrained urban populations in the industrial context), the spatial arrangement and infrastructure of these actual educational institutions, and finally their relationship to the state through the notion of citizenship (the individual-collective relationship).

As such, policymakers in industrial societies of the late 19th and early 20th centuries had to find ways of transforming these masses into effective citizens and a functional and productive workforce. These educational policies, since they arose from a situation of severe living conditions and social inequalities, came together with the political promise of egalitarianism, or the goal of various forms of deeper and more equal integration into society of the re-educated social groups. One of these educational policies, quite popular in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (and still functioning today in developing countries), [9] was the so-called “factory schools," linking directly the educational project with the goals of industrialization and educating youths by putting them directly to industrial work. In terms of their social and political role, factory schools were everywhere institutions that stood somewhere in between penalty institutions, proper schools, and free labor factories. [5] They were institutions preoccupied with the “reformation” of the petty-criminal urban working class, especially of young age, and its integration into society. Epistemologically, all factory schools can be argued to incorporate some sort of Pestalozzian form of education, linking emotions with practical experiences and putting the child in situations of gradual complexity and familiarity where problem solving and improvisation are required for a given task. Nevertheless, except for this general frame, the relation between the educational process, the material formulation of these institutions, and their goals varies significantly, depending on their actual political and social context.

In this article, we will briefly compare three different examples of industrial “factory schools.”: the cases of Robert Owen in Britain, Charles Brace in the USA, and Anton Makarenko in the early USSR. By contrasting these three examples, I tend to argue that Makarenko's case demonstrates an exceptionalism that can give us insights beyond the field of the history of education. I will compare these cases from the point of view of their internal structure, their pedagogical goals and epistemology, and their relation to the state apparatuses. Thus, in each case, I intend to derive from these examples remarks on state policies of citizenship and their relation to education and building infrastructure.

II. The British case: early industry and enlightened industrialist factory schooling in the early 19th century

Factory schools, as a general idea, can be said to be of British origin. This is not surprising since Britain first faced the social challenges of industrialization. Early factory schools were establishments mainly administered by industrialists. In these establishments, which were always inside or near industrial complexes, two kinds of

children were administrated: the children *of the adult workforce,* already working in the industry, and *orphans* who could choose an establishment like that to avoid getting administrated into the working house facilities, facilities for the poor according to the British Poor Law of 1834, where the working conditions were way worse and less secure than in factories. Factory schools had the advantage of providing basic education, labor skills, and a relatively secure promise that, upon adulthood, these kids would become part of the workforce of the same factory where they were schooled, since industrialists preferred a workforce that they trained themselves.[5]

Even though there were many of these examples in Britain, the first was probably the most known: Robert Owen's project at New Lanark. This social experiment was not a simple educational or productive unit but a *commune,* claiming that by combining communal living, education based on direct experience in production, and better housing conditions, it provided an alternative to the deteriorating living and working conditions of the working class in the British industrial megacities. These provisions aimed to form a new anti-individualistic psychology, challenging the laissez-faire tendencies of the official British economy of the time. The New Lanark situated itself far from the urban fabric, in the heart of Scotland's rural environment, serving as an intermediary between the agrarian lifestyle, which most workers were more accustomed to, and the industrial life. Nevertheless, the commune was well defined topologically, with distinct gates and exits where the movement of laborers could be monitored. The commune, which was comprised of administrative buildings, a central road, 3-store dwellings for workers, a school, and the factory cotton mill, was in fact a micro-state, an idealized miniature of Britain. It has to be noted here that these projects were still connected (economically and infrastructurally) to the general British economy and market, since they were selling their productive outcomes in order to survive. [6]

Provisions for workers were given, and the educational process for non-adults was twofold: classroom and light engagement with the production process itself. The main goals of Owen were to promote a “new moral life,” and by that he meant both abstract and concrete goals. The more abstract goal was the promotion of a collective, non-individualistic way of life, even though these goals were never fully fulfilled. On a more specific level, the goal was to facilitate the next generation of *worker-citizens*, i.e., persons who would be able to act effectively in production and civilly in terms of social behavior. Owen regarded petty crime, illiteracy, and the absence of state provisions as the main causes of the social stigma of the poor classes, especially the poor orphan children. The main idea was that by growing up inside a community that was micro-scale and an idealization of Britain, from an early age the kid was educated in acting and thinking in a civil way (both in terms of politics and in terms of subjective behavior). Evidence suggests that actual schooling time was limited, and many children over 12 years old were spending much time in or around the factory, especially when their parents were working. Some of them also worked. This phenomenon was even more common in other factory schools that were run by less “socialist-inclined” philanthropists. This also created friction between the administration of the Owen commune (and the factory school owners in

general) and the parents, who were "brought up still in the old ways" and, as such, were influencing the children negatively. In general, fighting and drunkenness, common phenomena among the poor in working urban neighborhoods, were forbidden and judged as unethical for both adults and minors. In this context, citizenship was not only a legal status but also a cultural one. A citizen worth having a creative relationship with the administration of her or his community was someone who could participate in an effective and productive way in all aspects of social life and was capable of self-sustainment and non-individualist thinking. Promises of democratic participation in the management of the commune, the factory, and the school were made by Owen and other philanthropist industrialists, but they were never fulfilled. The whole educational-working process was largely administered by the factory administrations. [4]

As such, the New Lanark community and many other owenite inspired factory communities in Britain were playing a double role: ideologically, they presented themselves as *alternatives* to the existing capitalist, individualistic, and politically authoritative world (the owenites were explicitly anti-nobility). At the same time, their educational goals and their practical-oriented educational method through the internalization of a working ethos and industrial discipline were the very fact that made them valuable to the British state itself: the owenites were solving a problem that the state itself could not in the 19th century. [4] They were formulating "civilized" and skilled industrial workers in accordance with the prevailing conception of citizenship at the time: *a citizen is not a legal status but a complex matrix of community-oriented character traits and acts of community engagement. Especially for the male population, the concept of the ideal citizen was associated with duties and* responsibilities towards the national and local community. *As a whole,* Britain was trying to strike a balance between an anti-individualism that was rendered positive and needed and the increasingly individualistic economic system of early capitalism. Juristically, this was mirrored in the various economic and behavioral limitations that the British Law presented in terms of voting rights and receiving social security. Despite the changes in British voting and social security legislation, full citizenship was until the beginning of the 20th century linked with minimum income or property evidence [7] that served as a proof of social status and responsible civil behavior. As such, the owenite inspired factory schools can be seen as a supplementary project to the British state. [2]

III. The American case: Charles Brace and the Children's Trains

In the USA, the historical period after the American Civil War and the reconstruction period is known as the Gilden Era. The Gilden Era was a period of rapid economic growth and industrialization that made the USA a world economic power. Urbanization and mass migration came to the USA with the familiar problems of extreme poverty, deteriorating dwelling conditions, orphanhood, and more social inequalities. To this image, it should be added that in the USA, inequalities were also extremely racialized, where the majority of the urban poor and especially the so-called "street children" were of African, Italian, Irish, or American indigenous origins. The urban poor and workers in new factories or ports were branded as uncivilized and unlawful.

It has to be noted, though, that the concept of citizenship in the USA in the 19th century was way more fragmented than in Britain of the same era. The American system bared traits of both the British system (limitations to legal citizenship based on property and income criteria that served as indicators of social obedience) but also on local and state laws that explicitly required that African Americans, migrants, or indigenous people disassociate themselves from their respective cultures in order to gain civil rights as they were considered "unfit for a civilized society."[8]

In this historical context, Charles Brace's educational project is of extreme interest. Brace was a philanthropist and founder of the Children's Aid Society in 1853, a philanthropic organization that embraced the application of the concepts of a "factory school" and "schooling through labor" to children coming from an "uncivilized" background. [1] The activity of this organization skyrocketed after 1860 until the end of the 19th century. The main way of operating this project was through a network of orphanages located in the major east coast urban centers and an extensive network of private and state-owned railroads. The orphanages were used as recruiting spots, mainly by social workers and philanthropists that were gathering kids from the streets when the family was ruled out as "unfit" or as dropping points when working-class and migrant parents unable to feed their own kids were dropping them off. The American system of factory schooling had a distinct aspect of forced "orphaniazation." The main idea behind Brace's organization was that the environment severely influences the character of the child, and as such, working-class neighborhoods and slums were unfit for the reconstitution of the urban poor into future proper citizens. Poor urban kids, orphans, and indigenous kids were thus gathered in orphanages, where they engaged in light workhouse labor in order to gain several minimal laboring skills but also to be cut off from an unhealthy environment. After gaining labor skills, they were sent by train to cut off locations in the American West and North as workers in light industry or plantations. Additionally, their families encouraged them to embrace a protestant, individualistic worldview. Through this method, the children were completely separated from their families, forbidden to communicate with them, and often even given new names. At their destinations, they were working alone or with other unknown orphans from all over the USA. [14]

The factory school of the Brace system had as its main goal also to form obedient worker-citizens for the emerging North American industry by eliminating some basic character traits such as lack of hygiene, drunkenness, and aggression so that the urban poor were considered guilty off. But the American ideal citizen was to be working-oriented, obedient, bu*t* also *individualized*, an entrepreneur of itself, self-reliant, and a family *man*. The individualistic working ethos in the USA was explicit, while Britain was quite ambivalent towards that issue. By cutting off the familial or cultural ties of the child, the Brace system resolved the friction that was tantalizing the British factory industrialists. The kid was isolated by any "relation to the old ways." The American worker-citizen, craved off from the street orphan or the indigenous kid, was to be a "pure worker" with no other social determination than an economically productive "civilized" behavior.

The post-imperial and then colonial aspects of the USA after the Civil War formulated thus a factory educational system that methodologically and topologically was reflecting the predominant ideology of the United States at the time: working ethos and individualism were objectified in the very object of inter-state railroads, the administrative act of forcibly omitting one's name or original culture, and the geographical and physical alienation of the kid. The formation of the worker-citizen was thus simple: *the only thing that was left for the laboring orphan to appropriate and elevate was labor itself.* Only after this process of re-education could the urban, "uncivilized" poor be considered full citizens, and for African Americans, in some states even after that, this was not fulfilled. The American factory school, composed of the material complex of orphanage-railroad-labouring destinations, was the epitome of an aggressive, extremely undemocratic, social homogenization project.

Both the British and American examples of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it has to be noted, were derived from an epistemological paradigm that treated the person as malleable, passive material, formed mainly by external social forces.[3]

VI. The peculiar case of Anton Makarenko and the early Soviet factory education

Industrialization in the Russian Empire came late. The main industrialization projects in the region were carried out by other Soviet authorities, especially after the late 1920s. Industialization in the Soviet Union causes analogous issues: massive migration waves, the uprooting, often by force, of traditional rural and agrarian communities, and a massive project of "proletarianization of the population." But the political and social peculiarities of the socialist orientation of the Soviet regime gave different intonations to concepts such as citizenship, belonging, and community than in Britain and the USA. Citizenship for the Soviets meant, by definition, universal citizenship for all, regardless of race, religion, or sex. Nevertheless, the fragility of citizenship in the Soviet context had to do not with formal, legal fragmentation but with the ease with which it could be revoked. Soviet citizenship was always a fragile concept interlinked with discourses on the goals of the Soviet state for industrial development of a socialist type and a more general reformulation of society, the creation of a "socialist way of life." Failure to meet these standards could result in someone being targeted for "anti-socialist" behavior and facing various legal consequences.[12]

As such, the ideal citizen, especially in the late 1920s, was a collectivist-oriented, obedient worker. Drunkenness and aggressivity, the main traits stereotypically attributed to the poor working-class masses and main obstacles to industrial discipline, were considered counter-productive, individualistic, and, as such, capitalist and counter-revolutionary. Epistemologically, the Soviet educational system of the time, until 1936, was dominated by psychological theories of "internationalization of external social activity" or "reflexology," theories quite different from British and American Lamarckism that resulted in similar positions, mainly the opinion that behavior is a dependent character trait that can be moulted into people's psyches. Thus, the ideal Soviet citizen could be formed by constant and specific social tasks, community work, and political and party agitation.

It is true that the early Soviet education system exemplifies this kind of philosophy that the subject is passive during the educational process, or tabula rasa. This attitude was revised repeatedly after 1936 and after World War II, but this is out of the scope of this article. The main issue is that in this environment, factory schooling seems to be a more peculiar case than someone could suppose, given the political and epistemological situation of the era. Anton Makarenko's example stands as a peculiar case of factory schooling.

Anton Makarenko, a national Ukrainian, started experimenting with "factory and agricultural schooling" as early as 1921 in Ukraine. The first commune, located close to Poltava and comprised of orphans from the times of the revolution and the subsequent civil war, was more agricultural in its orientation. Subsequent labor communes in Kharkiv (1927) and outside Moscow (1930), associated with Makarenko, were proper factory schools. In these schools, orphan kids were educated both formally (teaching classes) and practically (by working in light industry inside the communes). These communes, while in general resembling other factory schooling projects, especially the British ones discussed above, should not be treated this way. Of course, some common features and goals were present. Orphans introduced in these facilities, mostly kids of the streets and petty criminals, were supposed to live behind any illegal activities and "anti-socialist" behaviors, mostly drunkenness, drugs and individualistic behavior (but reasonable drinking and tobacco smoking were allowed). [16] Nevertheless, the fact that these kinds were actually orphans resolved in a more nuanced matter the issue that faced both the British and the Americans, namely, the relationship of the kids to "the old ways of life" through their parents. [11]

Makarenko's communes should be considered small, light industrial complexes with a relatively stable children's community running them along with the educational administration staff. These industrial complexes were proper production units organized in a communal way of life and production. It has to be noted that, from an architectural and topological point of view, these communes were a) close to major cities and b) open. By close to major cities, it means that they were not placed in a faraway, strictly rural environment (such as in the British case) nor were they dispersed over a wide geographical area (such as in the American one). By open, it means that these were not prisons but open establishments where the children could go out whenever they desired. Spatially, these institutes always had open gates.[16] The Moscow commune had no fence around it. These unusual architectural and topological characteristics relate to and express one of Makarenko's most influential educational innovations: political self-management as an educational reality within the commune. While Makarenko's projects may remind us of the general goals of factory education, it was his introduction of a democratic, formal process of self-management to the educational system that made his case exceptional.

As such, Makarenko's communes also had in their complexes a building specifically for political meetings. The kids, working members of the commune, had the right to vote and to determine many aspects of their lives in these factory schools, such as the pace of production, the structure of teaching lectures, their recreational activities, and most importantly, they were able to formulate binding regulations and

duties for their everyday lives and inter-personal engagement in these communes. [13]

The remarkable thing about this situation is that Makarenko's case exemplifies a reversal of the educational process for other factory schooling projects. While the educational goals of Makarenko were formaly aligned with the Soviet state's policies, the background of the Makarenko project was counter both to European factory schooling and the Soviet educational system of its time. In terms of the issue of citizenship, given the socialist context, Makarenko is clearly at odds with the American and British factory systems since his approach is clearly collectivist-oriented. But the notion of "education through political experience of self-management" was also counter to the predominant conception of collectivity in the early Soviet Union, which rendered any trait of individualism as opposing to the collectivist ethos. Makarenko recognized that a functioning collective can actually survive only if the collectivist ethos is based on a well-developed individual personality that can *self-reflect* and *self-evaluate* the way that it is dependent on and bound to its collective. Individual judgment and self-reflection were indisputable assets for a functioning collective. As such, the educational project of Makarenko was neither strictly individualist nor collectivist in an absolute and crude manner. In contrast to the dominant epistemological paradigms in the West and in the Soviet Union of that time, Makarenko acknowledged a non-passive aspect of child development. He treated children as possessing the quality of active agency and not as passive subjects. Given the right conditions (equality of material provisions) and institutions (collective laboring, interpersonal collaboration, and collective self-management of a group), they could rationally by themselves form goals and thus understand the complex relations between their own desires and their duties towards the social whole. [13]

This aspect of Makarenko's factory schools is also related to their conception of citizenship. Of course, the ultimate goal was to reform the orphans in such a way that they would be exemplary Soviet citizens. But self-management as an educational experience formulates subjects that are more complex than just an obedient workforce. Makarenko thus was not educating to make kids *worth* Soviet citizenship since this was already a given. He was working to a) *secure the status of citizenship for his factory-schooled children* by forming subjects that were able to judge and adapt to situations and not just follow orders, which is always a more precarious psychological situation. b) Self-management and self-reflection in this Soviet context made citizens able to achieve greater social mobility. Many of the Makarenko-schooled children became distinctive citizens in the years following World War II. In Makarenko's conception of factory schooling, it was not the factory discipline itself that provided the educational paradigm *but the collective functional management* of the factory.

V. Epilogue: A Summary

This short presentation of three representative factory schooling projects provides us with the differences and commonalities between factory schooling in industrializing societies of different economic and political orders. Despite some common ground on the immediate goals of re-educating the petty-criminal

proletarian masses (especially in relation to alcohol and civil behavior), significant differences arise. From the above comparison, through the analytic glass of citizenship, educational practices, and the spatial organization of factory schooling, we can derive three typologies:

a) The British are one of the philanthropic industrialists. In this case, factory schooling plays a double-contradictory role. On the one hand, it claims to be *an alternative to* the existing social order of laissez-faire, uncontrolled capitalist industrial development, trying to form an organic, anti-individualistic, productive society. On the other hand, it actually supplements this capitalist development by creating a workforce more suitable for labor and for "civilized" behavior in an urban/industrial society, i.e., to produce citizens capable culturally and economically to enter the status of citizenship and thus to belong to the "national family." Pedagogically, the British factory schools, and especially the Owenite ones, were declaring political educational principles: atheism, socialism, common ownership, and/or democratic participation in production management. None of these declarations was actually implemented on a significant scale because of their double role in their relationship with the official economy. This was mirrored in their topology as well: on the one hand, they were linked with the wider capitalist market and the supply chains of the British state and economy through roads and railroads; on the other, they were placed in rural regions, far away from cities. The British factory schools were *semi-alternative communities of factory schooling,* linked to but also "cut off" from the rest of society, trying to find a balance between collective working ethos and laissez-faire capitalism. The main educational instrument in this context was the factory itself, and in the end, market imperatives for economic efficiency prevailed in the "schooling process."

b) The American Brace system can be considered the most fully developed capitalist factory educational system. Topologically, the system was comprised of three elements: the orphanage-railroad-labouring destination complex. Its sole goal was the fragmentation of community feelings and the forging of an anonymous, individualized mass worker-citizen. The geographical dispersion of the system was also a material demonstration of individualization. It has to be kept in mind that the American Brace system was overly preoccupied with "civilizing" migrants, indigenous people, and African Americans; thus, it could be better understood as a *colonial capitalist factory schooling system.* In this case, the main educational instrument was the act of isolation and forced labor.

c) Makarenko's case in the early USSR. Makarenko's approach to factory schooling can be said to go in the opposite direction: collectivist ethos, collective organization of common life, and collective forms of political management of the community. What is interesting is that under the transitional and authoritative regime of early Stalinism, Makarenko managed to formulate a more liberal and more democratic factory-school than his western counterparts. This virtual contradiction may have to do with the fact that states in transitional processes such as the early USSR may leave room for experimentation. Another explanation of this paradox is that in the USSR there were cases of "cluster liberalism": the fact that specific functions of the state were dependent on specific bureaucratic individuals (patrons),

which occasionally allowed more freedom in specific circumstances if the patron allowed it.

Makarenko tried to strike a more balanced approach to the issue of the collective and the individual. While he was quite critical of individualistic tendencies and behaviors, he did not think of the collective as only a coordination issue between individuals. It was the ability of a person to take responsibility and to self-reflect on their actions, desires, and duties that formed the backbone of his approach. He did not treat the child as passive material waiting to be formed by education but as an active part of the process. As such, the main educational instrument was not labor itself but the experience of collective management of labor. Topologically, the fact that his educational complexes had no fences or significant barriers and were placed relatively close to urban centers also demonstrates that this was not a project of forced isolation or forced, confined socialization. This puts a question mark on whether the factory can be considered an indispensable part of his educational program. It was a program to secure the concept of citizenship by forming a self-reflecting subjectivity. As such, Makarenko's educational factory schools still present a wider interest both pedagogically and politically in our time, while it is common ground that factory schooling is obsolete.

References:

1. Brace, C. L. (1868) *Address on Industrial Schools*. New York, Press of Wynkoop & Hallenbeck. Retrieved from the Library of Congress.
2. Brad Beaven, John Griffiths, (2008) “Creating the Exemplary Citizen: The Changing Notion of Citizenship in Britain 1870–1939.” *Contemporary British History*, 22:2, 203–225.
3. Burkhardt, R. (1980).“Lamarckìsm in Britain and the United States,” In E. Mayr & W. Provine (Ed.), *The Evolutionary Synthesis: Perspectives on the Unification of Biology* (pp. 343-352). Cambridge, MA and London, England: Harvard University Press.
4. Ciccantell, J., Geier, B.A. (2023). “Robert Owen: Education for a New Moral World.” In: Geier, B.A. (eds) The Palgrave Handbook of Educational Thinkers. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
5. Colin M. Brown (1980) “Industrialists and their Factory Schools,” History of Education: Journal of the History of Education Society, 9:2, 117-127.
6. Dennis Hardy, *Alternative Communities in 19th century England,* Longman, 1979.
7. Dewan, T., Meriläinen, J., & Tukiainen, J. (2020). Victorian Voting: The Origins of Party Orientation and Class Alignment. *American Journal of Political Science*, *64*(4), 869–886.
8. Engermann, S. L., & Sokoloff, K. L. (2005). “The Evolution of Suffrage Institutions in the New World.” *The Journal of Economic History*, 65(4), 891–921.
9. *Factory Schools: Erasing indigenous identity,* Survival Report, 2019.
10. Föllmer, M. (2020). “The sociology of individuality and the history of urban society.” *Urban History,* 47(2), 311–326.
11. Gehring, Thom, Fredalene B. Bowers, and Randall Wright. (2005) “Anton Makarenko: The ‘John Dewey of the U.S.S.R.’” *Journal of Correctional Education (1974-)* 56:4 327–45
12. Krylova AO (2019) “A History of the “Soviet”: From Bolshevik Utopia to Soviet Modernity.” Alternative Realities 14:105–127

13. Антон Макаренко, *Педагогическая поэма*, Public Domain, 1936.
14. Kyla Schuller, *The Biopolitics of feeling,* Duke University Press, 2017.
15. Mark D. Steinberg, *The Russian Utopia, A century of revolutionary Possibilities,* Bloomsbury, 2021.
16. Герц Хиллинг, «Новые данные о болшевской трудовой коммуне», *Педагогика*, no. 3 2001.

SPOLEČNÉ RYSY ÚSPĚŠNÉ (PŘE)VÝCHOVNÉ ČINNOSTI A.S.MAKARENKA A G. M. BOSCA

Stanislav Bendl
Praha, Česká republika

Anotace:

Článek se zabývá pedagogickou činností A. S. Makarenka a Dona Bosca při práci s bezprizornými. Stručně představuje dva významné představitele sociální pedagogiky, kteří byli velmi úspěšní na poli výchovy, resp. převýchovy. Snaží se poukázat na fakt, že ačkoli oba vychovatelé vycházeli z odlišných ideologických pozic, a na první pohled se tak mohou jevit jako dokonalé vychovatelské protipóly, ve skutečnosti měli po pedagogické stránce mnoho společného. Ukazuje se, že v oblasti (pře)výchovy platí univerzální pedagogické principy a metody, které jsou důležitým předpokladem pro úspěšnou a účinnou vychovatelskou činnost.

Úvod

Tento článek pojednává o A. S. Makarenkovi a Donu Boscovi, dělnících sociální pedagogiky a ideologických protipólech, kteří reagovali na v jejich době a zemi aktuální společenskou objednávku, tj. zvládnutí obrovské masy bezprizorných dětí a mládeže. Byli to právě A. S. Makarenko a G. M. Bosco, reprezentanti praktického proudu sociální výchovy, tj. vychovatelští praktici, kteří stáli v první linii při práci s bezprizornými, opuštěnými, chudými a vyloučenými jedinci stojícími na okraji společnosti.

V Boscově případě se jednalo především o děti a mládež, která se v době nastupující průmyslové revoluce potulovala po městě Turíně, byla často negramotná, marginalizovaná, přespávala v ubytovnách pro nejchudší, pracovala za mrzký peníz na stavbách (většina chlapců pracovala jako kameníci, zedníci, štukatéři nebo dlaždiči), v dílnách a továrnách, běžně se dopouštěla krádeží a plnila místní věznice. Tyto „děti ulice“, které tvořily „druhou tvář“ města Turína, se často dopouštěly násilí, budily obavy místních obyvatel a společnost se je snažila izolovat.

V Makarenkově případě šlo převážně o mladistvé, kteří v důsledku 1. světové války, občanské války a hladomoru ztratili rodiče. Přišli tak o domov, zázemí, často se o ně neměl kdo starat nebo tato starost připadla na staré prarodiče, kteří na výchovu nestačili a od nichž děti utíkaly. Velká skupina dětí a mládeže tak vyrůstala bez dozoru, složitě se protloukala životem. Často se živila krádežemi, dopouštěla se loupežných přepadení, sdružovala se v tlupy a pouliční gangy a páchala násilí. Ačkoli bezprizorní existovali již v carském Rusku, v porevoluční době jich natolik