

American Makarenko and soviet Dewey: a search for pedagogical renewal

Yelena Rogacheva

e-mail: erogacheva@hotmail.com

Vladimir State University. Russia

Abstract: The paper deals with educational legacies of John Dewey and Anton Makarenko – two outstanding educators who were named by Otto Anweiler the best in the XXth Century alongside with Maria Montessori and Georg Kershenshteiner. Having got the title of the «Teacher of Soviet teachers» Anton Makarenko, as well as John Dewey who was called «The Teacher of Teachers», both educators thought of a new concept of school and a new type of a teacher for the XXth century that still keep relevance in the XXI century. John Dewey's democratic concept of school and its international significance as well as his new concept of teacher training are compared to Anton Makarenko's ideas. The man of the XXth century, John Dewey (1859-1952) has made great impact on the development of world pedagogy. The educational legacy of A. Makarenko is also the subject of international study and an international phenomenon. The connection of Dewey and Makarenko with Maxim Gorky is touched upon in the paper too.

Keywords: history of comparative education; history of school; John Dewey; Anton Makarenko; Soviet Union; USA, XX century.

Received: 16/10/2021

Accepted: 13/12/2021

1. Introduction

Educational legacies of American scholar John Dewey (1859-1952) and Soviet and Ukranian Educator Anton Makarenko (1888-1939) are still relevant in the XXI Century and serve as good platforms for rethinking an ideal model of school in our complicated and dynamically changing world. Two outstanding educators that were named by Otto Anweiler the best in the world's pedagogical thinking of the 20th century alongside with Maria Montessori and Georg Kershenshteiner are considered to be the subject of interest even today not by chance. So highly ranked by UNESCO (1988) they both not only expressed their ideas theoretically but, practically, they

both worked in experimental schools. Makarenko was called The John Dewey of the USSR (Gehring, Bowers and Wright, 2005, p. 327).

Though Dewey and Makarenko lived and worked in different countries and were the products of different cultural contexts and existential factors their intentions and dreams were rather similar and had much in common.

Anton Semyonovitch Makarenko was born in 1888 in the small Ukrainian railway town of Belopole. He grew up with three siblings in a working-class family. His father was the family's breadwinner and worked as a painter at railway workshops. John Dewey was born in 1859 in Vermont, USA. Like many reform pedagogues of the XX century they thought of a child-oriented school, labour school, activity school and a new type of teacher.

2. Innovative search for a new school and a new teacher

Dutch researcher and historian N.L. Dodde, looking back at innovative experiments in school, stressed that at the beginning of the last century many educators expressed the intention that

the school system should be more conveniently arranged and more accessible for pupils. The educational institute should pay more attention to differences in interest, experience and development of its pupils and the education should, besides intellectual education, also offer space for more practical training (Dodde, 2000, p. 317).

Both John Dewey and Anton Makarenko thought in the same direction and tried to combine learning with labour, play, communication. They both considered discipline at school to be an important factor in learning but for both of them school discipline was the result of a specially organized educational environment. For Dewey and Makarenko discipline was not the reason, the method, the way of good upbringing but a result of it. Makarenko stressed that «discipline is that good end the educator should seek by all his/her forces and with all the means at his/her disposal» (Makarenko, 1978, pp. 24-25).¹

In the *International Encyclopedia of Education published in 1985* in Oxford American professor G. Silver names three figures influential in educational world: Johann F. Herbart in Germany, A.S. Makarenko in the USSR and John Dewey in the USA (Dichek, 2002).

International reputation of Dewey and Makarenko in the world context is very high. On occasion of Dewey's ninetieth birthday (October 20, 1949) W. Brickman discussed Dewey's reputation as an educator in foreign countries and pointed to some examples of Dewey's influence on educational thought and practice abroad. Mentioning that «[...] a more accessible measure of Dewey's relationship to his contemporaries in foreign countries is his reputation as an educator», he determined

¹ For Dewey discipline is positive and constructive. It comes of people's interaction. «Discipline is the power over your own possibilities, control of available resources for accomplishing undertaken activity. Discipline is constructive» (Dewey, 2000, p. 124).

it «[...] by translations of books and articles, professional reviews, discussions of ideas in professional and other publications, and references to theory and practice in miscellaneous sources» (Brickman, 1949, p. 258).

Dewey's works were translated in 35 languages. Makarenko was also studied in many foreign countries: Germany, Denmark, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Norway, Yugoslavia, Poland, Romania, Hungary, Japan, China, Vietnam, USA and some countries from Latin America like Chili. Otto Anweiler in the book *Soviet pedagogy in the world today* published in 1969 in Heidelberg wrote that Makarenko became the most famous and the most readable educational author from Russia in the world' (Frolov, 2006, p. 138) If we take Japan – out of 176 items in *Japanese Educational Bibliography* (81) belong to Dewey in the section «Studying thinkers in Education». Makarenko is the second in popularity (18 items), as we learn from the bibliography published by Japanese Society of Education in Tokyo (1958), covering the period August 1945-March 1957.

As for John Dewey he was not only the leader of North American educational reform that took place around the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, but one of the key figures in what was called «new education», «progressive education» or «reform pedagogy». The man of the XX century, international expert on education John Dewey has made great impact on the development of world pedagogy. His educational paradigm was an alternative to existing traditional authoritarian one that was criticized by educators in many countries. The President of American Psychological Association, the President of American Philosophical Association, the President of American Association of University Professors and there is a long list of his social roles to be continued John Dewey was very significantly called «the Teacher of teachers» (Rogacheva, 2016).

In his many years of working first at the University of Chicago and then at Teacher's College of Columbia University Dewey tried to do his best to improve teachers' professional training. His Chicago summer-sessions for in-service teachers brought him popularity too. The content of his thought, his logic made a great impact on the listeners of Dewey and the readers of his writings.

The century that John Dewey lived in saw many events and people like Darwin's theory, the First World War, Russian Revolution, Trotsky, Lenin, the USSR, Charlie Chaplin, Picasso, Adolph Hitler, Winston Churchill, German concentration camps, William Faulkner, Ernest Hemingway etc. Dewey wrote about his own development:

upon the whole, the forces that have influenced me have come from persons and situations more than from books – not that I have not, I hope, learned a great deal from philosophical writings, but that what I have learned from them has been technical in comparison with what I have been forced to think upon and about because of some experience, in which I found myself entangled (Adams and Montague, 1930, p. 22).

The times of Makarenko also were dramatic. Makarenko lived his childhood, adolescence, and early adulthood in a period of political turmoil. Born in 1888 he faced great changes in Russia: The First World War and its negative impact on Russian population – a lot of killed and wounded, great number of homeless children, misery

and hunger. He faced October Revolution in 1917 being a well-educated person and played a great role in creation of Soviet school. He was interested in world educational legacy and studied it rethinking it originally. In 1922 Ukraine became a part of the Soviet Union. World War 1 and the civil war led to large numbers of orphans. Many of these so-called *besprizorniki* roamed the cities and countryside and made their living by begging, theft, robbery, or prostitution (Caroli, 1999, 2004).

One cannot but agree with Terje Halvorsen, a researcher from Norway that Anton Makarenko as well as John Dewey was heavily influenced by Hegelian philosophy. He often tried to transform opposites on one level into a synthesis on a higher level. The author states that Makarenko shared this dialectical way of reasoning with his contemporary, the prominent theorist and Hull House activist, John Dewey. Throughout his professional life Dewey endeavored to identify and transcend dichotomies. However, the intellectual kinship between Makarenko and Dewey goes further. In their texts on education and upbringing, they both deal with issues in aesthetics, epistemology, social philosophy, and philosophy of mind. Makarenko is often referred to as the John Dewey of the Soviet Union. Maxim Gorky, Makarenko's friend and literary mentor, was an acquaintance of Dewey, and, in fact, John Dewey visited the Soviet Union in 1928. In spite of this, Makarenko and Dewey never actually met (Halvorsen, 2014, p. 69).

3. Maxim Gorky in John Dewey and Anton Makarenko's lives

Very remarkable about Makarenko and Dewey seems their connection with Russian writer Maxim Gorky. In the chapter *Gorky Affair* Jay Martin – one of the Dewey biographers tells about Russian writer Maxim Gorky's arrival to America in order to generate support and raise money for revolutionaries fighting the czar and czarist injustices in Russia. New York and Chicago were at that time the centers of American socialism. When Gorky arrived in New York he was in the focus of attention of newspapermen. As Maxim Gorky declared to them «Columbus could not have been more anxious to discover America than I» (Martin, 2002, p. 239). His reception committee had planned a fine event for him on the evening of his arrival in the Fifth Avenue Club, where such New York luminaries as Mark Twain, William Dean Howells, and Finley Peter Dunne would meet him. But when Americans found out from newspapers in four days that Gorky came to United States with actress Andreeva but not with his wife who stayed in Russia with two children everything for Maxim Gorky went bad. The Americans «could accept and even applaud Gorky's revolutionary fervor; they could donate money to arm the revolutionaries; and they could support socialism-especially for Russians. But they could not accept flagrant breaches of conventional morality» (Martin, 2002, p. 239).

The reception by President Roosevelt in the White House was cancelled. The hotels in New York like Belleclare and Lafayette-Breevort closed the doors in front of him and Andreeva. Mark Twain did not come to meet Gorky again. Deserted by all Gorky had only one speech at Carnegie Hall and then left New York for Chicago where Jane Addams took them in. When he returned in May to New York and no hotel could receive Gorky it was John Dewey who invited Gorky and Madam Andreeva to his estate and greeted them warmly. His wife Alice and he himself never sacrificed

democratic principles. Dewey invited his students of Barnard College to listen to Madam Andreeva's lecture in French. This episode showed Dewey's openness and hospitality to other people, readiness to help in a difficult situation, his fearless nature though he could have different opinion and views.

For Anton Makarenko Gorky was a great friend. Makarenko's literary interest and fascination for the writings of Maxim Gorky played a great role in Makarenko's attitude to Gorky. In the aftermath of the Russian Revolution of 1917 Makarenko established self-supporting orphanages for street children including juvenile delinquent – left orphaned by the Russian Civil War of 1917-1923. In 1920, Makarenko was requested by the Ukraine authorities to undertake the directorship of a new institution for homeless and delinquent youth, the Poltava Labour Colony. He accepted the position and decided that the name of the institution should be changed to the Gorky Colony. The other establishment that appeared later was the «Dzerzhinsky» labor commune in Kharkov (Gorky, 1976).

Maxim Gorky became a patron of his Colony. He visited Makarenko very often and helped in organization. In the summer of 1928, Maxim Gorky came and stayed a few days. Afterwards he described Makarenko in high terms:

The organizer and man in charge of this colony is Anton Makarenko, undoubtedly a great teacher. The boys and girls in the colony clearly love him and talk about him in tones of such pride as if they themselves had created him (Gorky, 1976, p. 112).

In educational search of 1920-1930 Soviet school Makarenko is considered one of the most outstanding figures. Makarenko worked not in ordinary school but in institutions for homeless children. Most of them were juvenile delinquent, left orphaned. In spite of the difficulties and hardship, Makarenko managed to bring most of the juveniles away from a destructive trajectory. Gradually the young people participated in productive work, in education, and in organized leisure activities. The fields were utilized for food production under the guidance of a trained agronomist. They also built workshops and hired craftsmen to train the juveniles. Dismissed from his post in Gorky Colony in September 1928 Makarenko immediately undertook the directorship of another orphanage, the Dzerzhinsky Commune. The inmates participated in job training through productive work. The tasks were not of an agricultural kind as they had been in the Gorky colony. Initially the Dzerzhinsky Commune had three workshops, one for shoemaking, one for tailoring, and one for cabinetmaking. These units were led by highly qualified professionals.

After a few years, the work activities at the institution changed from craftsmanship to industrial production. First, a factory for the production of electric drills was built. Several engineers and highly skilled technicians were hired to organize the production and to train the juveniles in handling advanced instruments and machines. After a challenging start-up, the factory became a success. High quality drills were produced in large numbers and the juveniles expressed pride by becoming qualified workers. The next step in the industrial expansion at the Dzerzhinsky Commune was to build a factory for the production of photo cameras. The camera production became a success, both commercially and from an educational perspective.

In addition to covering expenses for wages, food, clothes, school material, leisure activities, and investments, it was possible to allocate scholarships to former inmates who had become students at universities or technical colleges.

As in the Gorky Colony, the juveniles in the Dzerzhinsky Commune were part time workers. Every day they attended a number of lessons and did homework. The institution had a ten-year mandatory school that all the inmates completed. In addition, there were several so-called «Worker Faculty» (*Rabfak*) classes available for the eldest juveniles. These were classes that prepared for higher education. Several detachments in the Dzerzhinsky Commune contained both juveniles and children. Here the eldest acted as caregivers, supervisors and role models. They also stood up for the younger ones in cases of bullying. Also at the Dzerzhinsky Commune the facilitating of cultural activities, sports, and travels was strongly prioritized. Makarenko negotiated a special agreement with the theatre in Kharkov which stated that professional actors would come to the Dzerzhinsky Commune to instruct drama activities, and that the Dzerzhinsky Commune got tickets to all productions at the theatre. Several bands were established. These were led by highly qualified musicians. The library held a large number of titles and was managed by a professional librarian. Sports grounds for bandy, volleyball and other team sports were built. During summer Makarenko and his colleagues organized journeys that gave the juveniles both recreation and new insights. The longest journey taken was a tour to Nizhny Novgorod, Volgograd, Sochi, Odessa, and Kiev. This tour lasted six weeks (Halvorsen, 2014).

Thanks to Gorky in 1925 Makarenko decided to write his *Pedagogical Poem* (*Pedagogicheskaya Poema*) with a special introduction, devoted to Maxim Gorky. Makarenko addressed him as a friend and a Teacher, expressing his devotion and love. The book was published only in March 1936. Maxim Gorky was interested in his publications and read his book *1930 Marsh* (*Marsh 1930 goda*) that was finished by Makarenko at the end of 1930. In this book he tried to present real events of Dzerzhinsky labor commune life starting from its foundation at the end of 1927 and till the end of 1930 giving real names and exact dates of events. Gorky did his best for the book to be published though it was not easy. For Makarenko it was very important as it stimulated his interests to reflect on his educational experience.

Makarenko also wrote the play about this institution *Major* (*Mazhor*). Firstly, he lost the manuscript but later he wrote it again in fall 1933 and presented it at the All-Union Theatrical Contest. He was among three winners out of 3000 participants. The plot reflects the collision of two cultures, interaction and development of both under the influence of all atmosphere of socio-cultural changes in the Soviet Russia. The collective of young people and old workers are shown as a new form of social-educational process. Makarenko could not see the publication of this play. It was not included in 7 volumes and 8 volumes of Makarenko's works. Only in 1993 it was published in Russian in Moscow as a small brochure (*Unknown Makarenko. Neizvestnij Makarenko*, 3rd edition by S. S. Nevskaya and others). Makarenko wrote several books, of which *The Pedagogical Poem* (Педагогическая поэма), a fictionalized story of the Gorky Colony, became especially popular in the USSR (Gehring, Bowers and Wright, 2005, p. 327).

Makarenko was active as a writer for several years before moving to Moscow. Most of his texts deal with pedagogical issues. However, he also wrote theatre scripts and screenplays. The most important educational texts are *The Road to Life*, *Flags on the Battlements*, *Problems of Soviet School Education*, and *A Book for Parents* (Makarenko, 1951, 2002, 2005a, 2005b). In 1937 publication of *A Book for Parents* Makarenko mentioned that it was written in cooperation with his wife Galina Makarenko. We should admit that there were very many positive reviews but negative ones were also seen in the paper of N. Storzhenko. In 1938 in a famous periodical «Sovetskaja Pedagogika» («Soviet Pedagogy», № 3) she blamed Makarenko for violation of party and state documents on school. But for John Dewey Makarenko looked great in his experimental work. In 1933 introducing after his trip to Soviet Russia in 1928 a film *The Road to Life* to American people Dewey said: «You will see an educational lesson of the power of freedom sympathy, work and play to redeem the juvenile delinquent; a lesson from which we too may learn» (Gehring, Bowers and Wright, 2005, p. 327).

As for Dewey he founded his Laboratory school at the university of Chicago thinking not only about his and colleagues' children and their education but also about educational renewal of the nation. But both educators tried to create such a developmental environment for upbringing and educating that could meet the interests of the children and help them to become thinking and creative personalities. One should stress that for Makarenko the aspect of upbringing was the most important one. Implementing his collective theory, he could achieve good effects as his school was based on close links with life. Makarenko could not only contribute to Labor school theory but organized his educative process in his colony so well that the famous FED cameras were produced in his Dzershinsky labour commune.

Though scientific legacy of John Dewey amounting to 1000 writings in different fields of science including about 190 items on pedagogy cannot be compared with some significant educational writings of Makarenko both were great practitioners as well.

Both Makarenko and Dewey thought of practical side of school curriculum. Dewey tried to find the correlation between theory and practice. He wanted to put a teacher in the position of a researcher and thanks to him a lot of interesting techniques were introduced to teacher training. His work *The Relation of Theory to Practice* serves as a vivid example of it. In this important article Dewey intended to substitute a traditional approach to teaching that he called «of the nature of apprenticeship» by a cardinaly new one. Dewey was right when he concluded that «practical work should be pursued primarily with reference to its reaction upon the professional pupil in making him thoughtful and alert student of education, rather than to help him get immediate proficiency» (Dewey, 1974, p. 320).

He writes: «we may propose to use practice work as an instrument in making real and vital theoretical instructions, the knowledge of subject matter and of principles of education. This is the laboratory point of view» (Dewey, 1974, p. 314). Different case – studies of educational problems of the classroom stimulated a trainee teacher to develop his reflective skills and to realize the problems of the concrete school students. The students saw how theory could be applied to practical task. It was different from traditional way of carrying on practical work «with the object of giving

teachers in training working command of the necessary tools of their profession, control of the techniques of class instruction and management; skill and proficiency in the work of teaching» (Dewey, 1974, p. 313).

Many findings of the American educator have significance today. Dewey worked in Teacher's College of Columbia University – the world Educational center and his graduates brought his ideas to many countries of the Globe and founded experimental schools based on his philosophy of education, occupied prestigious positions in educational spheres.

As for Anton Makarenko he was called «The Teacher of Soviet teachers» as he did a lot to organize a system of teacher training for a new Soviet school to improve technical skills of teachers, their thinking and their professional outlook and culture.

The Laboratory School founded by Dewey at the University of Chicago (1896-1904) was one of several progressive schools of that period. His educational philosophy, grown out of his experiment, seemed to be inspiring for many teachers because it met the demands of the changing society. This year we mark 125 years Anniversary of its foundation. In Special Collection of Regenstein Library at the University of Chicago one can see 143 items chronologically listed beginning from Dewey's letter of February 15th, 1894, optimistically viewing the opportunities in prospect at the University of Chicago. The archives give a chance to grasp the devotion of the scientist to his experiment and his reflection over it. Dewey's letter to president W. Harper about his friend G. H. Mead, who was his true and cooperative colleague at Lab School (dated April, 10th, 1894), his «Plan of Organization of the University Primary School» as well as the records of his Lab School, nice pictures of it in different periods of its existence and even the letter of Dewey of June 16th, 1904, after he angrily had resigned from the University and was about to leave for Columbia and New York – all the documents show the experience of the founder of the school, «his commitment to the idea that the concerns of education are really worthy of the most serious scholarship that university can provide»².

The Laboratory school even in Dewey's time was the phenomenon of international importance. Dewey's model of school – making emphasis on the learner, his/her needs, interests, abilities and limitations rather than on the lesson, task or subjects – was one of the main innovations at that period. His school aimed at educating a flexible, creative, thinking and cooperative pupil and not a passive person. Dewey's «mini-society» school called for democracy, cooperation, sharing, humaneness, mutual decision-making, the fellowship of occupation, and the interest of the pupils.

Addressing the parents of his students, Dewey said that the main aim of his school was to find out by trying, by doing, and not only by discussion and theorizing,

how much can be given to a child that is really worthwhile to get, in knowledge of the world around him, of the forces of the world, of historical and social growth, and in capacity to «express himself in a variety of artistic forms» (Dewey, 1896).

² See *Special collection*.

Dewey did not conceive of his school as a teacher training institute, though, and he didn't conceive of it as a psychology laboratory, either. He conceived of it as a philosophy laboratory. Dewey was not conducting curricular experiments or collecting data on mental development. He was trying out a theory. It was a theory as he said, of «the unity of knowledge» (Menand, 2001, p. 322).

In his Laboratory School Dewey tried to solve by experimentation the core problem of education – the problem of curriculum and focused his attention on manual occupations that were related to everyday life: «shop work with wood and tools; cooking and work with textiles (sewing and weaving)», with boys and girls engaged in all three.

With the aid of the teacher's questions and suggestions, the pupils «reinvented» the simplest tool for spinning wool; and so experiment and discovery went on till they understood the loom used at the present day. All the while they were learning a considerable amount of art and science and history. Many of Dewey's followers assumed that a subject-oriented curriculum in his experimental school was replaced with a new program consisting mainly of projects. Some of them – W. Kilpatrick and Y. Meriam – were sure that teaching «accidentally» they were exactly following Dewey. On the contrary, I agree with L. Tanner that Dewey's curriculum was not synonymous with projects. The curriculum had two dimensions: the child's side (activities) and the teacher's side (logically organized bodies of subject matter: chemistry, physics, biology, mathematics, history, language, literature, music and physical training) (Tanner, 1997).

Dewey was sure that to refer to a school subject mainly as a set of facts and principles, mastered through effort rather than interest, means to ignore child psychology. Dewey was correct when he said that taught in that way children would be unable to translate abstract knowledge into the concrete form demanded by practical life. Nor would they be able to deal later on with more complex concepts in the subject area. The theoretical basis for Dewey's curriculum was taking into account the distinction between a study as a logical whole and the same study considered as a psychological whole.

Relevant for contemporary teachers is Dewey's idea that something done should be something inherently significant, and of such a nature that the pupil appreciates for himself/herself that it is important enough to take a vital interest in it. «Learning by doing» was the principle proclaimed by Dewey as a reform of the methods of instruction. According to Dewey, every educative process should begin with doing something and the necessary training of sense perception, imagination, and judgment should grow out of the conditions and needs of what is being done. The child's impulses are an enormously important educational resource and a teacher should provide opportunities for children to be developed through engagement in activities. Dewey was far ahead of his time when he pointed out that a school subject is just a form of communication and artistic expression, and should not be referred to as something existing for its own sake.

Dewey's followers remarked, that

one of Dewey's curricular obsessions, for instance, was cooking. (Like all courses at the school including carpentry and sewing, cooking was coeducated).

The children cooked and served lunch once a week. The philosophical rationale is obvious enough: preparing a meal (as opposed to say, memorizing the multiplication table) is a goal-directed activity, it is a social activity and it is an activity continuous with life outside school, but Dewey incorporated into the practical business of making lunch arithmetic (weighing and measuring ingredients, with instruments the children made themselves), chemistry and physics (observing the process of combustion), biology (diet and digestion), geography (exploring the natural environment of the plants and animals), and soon. Cooking became the basis for most of the science taught in the school (Camp and Camp, 1936, p. 297).

The analysis of Dewey's main educational work «Experience and Education», written by the American educator in 1938, can give future teachers a good stimulus to discuss the following problems: «a child-centered» and «a curriculum-centered» school. It would be helpful for them to find oppositions, such as: «free activity – imposition from above»; «learning from texts and teachers» – «learning through experience»; acquisition of skills and techniques «as means of attaining ends which make direct vital appeal» – acquisition of them by drill; «making the most of the opportunities of present life» – «preparation for more or less remote future»; «acquaintance with a changing world» – «static aims and materials» (Dewey, 1938, p. 29).

4. Conclusion

Makarenko and Dewey's work can give a teacher an example of experimenting in a pioneering way with curricula, methods of teaching and organization. Dewey saw the main aim of his school in finding out by trying, by doing, and not only by discussion and theorizing «how much can be given to a child that is really worthwhile to get, in knowledge of the world around him, of the forces in the world, of historical and social growth, and in capacity to «express himself in a variety of artistic forms» (Dewey, 1896).

Makarenko was also trying to provide opportunities for his schoolchildren to express themselves, to develop not only practical skills but abilities to understand art and music, to learn to work in a collective respecting each other. John Dewey was trying to overcome a dogmatic habit of mind in students and future teachers as he believed in an experimental approach, that meant that all ideas and beliefs should be continually tested by practical application and revised on the basis of the results of such application. Being misunderstood by their interpreters some ideas of Dewey after implementation into practice brought some negative results. The overemphasis of the process aspect of teaching/learning and the under-emphasis of the content itself in some American schools during the early twentieth century led W. Bagley – the leader of essentialist movement – to criticize Dewey's theory. But nobody would deny that Dewey's ideas encouraged the thought, self-activity and creativity of the learners. Dewey's position is the understanding of these three elements – a child, a society and a school – as the «aspects of an organic whole. More to the point, Dewey inserts other concepts – growth, democracy and experience. These

concepts form the educational triumvirate. According to Dewey, the only way in which the child may come to know the meaning of objects, actions, or events is by participation in collective human practices. The hard core of the pragmatic paradigm in education is not sufficiently described in terms of its definition of the problem of education (in terms of coordination) and its definition of the process of education (in terms of reconstruction of experience). I agree with Gert Biesta, a philosopher and a Deweyan scholar that a third element of Dewey's paradigm is the theory of communication. Communication is considered by Dewey to be the process by which meaning is created. Thus he defines it as «the making of something in common». For Dewey the main characteristic of human interaction is the form of interaction in which the activities of the partakers are regulated by their ongoing interaction. Human interaction is a matter of cooperation and communication (the making of something in common); it is a practical matter, not only the exchange of linguistic tokens, but «establishment of cooperation in an activity in which there are partners, and in which the activity of each is modified and regulated by partnership», as he points out in his book *Experience and Nature* (Dewey, 1925/1981).

Dewey's idea of an educational process based on communication, his insistence that children understand a subject best if they experience it as a form of communication is very appealing to Makarenko too. The task for Dewey's philosophy of education was to comprehend and gather together the varied details of the world and of life into a single inclusive whole – to attain as unified, consistent, and complete an outlook upon experience as is possible on the macro, meso and micro societal levels. Both Dewey and Makarenko were sure that school should prepare a child to live in society. School should be based on communication of children of different age.

The processes of socialization and education, socio-cultural and educational phenomena should interact. Education as a constant reconstruction of experience (J. Dewey), school as real life (Makarenko), using educational potential of museums and art galleries – these ideas are still relevant in educational reform of XXI Century school. Russian educator Stanislav Shatsky, who called Dewey the best philosopher of school at the beginning of the XX century mentioned that future teachers should study Dewey's works very thoroughly. Dewey attracts the reader by his great ability to reflect over his own educational experience, over the vast number of well-analyzed facts. As for Makarenko, he is also open for future study. A Norwegian scholar A. Ronne wrote «The genius (charisma) of Makarenko is so great and his merits in history are so colossal that only new generation can estimate them». But what is very important for contemporary educators is not to revive the educational systems that both great pedagogues had created but to pay attention to scientific method of their thinking and acting while creating it. Then it could be possible to progress in the field of pedagogical renewal.

5. References

Adams G. P., & Montague W.P (Eds.). (1930). *Contemporary American Philosophy* (Vol. 2). NewYork: Macmillan.

- Brickman, W. W. (1949). John Dewey's Foreign Reputation as an Educator. *School and Society*, 70, 257-265.
- Camp, K., & Camp, A. (1936). *The Dewey School. The Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, 1896-1903*. New York, London, D. Appleton – Century.
- Caroli, D. (1999). Socialisme et protection sociale: une tautologie? L'enfance abandonnée en URSS (1917-1931). *Annales ESC*, 54(6), 1291-1316.
- Caroli, D. (2004). *L'enfance abandonnée et délinquante dans la Russie soviétique (1917-1937)*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Caroli, D. (2021). John Dewey, his Impressions of Soviet Russia, and the post-revolutionary educational system. In *Reinventing Education. Second international conference organized by Scuola democratica*. In press.
- Caskey, B. (1979). The Pedagogical Theories of A. S. Makarenko: A Comparative Analysis. *Comparative Education*, 15(3), 277–286.
- Dewey, J. (1896). The University School: Address before the Pedagogical Club (31 October 1896) University Record, vol.1, no.32, 6 November.
- Dewey J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. The Kappa Delta Pi Lecture Series. Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Dewey, J. (1974). *John Dewey on education. Selected writings*. University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1981) [1925]. Experience and Nature. In Boydston, J. A. (Ed.), *The later Works, 1925-1953. John Dewey* (Vol.1). Chicago.
- Dewey J. (2000). *Democracy and Education*. Russian Tr..Moscow, S.124.
- Dichek, N.B (2002). A.S. Makarenko i mirovaja pedagogika/Poltava, v.4, p. 2266-2274.
- Dodde N. L. (2000). The Netherlands. In Salimova, K., & Dodde, N.L. (Eds.), *International Handbook on History of Education// International Academy of Self-perfection* (p. 317). Orbita-M.
- Frolov, A.A. *A.S. Makarenko and the World: Historiography and elaboration of his heritage (1939-2005), Critical Analysis*, Nizhnj Novgorod, Volgo-Vyatskaja Academy, 2006, p.138).
- Gehring, T., Bowers, B., & Wright, R. (2005). Anton Makarenko: The John Dewey of the USSR. *The Journal of Correctional Education*, 56(4), 327-345.
- Gorky, M. (1976). Across the Soviet Union. In Kumarin, V. (Ed.), *Anton Makarenko. His life and his work in education* (p. 112). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

- Halvorsen, T. (2014). Key Pedagogic Thinkers: Anton Makarenko. *Journal of Pedagogic Development*, 4(2), 58-71.
- Makarenko A. S., Lektzii o vospitanii detej. *Izbrannije ped. soch.*, 2, 24-25.
- Martin, J. (2002). *The Education of John Dewey. A Biograpgy*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Menand, L. (2001). *The Metaphysical Club. Farrar, Straus and Girous*. New York.
- Рогачева Е.Ю [John Dewey: Educational experiments in the family and at school. Монограф]. Джон Дьюи: педагогические эксперименты в семье и школе. Монография, Мин-во образования и науки Рос.Федерации,Федер. гос. бюджетное образов. Учр. Высш. Проф. Образования «Владим.гос.ун-т им. А.Г. и Н.Г. Столетовых»-Владимир:Транзит-ИКС, 2015 г. Vladimir: Transit-IKS, 2015.
- Рогачева, Е.Ю. (2005). Педагогика Джона Дьюи в XX веке: кросс-культурный контекст [Rogacheva Y. John Dewey's Pedagogy in the XXth Century: cross-cultural context]. – Владимир. 333 с. ISBN 5-87846-461-6.
- Rogacheva, Y. (2016). The Reception of John Dewey's Democratic Concept of School in Different Countries of the World. *Espacio, Tiempo y Educación*, 3(2), 65-87.
- Special Collection*. University of Chicago, Regenstein Library, Laboratory Schools. Records. 1891-1986. Elementary School, 1898-1934 vol.1.1898, box1. Folder1; vol. II (1899-1900), box. 2. Folder1; vol. iii (1900-1901), box. 3. Folder1: pp. 1-639: July 10 The Plan of Organization of the University School. University Presidential Papers. Box30. Folder 23.
- Tanner, L. N. (1997). *Dewey's laboratory school: lessons for today*. New York: Teachers College Press.

página intencionadamente en blanco / page intentionally blank