



***Ideological Determinants of the Dialogical Relationship
Between Teacher and Student in Polish Schools
of the Stalinist Period (1948-1956)***
***Ideologiczne uwarunkowania relacji dialogicznej
nauczyciela i ucznia w szkole polskiej
okresu stalinowskiego (1948-1956)***

ABSTRACT

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE: The aim of this study is to analyze the ideological determinants of the dialogical relationship between teacher and student in the Polish school of the Stalinist period (1948-1956).

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM AND METHODS: The main research problem is to answer the question: what were the ideological conditions of the dialogical relationship in the schools of the Stalinist period? The method used was the analysis of selected source materials in accordance with the historical research procedure and the method of analysis and synthesis of the literature on the subject.

THE PROCESS OF ARGUMENTATION: The starting point for the discussion was to present the definition of dialogue, its boundary conditions as well as its basic functions. Subsequently, the political, social and educational conditions of dialogical relations in the Polish schools of the Stalinist period were discussed.

RESEARCH RESULTS: The ideological priorities of the Polish school during the Stalinist period stood in fundamental contradiction to the essence of pedagogical dialogue. By definition, this made it difficult or even impossible to realize the dialogical relationship and fulfil the basic functions of dialogue in the official school space.

CONCLUSIONS, INNOVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: The analysis proved that the idea of pedagogical dialogue and its function were in opposition to the ideological premises of the Stalinist school. The presented discussion can serve as an inspiration to broaden research on education to include the educational practice of the historical period in question. It can be assumed

Suggested citation: Król, J. (2022). Ideological Determinants of the Dialogical Relationship Between Teacher and Student in Polish Schools of the Stalinist Period (1948-1956). *Horizons of Education*, 21(60), 47-57. <https://doi.org/10.35765/hw.2022.2160.06>

with a high degree of probability that such a dialogue existed unofficially and was part of a strategy of survival and/or resistance to the school system.

→ **KEYWORDS:** DIALOGUE, TEACHER, STUDENT, SCHOOL, IDEOLOGY

STRESZCZENIE

CEL NAUKOWY: Celem naukowym opracowania jest analiza uwarunkowań ideologicznych relacji dialogicznej nauczyciela i ucznia w szkole polskiej okresu stalinowskiego (1948-1956).

PROBLEM I METODY BADAWCZE: Główny problem badawczy dotyczy odpowiedzi na pytanie: jakie były uwarunkowania ideologiczne relacji dialogicznej w szkole okresu stalinowskiego? Zastosowano metodę analizy wybranych materiałów źródłowych zgodnie z procedurą badań historycznych oraz metodę analizy i syntezy literatury przedmiotu.

PROCES WYWODU: Punktem wyjścia do zasadniczych rozważań było przedstawienie istoty dialogu, jego warunków brzegowych i podstawowych funkcji. Następnie omówiono ideologiczne uwarunkowania relacji dialogicznej w szkole polskiej okresu stalinowskiego.

WYNIKI ANALIZY BADAWCZEJ: Priorytety ideologiczne szkoły polskiej w okresie stalinowskim stały w zasadniczej sprzeczności z istotą dialogu pedagogicznego. Z założenia utrudniało to lub wręcz uniemożliwiało realizację relacji dialogicznej i spełnienia podstawowych funkcji dialogu w oficjalnej przestrzeni szkolnej.

WNIOSKI, INNOWACJE, REKOMENDACJE: Przeprowadzone analizy dowiodły zarówno opzycyjności idei dialogu pedagogicznego, jak i jego funkcji wobec założeń ideologicznych szkoły stalinowskiej. Przedstawiony wywód może stanowić inspirację do poszerzenia poszukiwań badawczych o praktykę edukacyjną omawianego okresu historycznego. Z dużą dozą prawdopodobieństwa można przyjąć, że nieoficjalnie taki dialog istniał i wpisywał się w strategię przetrwania i/lub oporu wobec systemu szkolnego.

→ **SŁOWA KLUCZOWE:** DIALOG, NAUCZYCIEL, UCZEŃ, SZKOŁA, IDEOLOGIA

Introduction

Dialogue is one of the key categories in the humanities and social sciences. The importance of dialogue, its meanings, conditions and barriers to it and, finally, its significance for personal development are discussed mainly in the fields of philosophy, anthropology, pedagogy, psychology and sociology. Indeed, dialogue is "a vital phenomenon at all levels of human life: social, cultural, cognitive, subjective" (Koć-Sieniuch, 2003, p. 692).

Over time, the definition of dialogue has broadened, and depending on the theoretical and pedagogical approach, there is a diversity of views on what dialogue is. Without going into detailed analysis, I can mention those theories that are most common in the field of pedagogical work, namely those by Joanna Rutkowiak (1992, pp. 28-44), Andrea Folkierska (1995, p. 164) and Janusz Tarnowski (1992, pp. 149-150). The definition of dialogue by the creator of personal-existential pedagogy, namely Father Professor J. Tarnowski, seems to be particularly relevant for this discussion. He considered dialogue as a method, process and social attitude, which are organized by four basic values: truth, freedom, good and love (Tarnowski, 1992, p. 149-150).

Depending on the educational-social space and the anthropological-educational concepts associated with it, the dialogue will be different, and sometimes there will be no dialogue at all, or it will take the form of para- or anti-dialogue.

Research methods

The purpose of this article is to analyze the ideological conditions of the dialogical relationship between teacher and student in the Polish school of the Stalinist period (1948-1956). The main research problem is the answer to the question: what were the ideological determinants of the dialogical relationship in the school of the Stalinist period? The research method was the analysis of selected source materials, including external and internal criticism. The analysis of sources was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the historical research procedure of establishing facts, classifying them, explaining them, discovering relationships between them, and generalizing them. Printed sources were used as the main sources, which were regarded chiefly as illustration for the conclusions formulated in the text. A supplementary research procedure was the method of analysis and synthesis of the literature on the subject. The findings which the literature contained provide a background for the argumentation. I want to point out that I do not analyze the issue of dialogical relationship in school practice, as this exceeds the scope of the article. This problem will be analyzed in a separate publication.

Structural and symbolic Sovietization of the Polish school between 1948 and 1956

After 1944, Poland found itself in the sphere of influence of the USSR, which meant a fundamental reconstruction of state and social structures. In fact, this meant the structural and symbolic Sovietization of Poland, which in effect led to the construction of a monocentric order with a single center of power and control and the subordination of all social processes to immediate political goals (Ossowski, 1983, pp. 81-83). The communist state's education priorities of favoring worker-peasant communities and strengthening vocational training soon translated into a structural change in the education system,

i.e. the introduction of an 11-year comprehensive school (Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1948). In a formal sense, the reduction in the number of years of schooling was a departure from the resolutions of the Educational Convention in Lodz in 1945 (Ministerstwo Oświaty, 1945, pp. 246-247), and in symbolic terms it meant a reduction in educational standards. The Stalinist period was, in essence, a domination of symbolic Sovietization, which was of particular importance in terms of the interests of the communist government, since its goal was to fundamentally change social consciousness. This process went down in history under the name "ideological offensive" (Hejnicka-Bezwińska, 1996, p. 49). The turning point was the meeting of the PPR Central Committee's Political Bureau in April 1947 and Stanisław Skrzyszewski's announcement of a draft educational reform. This document, although never published, carried enormous importance, as it actually defined the future trends of the state's educational policy. Indeed, it announced the transition "from the previous defensive position to a decisive and broad ideological offensive" (*Projekt rezolucji w sprawie szkolnictwa*, 1948, p. 27). The main target of the ideological offensive was culture in its broadest sense, including school education. The process of unifying knowledge, beliefs and views was intended to lead to the creation of a "new man" equipped with a scientific worldview and ready to fully realize the idea of socialist Poland.

Realization of the "new man" project as the focus of didactic and educational work

The creation of the new man soon became the fundamental goal of the communist authorities, and thus the principle organizing the didactic and educational work of Stalinist schools. This was postulated by Minister of Education Skrzyszewski:

[...] we must educate students in an atmosphere of a new morality based on socialist foundations, develop in them an ideological attitude, people's patriotism, and boundless love for people's [...] Poland [...] We must educate youth in an atmosphere of international solidarity of the working masses fighting for peace, democracy and progress; in an atmosphere of faithful friendship towards the USSR, the country of victorious socialism. We will mold in our students the people's will and character [...] conscious discipline [...] We will bring up Polish children in respect for work and social good (Skrzyszewski, 1948, pp. 34-38).

The basic qualities of the new man (Kairow, 1950, pp. 7-45; Radziwiłł, 1981, pp. 4-9, 22-24; Mazur, 2009, pp. 325-458) soon became the goals as well as the content of the new school curricula and textbooks. The rationale for this was a document that should be regarded as groundbreaking, namely the Ministry of Education's Guidelines for Authors of Curricula (*Wytyczne Ministerstwa Oświaty...*, 1948). This document, in fact, contained the notable and far-reaching words that Marxism-Leninism, as a victorious ideology, should be the philosophical, cognitive and methodological basis for curricula (*Wytyczne Ministerstwa Oświaty...*, 1948). This statement was soon repeated by Joseph Barbag at a convention of school inspectors in May 1949 (Barbag, 1949, p. 3).

According to him, the new educational content and textbooks should primarily serve to instill in students a materialist view of the world, a conviction of the superiority of socialism as a mature form of social system, an awareness of the division of the world into the progressive camp and the reactionary camp, and an active attitude in the struggle for a superior culture and morality (Barbag, 1949, p. 3).

Thus, education was reduced to two high-priority goals: the formation of a scientific worldview and the formation of socialist morality (Hejnicka-Bezwińska, 2015, p. 259). The authorities attached great importance to both of these issues, as only conscientious and fully effective fulfillment of those goals could guarantee the success of symbolic Sovietization.

Teacher and student as senders/receivers of the ideologization process: Implications for the dialogic relationship

With this in mind, the magnitude of the efforts that party policymakers made to properly prepare and guide the teaching staff is not surprising. It is significant that as early as 1947, then Minister of Education Stanisław Skrzyszewski announced “a battle for the soul of the teaching profession” (Kryńska & Mauersberg, 2003, p. 156). And this was not just a matter of adjusting their beliefs, but of a total reconstruction of the social consciousness of teachers, so that they would successfully act as an extension of the Party’s power in the school. Eustachy Kuroczko mentioned in 1947 that “the problem of raising the new man... is the most important task for us [...] it requires a mental reconstruction of the teacher, diverting him or her to a new track of thought and work” (Kuroczko, 1947, pp. 42-43).

Without going into detailed analysis at this point, it can be argued that the highest priority goals of personnel policy with regard to teachers during the Stalinist period included constant screening of the staff according to the criterion of social origin, political views and social attitudes; an extensive system of rewards and punishments that rewarded politically and socially active teachers and persecuted those who resisted or were insufficiently involved in building the new order (Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1949d; *Zarządzenie z 4.V.1950...*, 1950; *Zadania nadzoru pedagogicznego...*, 1953, p. 3).

These measures were accompanied by a system of educating and training teachers which was based on the paradigm of so-called “socialist pedagogy”. The goals, content, methods as well as forms of education in teacher training institutions were subordinated to this paradigm (Kryńska & Mauersberg, 2003, pp. 155-175; Grzybowski, 2013, pp. 141-151, 177-254; Kahl, 2008, pp. 49-78; Chmielewski, 2006, pp. 82-126, 161-178, 183-221). The process of reorienting or building a new social consciousness was further supported by ideological training and self-education. Obligatory ideological training was introduced in 1949 (*Instrukcja Ministra Oświaty...*, 1949), which in practice meant not only compulsory participation, but also taking exams (Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1950c). In order to accelerate the “crystallization of the teacher’s scientific worldview”

(Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1950c), it was even proposed that the outcomes of self-education be taken into account in the process of promoting teachers and of distributing privileges, such as free holidays or special bonuses (Kuroczko, 1952, p. 2).

Since the teacher was treated as both the recipient of ideological content and its sender, he or she was supervised in carrying out all his/her duties (Kryńska & Mauersberg, 2003, pp. 159, 165-168; Kahl, 2008, pp. 65-73; Grzybowski, 2013, pp. 218-227). In a Ministry's document from 1949, for example, we can read that "one of the most important tasks of the headmaster [...] of a school is the constant and planned supervision of work" and this includes "ensuring that the work of teachers is carried out according to the correct ideological and educational policy" (Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1949d).

Requirements for a proper ideological stance were also formulated for the other party in the educational process, the students. Minister Skrzyszewski made it clear in 1948 that the main goal of the school's activities was to raise "a man prepared to build and defend socialism" (Skrzyszewski, 1948, p. 32). Translated into practice, this was to mean conscientious absorption and internalization of educational content, participation in propaganda campaigns, vigilance against the class enemy, and activity in ideological organizations that operated on school grounds (Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1949b; Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1950a; Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1950b; Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1950c; Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1951a; *Uzasadnienie polityczne...*, 1954; *O wychowaniu uczniów...*, 1954).

Given these ideological premises, the question of a dialogical relationship in education is irrelevant. Following the statement of A. Folkierska, "Real dialogue is the opening of both parties to the conversation to a new experience. New experience is possible only when we ask" (Folkierska, 1995, p.164). Asking questions that can shatter the status quo always requires courage, independent judgment and, perhaps most importantly, the conviction that the other side of the dialogue is ready and open to being asked the question.

The essence of dialogue as well as its boundary conditions could therefore not be actualized during the Stalinist period. Freedom, authenticity and transgression of generally accepted beliefs, in other words, the constitutive features of dialogue, were a threat to the Party, as they would make a breach in the Center's monolith. One might also wonder about the side of the dialogue between teacher and student. Was it possible to speak of an unrestricted relationship, openness and mutual trust in a situation where the teacher, as the "right hand of the party," was intended to become a transmitter of ideological content, and the student a passive recipient of it? Locking the teacher into an ideological worldview, without permission for critical judgment condemned him or her to function in a social role that Robert Fudali described as heteronomous (2007, p. 109). From the point of view of the authorities, the teacher was like human material that could be molded and shaped to carry out the instructions and directives in the most effective way. The student, in turn, was also such a fully malleable material in the hands of the teacher. Both sides of a potential dialogue were thus inscribed in the axiom that was fundamental to the monocentric order, which was the belief in the full malleability of human nature.

The possibilities of building a dialogic relationship during the Stalinist period can also be viewed from the perspective of the function that this dialogue usually has to fulfill (Koć-Sieniuch, 2003, pp. 690-691; Winiarski, 2003, p. 695). I would just like to make the caveat that such a strict distinction of functions has been made for the purpose of this article, since it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between them in educational practice.

The basic functions of dialogue and their implementation in the Stalinist school

- **socialization function**

Socialization is generally understood as the introduction of a person into the world of social life: its norms, customs, symbols as well as the process of acquiring social roles. The function of dialogue in the fulfillment of the socialization function is to help both parties learn about and experience the diversity of life in the community and point out the possibilities of individual and social existence.

During the Stalinist period, there were only partial or caricatured forms of the socialization function. Although the student was introduced or even forced into social life, this world was deformed by propaganda. In the course of education, the student was given a ready-made vision of society and of him/herself in that society, and his/her only task was to conform. The primary intention of the political-educational authorities was "to mold the extrinsically steered (external) man, according to the simple principles of 'stimulus-reaction-reinforcement'" (Kozielecki, 1998, pp. 85-86).

- **cognitive function**

The precondition of pedagogical dialogue is mutual openness to knowledge, expansion of one's cognitive horizons as well as readiness to revise one's judgments. The process of forming knowledge in Stalinist Poland fundamentally contradicted the above possibility. With school curricula and textbooks being based on a Marxist-Leninist foundation, the students found themselves in the sphere of influence of depraved knowledge (Tyrowicz, 1970). The content of school curricula and recommended textbooks proves this. For example, one of the topics covered in the Polish language in grade 7 was to be "The struggle against superstition, obscurantism and backwardness, as well as criticism of the narrow-mindedness and conservatism of the nobility in the Stanislawski period" (Ministerstwo Oświaty, 1951); in history, "The Great Socialist October Revolution of 1917 and its watershed significance for the historical fate of the Polish nation" (Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1951b) and in the course on Poland and the modern world, "The working class as the leading force of the nation" (Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1951b). Textbooks and school readings, dominated by Soviet paperbacks or the works of so-called progressive authors, were used to teach these ideas (Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1949c; Ministerstwo Oświaty, 1951; Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw., 1951b).

It should also be emphasized that Marxism-Leninism offered a total vision of the world. Therefore, it excluded the possibility of asking questions and raising doubts since Marxism-Leninism, along with historical materialism, was considered “the only truly scientific theory of knowing, explaining and transforming the world” (Mauersberg & Walczak, 2005, p. 204).

- integrative and developmental function

An important function of dialogue is the integration of personality and concern for the comprehensive development of the student’s education. According to the texts disseminated at the time, the goal of all educational interactions was to form a well-rounded and harmonious personality. However, when we recall the previously mentioned qualities of the new man, it becomes clear that this was to be a personality strongly tailored for political purposes. There could be no question of a dialogical relationship with a view to the development of the student in a situation where the very principle of education was based on the rules of extreme behaviorism with an emphasis on the use of negative reinforcement (Kozielecki, 1998, p. 87). When we take into account one of the conditions for dialogue, which is to view each other holistically, it becomes obvious that it was simply impossible to fulfill this function.

- communication function

Communication is the essence and meaning of dialogue. Clarity of message, understanding, ability and readiness to listen largely determines the success or failure of a dialogic relationship. The same qualities should guide teacher-student communication. From the point of view of the 1948-1956 political-educational authorities, the quality of communication was equally important, since words were the basic means of the ideological offensive. And this very fact precluded the possibility of fulfilling the communication function in advance. In order to intensify the ideological message, the existing system of senses and meanings was abandoned, and replaced by the so-called “newspeak” (Głowiński, 1993, pp. 163-164). It was, inherently anti-communication, anti-communicative and value-laden. Language was used to organize the world, but according to the principle of opposition, i.e. us vs. them, enemy vs. friend, progressive vs. backwards. S. Skrzyszewski advised that “We must arouse vigilance in students against the enemy of the people’s state. We must demonstrate in a tangible way the superiority of socialist morality over capitalist morality” (Skrzyszewski, 1948, pp. 34-35). Newspeak, moreover, was ubiquitous, as it was used in the official space by all participants in the educational process. For example, to quote the words that the headmaster of one high school addressed to teachers: “Teachers as a group of educators must increase the political and social awareness of the area in which they work” (Protokół..., 1948). Students of another school were warned by the teachers “about the moral wretchedness and degeneracy of the imperialist oppressors and the enemies of the working people and of people fighting for world peace” (*Zarządzenie nr 30/1953...*, 1953).

The teacher, who according to the authorities played the role of a transmitter of ideological content, was expected to communicate it precisely in the language of newspeak thus closing off (in a theoretical sense) to himself and the student the chance for an open and constructive dialogical relationship.

Conclusions and recommendations

The above analysis of the ideological tenets of the Polish school during the Stalinist period leads to the conclusion that the nature of school education was anti-dialogical. The essence of the political changes after 1944 that intensified after 1948 was to create a fully ideologized individual, equipped with a scientific worldview and socialist morality. From the perspective of ideological premises, a potential dialogue between teacher and student was impossible, since socialist pedagogy did not provide for autonomy of judgment and freedom of expression. This also translated into the extent to which the functions of dialogue were realized. It was not possible to carry out the roles that could be fulfilled by pedagogical dialogue, and if there was any attempts to do so, it happened in a deformed form and was tailored to immediate political interests.

However, the discussion above refers to ideological presuppositions. With a high degree of probability, it can be said that pedagogical dialogue did occur in the practice of school life, which is confirmed by memoir materials. Knowledge of the realities of the years 1948-1956 suggests that the initiation of authentic dialogue may have resulted from the need for survival and/or resistance to the educational system, which is well-known phenomenon in the pedagogical literature (Bilińska-Suchanek, 2013).

REFERENCES

- Barbag, J. (1949). *Zagadnienia programów szkolnych i wyników nauczania*. Państwowe Zakłady Wydawnictw Szkolnych.
- Bilińska-Suchanek, E. (2013). *Nauczyciel i opór (wobec) systemu edukacji*. Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Chmielewski, W. (2006). *Kształcenie nauczycieli w okresie ideologizacji szkolnictwa (1944-1956)*. Wydawnictwo Neriton.
- Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw. (1948). Dziennik Urzędowy Ministerstwa Oświaty, 1948, nr 5, poz. 86. Instrukcja z dnia 4 maja 1948 r. w sprawie organizacji roku szkolnego 1948/1949 w szkolnictwie ogólnokształcącym.
- Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw. (1949a). Dziennik Urzędowy Ministerstwa Oświaty, 1949, nr 3, poz. 29. Okólnik nr 4 z dnia 18 lutego 1949 r. w sprawie Zespołów Młodzieżowych.
- Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw. (1949b). Dziennik Urzędowy Ministerstwa Oświaty, 1949, nr 4, poz. 56. Okólnik z dnia 3 marca 1949 r. w sprawie rekrutacji młodzieży do zakładów kształcenia nauczycieli i wychowawczyń przedszkoli.
- Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw. (1949c). Dziennik Urzędowy Ministerstwa Oświaty, 1949, nr 7, poz. 133. Komunikat w sprawie wykazu wydawnictw zatwierdzonych do użytku szkolnego.

- Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw. (1949d). Dziennik Urzędowy Ministerstwa Oświaty, 1949, nr 8, poz. 149. Instrukcja Ministra Oświaty z dnia 25 maja 1949 r. w sprawie pracy hospitacyjnej dyrektorów (kierowników) szkół.
- Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw. (1949e). Dziennik Urzędowy Ministerstwa Oświaty, 1949, nr 13, poz. 220. Okólnik z dnia 12 sierpnia 1949 r. w sprawie rozpoczęcia roku szkolnego 1949/50.
- Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw. (1950a). Dziennik Urzędowy Ministerstwa Oświaty, 1950, nr 7, poz. 111. Komunikat w sprawie organizacji szkolenia w szkolnych hufcach „SP”.
- Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw. (1950b). Dziennik Urzędowy Ministerstwa Oświaty, 1950, nr 20, poz. 285. Komunikat w sprawie pracy ZMP w szkołach.
- Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw. (1950c). Dziennik Urzędowy Ministerstwa Oświaty, 1950, nr 22, poz. 269. Komunikat w sprawie samokształcenia ideologicznego nauczycieli i pracowników administracji szkolnej.
- Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw. (1951a). Dziennik Urzędowy Ministerstwa Oświaty, 1951, nr 7, poz. 78. Zarządzenie Ministra Oświaty z 6 kwietnia 1951 w sprawie organizacji roku szkolnego 1951/52.
- Dz. Urz. Min. Ośw. (1951b). Dziennik Urzędowy Ministerstwa Oświaty, 1951, nr 11, poz. 135. Z instrukcji programowo-podręcznikowej Ministerstwa Oświaty na rok szkolny 1951/52.
- Folkierska, A. (1995). Kształcąca funkcja pytania. Perspektywa hermeneutyczna. In J. Rutkowiak (Ed.), *Odmiany myślenia o edukacji* (pp. 155-175). Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Fudali, R. (2007). Heteronomiczny charakter ról społecznych nauczycieli w warunkach ustroju totalitarnego w Polsce 1945-1989. *Przegląd Historyczno-Oświatowy*, 50(1-2), 97-109.
- Głowiński, M. (1993). Nowomowa. In J. Bartmiński (Ed.), *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej XX wieku*. T. 2 (pp. 163-172). Wiedza o Kulturze.
- Grzybowski, R. (2013). *Polityczne priorytety i elementy codzienności socjalistycznej szkoły. Wybór studiów poświęconych dziedzictwu edukacyjnemu PRL-u*. Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Hejnicka-Bezwińska, T. (1996). *Zarys historii wychowania (1944-1989) (oświata i pedagogika pomiędzy dwoma kryzysami)*. Część IV. Wydawnictwo Pedagogiczne ZNP.
- Hejnicka-Bezwińska, T. (2015). *Praktyka edukacyjna w warunkach zmiany kulturowej (w poszukiwaniu logiki zmian)*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Instrukcja Ministra Oświaty z 27.X.1949 r. w sprawie obowiązkowego szkolenia ideologicznego nauczycieli oraz pracowników pedagogicznych, administracji szkolnej w zakresie nauki o Polsce i świecie współczesnym, nauki o społeczeństwie i pedagogiki socjalistycznej*. (1949). Archiwum Państwowe Szczecin. KOSS, sygn. 2.
- Kahl, E. (2008). *Związkowe doskonalenie nauczycieli w Polsce (1944-1989)*. Uwarunkowania. *Przejawy. Konteksty*. Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Kairow, I. (Ed.). (1950). *Pedagogika*. T. 2. Nasza Księgarnia.
- Koć-Sieniuch, G. (2003). Dialog. In T. Pilch (Ed.), *Encyklopedia pedagogiczna XXI wieku*. T. 1 (pp. 688-693). Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”.
- Kozielecki, J. (1998). *Koncepcje psychologiczne człowieka*. Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”.
- Kryńska, E., & Mauersberg, S. (2003). *Indoktrynacja młodzieży szkolnej w Polsce w latach 1948-1956*. Trans Humana.
- Kuroczko, E. (1947). *O postawę społeczną nauczyciela*. Państwowe Zakłady Wydawnictw Szkolnych.
- Kuroczko, E. (1952). Perspektywy szkolenia ideologicznego nauczycieli. *Głos Nauczycielski*, 24, 2.
- Mauersberg, S., & Walczak, M. (2005). *Szkolnictwo polskie po drugiej wojnie światowej (1944-1956)*. Wydawnictwo Instytutu Technologii Eksploatacji.
- Mazur, M. (2009). *O człowieku tendencyjnym. Obraz nowego człowieka w propagandzie komunistycznej w Polsce i PRL-u 1944-1956*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Ministerstwo Oświaty (1945). *Ogólnopolski Zjazd Oświatowy w Łodzi, 18-22 czerwca 1945*. Państwowe Zakłady Wydawnictw Szkolnych.

- Ministerstwo Oświaty (1951). *Program nauki w 11-letniej szkole ogólnokształcącej*. Państwowe Zakłady Wydawnictw Szkolnych.
- O wychowaniu uczniów w karności i świadomej dyscyplinie. (1954). Archiwum Państwowe Szczecin. PWRN. Wydział Oświaty, sygn. 12267.
- Ossowski, S. (1983). *O osobliwościach nauk społecznych*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Projekt rezolucji w sprawie szkolnictwa*. (1948). Archiwum Akt Nowych. PPR KC, sygn. 295/XVII-8. Rezolucje Sekretariatu 1944-1948.
- Protokół z posiedzenia rady pedagogicznej z 20.XII.1948 r.* (1948). Archiwum Szkolne LO VI w Szczecinie.
- Radziwiłł, A. (1981). *Ideologia wychowawcza w Polsce w latach 1948-1956*. Niezależna Oficyna Wydawnicza „Nowa”.
- Rutkowiak, J. (1992). O dialogu edukacyjnym. Rusztowanie kategorialne. In J. Rutkowiak (Ed.), *Pytanie – dialog – wychowanie* (pp. 13-52). Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Skrzeszewski, S. (1948). *Podstawowe zadania oświatowe*. Państwowe Zakłady Wydawnictw Szkolnych.
- Tarnowski, J. (1992). Pedagogika dialogu. In B. Śliwerski (Ed.), *Edukacja alternatywna. Dylematy teorii i praktyki* (pp. 141-151). Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Tyrowicz, S. (1970). *Światło wiedzy zdeprawowanej. Idee niemieckiej socjologii i filozofii (1933-1945)*. Instytut Zachodni.
- Uzasadnienie polityczne wprowadzenia apeli w szkole i umieszczenie nauki religii na ostatnich lekcjach, 20.VIII.1954 r.* (1954). Archiwum Państwowe Szczecin. KW PZPR. Wydział Nauki i Oświaty, sygn.19.
- Winiarski, M. (2003). Dialog międzyludzki. In T. Pilch (Ed.), *Encyklopedia pedagogiczna XXI wieku. T. 1* (pp. 693-697). Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”.
- Wytyczne Ministerstwa Oświaty dla autorów prac programowych*. (1948). Archiwum Akt Nowych. Ministerstwo Oświaty. Departament Reformy Szkolnictwa. Tom 108/4.
- Zadania nadzoru pedagogicznego w świetle uchwał KW PZPR* (1953). Archiwum Państwowe Szczecin. PWRN, sygn.12385.
- Zarządzenie nr 30/1953 z 3.XI.1953 r.* (1953). Archiwum Państwowe Szczecin. I Liceum Ogólnokształcące, sygn. 8.
- Zarządzenie z 4.V.1950 r. w sprawie zatrudniania w szkolnictwie bez zgody MO osób zamieszczonych w wykazie zdyskwalifikowanych pracowników*. (1950). Archiwum Akt Nowych. Ministerstwo Oświaty, sygn. 517.

Copyright and License



This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution – NoDerivs (CC BY- ND 4.0) License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>