

Ewa Barnaś-Baran
ORCID: 0000-0001-8084-6150
University of Rzeszów, Rzeszów, Poland

The History of Education and Upbringing in the “Ruch Pedagogiczny” in the Years 1918–1939

Dzieje oświaty i wychowania na łamach
„Ruchu Pedagogicznego” w latach 1918-1939

ABSTRACT

The aim of this article is to present examples of upbringing and educational activities undertaken in the pedagogical past that were published in the *Ruch Pedagogiczny* [Pedagogical Movement] journal in the years 1918–1939. The method of the qualitative analysis of the source material was applied to the “Articles” section of selected issues of the journal published in the period under study.

It was found that *Ruch Pedagogiczny* published articles promoting upbringing and educational traditions which reminded the readers of the relationship between traditional and innovative approaches in the field of education. These articles described the changes to be introduced in elementary education and in teacher training at this level, and their aim was to encourage teachers to engage in professional self-development and to promote proactive, creative and patriotic attitudes. The history of education and upbringing was presented through the activities of individuals, schools and various institutions from Poland, Europe, and the world that were directly and indirectly connected with the education system and its reforms.

The beginning of the 20th century witnessed a growing interest in innovative trends in education and upbringing. As can be seen from the results of the analysis of the articles published in *Ruch Pedagogiczny*,

KEYWORDS:

Ruch Pedagogiczny [Pedagogical Movement] journal, history of reforms in education and upbringing, outstanding pedagogical figures, Galicia, Henryk Rowid

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE:

„Ruch Pedagogiczny”, dzieje reform wychowania i kształcenia, wybitne postaci pedagogów, Galicja, Rowid Henryk

SPI Vol. 22, 2019/4
ISSN 2450-5358
e-ISSN 2450-5366
DOI: 10.12775/SPI.2019.4.007
Submitted: 10.06.2019
Accepted: 02.12.2019

teachers' attention was drawn to the need to learn about pedagogical novelties, although the pedagogical past was not neglected. Attempts were made to demonstrate the achievements of outstanding figures from the history of education and upbringing and to recall examples from the past in order to encourage readers to actively participate in the changes. Knowledge of the latest trends in education and upbringing and knowledge of the pedagogical past were to contribute to the improvement of teachers' professional qualifications. *Ruch Pedagogiczny* can thus be seen as a source for studies on the history of schools and teacher training.

ABSTRAKT

Celem artykułu jest wskazanie, jakie przykłady działalności wychowawczej i oświatowej z przeszłości pedagogicznej przedstawiano czytelnikom czasopisma „Ruch Pedagogiczny” w latach 1918–1939. Przeanalizowano zawartość działu „Artykuły” w poszczególnych rocznikach czasopisma w badanym okresie. Zastosowano jakościową analizę materiału źródłowego.

Ustalono, że na łamach „Ruchu Pedagogicznego” zamieszczano artykuły ukazujące tradycje wychowawcze i oświatowe i przypomniano o związku, jaki zachodził pomiędzy tradycją a nowatorskimi założeniami w dziedzinie oświaty i wychowania. Treści tych artykułów dotyczyły zmian, jakie starano się wprowadzić w szkolnictwie elementarnym oraz przygotowaniu nauczycieli tej szkoły do pracy zawodowej. Zachęcano w ten sposób nauczycieli do samokształcenia, upowszechniano postawę twórczą, aktywną, działalność nacechowaną patriotyzmem. Problematyka dziejów wychowania i kształcenia obejmowała działalność osób, szkół, instytucji na ziemiach polskich, w Europie i świecie. Pisano również o postaciach, które nie były bezpośrednio związane ze szkolnictwem, ale swoją działalnością wspierały reformy kształcenia i wychowania.

Na początku XX wieku wzrosło zainteresowanie nowatorskimi prądami w kształceniu i wychowaniu. Jak wynika z dokonanych ustaleń, w „Ruchu Pedagogicznym” zwracano uwagę nauczycieli na potrzebę poznania nowinek pedagogicznych, ale nie zapomniano o przeszłości pedagogicznej. Starano się ukazywać osiągnięcia postaci z dziejów wychowania i kształcenia, rozbudzać potrzebę czynnego udziału w zmianach, odwołując się do przykładów z przeszłości. Zarówno znajomość najnowszych tendencji w kształceniu i wychowaniu, jak i wiedza z przeszłości pedagogicznej miały się przyczyniać do doskonalenia funkcjonowania nauczycieli w pracy zawodowej. „Ruch Pedagogiczny” może stanowić źródło do badań nad dziejami szkół i kształcenia nauczycieli.

Introduction

Since the 1880s, elementary schools in Galicia have been the subject of a growing number of heated discussions in the Sejm, in the press, and in newly established teachers' associations (Podgórska 1973: 73). Poland's political non-existence (resulting from its partitions), the teachers' obligation to follow a set of strict rules and regulations, and their frequent compulsory transfers between various institutions stifled teachers' attempts to fully engage in their professional activity, which negatively affected the search for new solutions in this area. The supporters of the reforms, especially those engaged in the innovative trend called New Education [*Nowe Wychowanie*], tried to change the contents and the methods of teaching that had been established and approved by the partitioning authorities, which had remained unchanged for many years. At the beginning of the 20th century, they not only noticed the necessity to introduce radical changes, especially in the grossly neglected area of elementary education, but were also aware that these changes could be implemented only by adequately prepared teachers, educators and carers. These very changes were to lead to the creation of a modern school model (Krochmalska-Gawrosińska 2011: 11). The new ideas spread in the Polish lands thanks to the involvement and even determination of individuals and groups. The efforts undertaken by national and democratic groups were strengthened by the following Galician pedagogical journals which joined the fight for the soul of the Polish teacher: *Szkoła* [*School*] (1868), *Muzeum* [*Museum*] (1884) and—published since 1912—*Ruch Pedagogiczny* [*Pedagogical Movement*] (Meissner 1995: 161; Meissner 1999: 49–50; Wałęga 2016: 256–257). Henryk Rowid, the editor of the monthly *Ruch Pedagogiczny*, wanted it to become an important carrier of the theory and practice of new methods of teaching and education, which—in the opinion of the next generations of educators—did indeed happen (Rowid 1912: 1; Łuczyńska 2000: 218; Ślęczka 2017: 89–90). The journal was published in Krakow from 1912 and in Warsaw from 1934, at the beginning as a supplement to the *Głos Nauczycielstwa Ludowego* [*The Voice of People's Teachers*] journal, and, since 1918, as an independent journal; it was not published during the First and Second World Wars. The journal was divided into several sections: scientific articles,

outlines of pedagogical literature and journals, reviews of pedagogical literature, information about magazines and journals, and a chronicle of important events, meetings, conventions, and pedagogical initiatives implemented in Poland and abroad. Its editors—Henryk Rowid (1912–1933), Benedykt Kubski, Marian Odrzywolski, Maria Kowalewska and Albin Jakiel (1937–1939)—made efforts to ensure the high quality of the magazine. The authors of the articles were outstanding representatives of pedagogy, psychology, philosophy, sociology and other sciences.

The first editor of *Ruch Pedagogiczny*, Henryk Rowid (1877–1944), a pedagogue and psychologist, wanted the journal to be a kind of forum allowing teachers and those interested in education to learn about the new ideas, theories and practices of the innovative solutions of New Education. According to Eugenia Podgórska, the theoretical basis for the education of elementary teachers and the functioning of a creative school which Rowid developed were born as “the antithesis of stagnation and a low level of pedagogical knowledge among teachers” (Podgórska 1973: 129). His journal addressed the issues of the theory of education based on philosophy and sociology, pedagogical psychology, didactic and methodological assumptions of the new school system in Poland, systemic and curriculum problems, as well as teacher training. It should be emphasised here that the openness of the editorial team and the authors to pedagogical novelties from the West did not prevent them from appreciating the achievements of past educational practices. The relationship between past traditions and contemporary achievements in the field of education and upbringing was definitely not forgotten. In the opinion of Danuta Koźmian, Rowid was one of the few representatives of the pedagogical community in the Second Republic of Poland who appreciated the role of the history of education and paid particular attention to the stages of constructing pedagogical theory and practice in the past (Koźmian 2000: 105). This opinion is confirmed by a statement made in 1922 by Rowid himself when he expressed his regret about the lack of continuity in the development of Polish educational traditions. In his opinion, the break with this continuity and the break with the pedagogical culture of Western countries contributed to the teachers’ lack of interest in educational problems and strengthened

their unwillingness to change anything in their professional lives (Rowid 1922: 1).

This paper presents examples of articles published in *Ruch Pedagogiczny* devoted to the history of education and upbringing, including the presentation of outstanding representatives of the educational field; their aim was to inspire teachers to take responsibility for their own professional development. The paper is of a historical and pedagogical character and is based on a qualitative analysis of the source materials, i.e. articles published in the *Ruch Pedagogiczny* journal in the section entitled “Articles” in the period between 1918 and 1939. Among all the articles published in this section during the analysed period, almost forty were connected with the history of education, and their length ranged from several to twenty pages. One quarter of them had a title which announced that it would be devoted to the past of education and pedagogical thought, while the remaining ones addressed this area while outlining the historical background of the contemporary changes. It should be noted that the first annals of the *Ruch Pedagogiczny*, published in 1912 and edited by Rowid and Helena Orsza, also included valuable studies on the development of pedagogical thought and the history of education.

Outstanding figures from the history of Polish education and upbringing presented in *Ruch Pedagogiczny*

The journal published biographical articles written after the death of one of its authors and to commemorate birth or death anniversaries of prominent figures in the field of education. These figures included Poles who played an important role in the history of elementary education, supported education among the lowest strata of society, educated children, initiated help for those in need, or prepared the ground for reforms in education in various periods, including priests, laymen, teachers, and people indirectly connected with education. In 1912 Aniela Szycówna observed that the reforms postulated by eminent educationalists had still not been implemented at the beginning of the 20th century (Szycówna 1912: 131). It can be assumed that the aim of this information was to encourage teachers to incorporate their guidelines in their own work.

The first editor of the journal hoped that the articles and other materials published in it would activate Galician teachers, encourage them to change their attitudes, and, above all, free them from the rigid limits of official regulations (Rowid 1912: 94). Mikołaj Orłow also noticed this problem: in 1926 he wrote that before World War I, teachers had been required to understand life in the ways described by a ministerial circular. Their task was to prepare students for life by keeping them away from it, which was exactly what the authorities did to teachers. In free Poland, such a policy should be abandoned (Orłow 1926: 97). Both the materials dealing with current events and the changes introduced in teaching, as well as those referring to the history of education and upbringing, activated the readers to move beyond the established patterns of teaching and the teacher-pupil relationship. The examples of pedagogical activity included not only successful endeavours but also pointed to difficulties and presented ways of coping with them, and the authors of the articles often provided personal commentaries on the issues they wrote about. The lives of people described in the journal demonstrated that introducing changes was not an easy task, and their positive effects were sometimes noticed only years later. Rowid, who was the author of the largest number of biographical articles, tried to bring the people he described closer to the readers and convince them of the need to look for new methods of pedagogical work. In his opinion, the successful development of education in the reborn Poland was noticeable not only in the growing network of schools but also in the widespread acknowledgement of the educational and upbringing accomplishments of the previous generations of educationalists (Rowid 1918: 3). In his opinion, upbringing issues were of interest to the most prominent thinkers throughout history (Rowid 1920a: 5). In the articles devoted to particular persons or to the ways of shaping creative attitudes in which these persons were mentioned, Rowid underlined the role the past generations had played in laying the foundations for contemporary changes. In 1920 he reminded the readers that the Polish pedagogical tradition was the heritage of Stanisław Konarski, Grzegorz Piramowicz, Ignacy Popławski, Stanisław Staszic, Hugon Koliątaj, Jędrzej Śniadecki, Bronisław Trentowski, Ewaryst Estkowski, Jan Władysław Dawid and many others. In his opinion, they were able to select the most valuable elements of the past

educational achievements and transplant them to Poland; by doing this, they showed us the path leading to the school of the future and to the reform of universal education (Rowid 1920c: 94–95). In 1930 Grzegorz Jampoler suggested that students should be taught the history of education and upbringing (Jampoler 1930: 149–155). He believed that they should not only learn about the facts connected with the lives and achievements of distinguished figures in this area, but also about how to evaluate their work and discuss the possibilities of implementing their timeless solutions in practice. Jampoler was convinced that the history of education could be taught from the position of a historian or a pedagogue. By providing facts from the history of education and upbringing, a historian helped students to understand life and the significance of the past of their nation and the whole civilised humanity. A pedagogue, however, should try to discover those facts from the past which could help him to properly fulfil his duties as an educator and a teacher of the young. The history of education based on carefully selected sources should be taught in a way that would enable students to gain greater independence in thinking and reasoning. In Jampoler's opinion, teaching the history of educational institutions should focus on the period between 1750 and 1850 (Jampoler 1930: 150, 155).

From the very beginning of the magazine's existence, even in the period before Poland regained independence, *Ruch Pedagogiczny* emphasised the need to remember and to continue the work undertaken by eminent figures engaged in introducing the reforms in Poland in the 18th century. In 1912 the 100th anniversary of the death of Hugo Kołłątaj (1750–1812), a reformer of education and upbringing and a collaborator of the Commission of National Education, was commemorated through the publication of a selection of sentences from his works and letters. At the beginning of the 20th century, the journal reminded its readers that Kołłątaj defined a truly poor person as someone who was not granted the right to education. The excerpts from Kołłątaj's writings revealed his belief that everybody's right to education and adequate teacher training, including the opportunities for teachers' further professional development, were necessary for the proper functioning of the whole nation (“Myśli Hugona Kołłątaja...” 1912: 26, 29).

As can be noticed from the analysis of the selected articles from *Ruch Pedagogiczny*, the majority of biographies presented there were highly positive; however, this does not mean that no critical remarks were made. In 1912 the readers learnt about Maria Laskowiczówna's negative response to the presentation devoted to Father Piotr Skarga (1536–1612). Laskowiczówna was the organiser of Polish education in the Lida area and a teacher of the Polish language, history, and pedagogy in private schools in Warsaw. She attended the Teachers' Union meeting in Warsaw during which Henryk Bolcewicz rightly presented Skarga as an outstanding 16th-century preacher and prose writer, a Christian sensitive to the misery of human beings, and an organiser of help for the poor. Her opinion, published in the journal, included a statement that she disagreed with Skarga's view that only a Catholic could be a good Pole, and she also criticised his impact on young people (Laskowiczówna 1912: 156).

After 1918, articles referring to the history of education and up-bringing were also published. In 1920 Rowid, commemorating the centenary of the birth of Ewayst Estkowski (1820–1856), wrote about the importance of his views for the development of national educational thought (Rowid 1920b: 177). In 1924 the journal reported several initiatives undertaken to commemorate Estkowski, including the erection of his monument or the activities of the E. Estkowski Pedagogical Society ("Kronika Pedagogiczna" 1924: 48). Rowid appreciated his role in popularising the achievements of Grzegorz Piramowicz, Bronisław Trentowski, Karol Libelt, and August Cieszkowski, as well as his struggle to increase the significance of elementary schools (Rowid 1920b: 167, 169, 171). He emphasised the timeliness of the curriculum developed by Estkowski for elementary schools, his teaching methods, and his practical pedagogical guidelines for teachers. In his article, Rowid also included a negative assessment of the way in which the issue of the development of Polish pedagogical thought was taught in teacher seminars at the beginning of the 20th century. In his opinion, the guidelines and methods developed by Estkowski seventy years previously were still not known to teachers (Rowid 1920b: 172, 173).

Ruch Pedagogiczny published "in memoriam" articles devoted to people who had initiated pedagogical research and improved research methods used to obtain information about teachers, students,

teaching and upbringing, including Jan Władysław Dawid, Aniela Szycówna and Józefa Joteyko. In his article devoted to Dawid (1859–1914), who had greatly contributed to the development of research on teachers, Rowid stressed that examples of his invaluable contributions included a definition of an ideal teacher, a model of teacher training, and tools and guidelines aimed at collecting and applying information about students. In his opinion, it was necessary to remember the Master's exceptional personality and his willingness and abilities to help teachers who needed such help (Rowid 1914: 1; Michalska 1995: 7–13). After the death of Szycówna (1864–1921), a continuator of the research trend initiated by Dawid, Rowid wrote that an outstanding teacher, scientist, and pedagogical author had died (Rowid 1921: 4; Michalski 2014: 37–43). Her cooperation with *Ruch Pedagogiczny* was extremely valuable, as were her attempts to popularise information about world pedagogical research in Poland, to represent Polish science at international forums, to initiate scientific research in Poland, to promote its results, and to invite Polish teachers to cooperate with her. Rowid described her as “a guardian of the national spirit in times of enslavement,” noting that she also actively participated in the development of the new pedagogy after the rebirth of Poland. She was one of the persons teaching at holiday courses for teachers in Zakopane (Rowid 1921: 4). In 1928 Maria Grzegorzewska wrote an article about another outstanding figure—the psychologist, educator and physiologist, Józefa Joteyko (1866–1928). According to her, Joteyko possessed the precious skill of using her extensive knowledge on a human being both in her scientific research and in applying her findings in practice. Her outstanding achievements and international fame made her one of the most eminent representatives of Polish science (Grzegorzewska 1928: 129–136). After her death, *Ruch Pedagogiczny* informed its readers that commemorative celebrations devoted to her had been attended by numerous representatives of the teaching profession (“Kronika Pedagogiczna” 1928: 160, 316; 1929: 29).

Ruch Pedagogiczny also published biographical articles depicting the involvement of important Poles in educational matters. They were not teachers or people directly connected with the education system but those who had fought to introduce changes in the education and upbringing of Polish children throughout history. In 1928

Anna Brossowa reminded the readers of Tadeusz Kościuszko (1746–1817), a pupil of the Nobles' Academy of the Corps of Cadets of His Royal Majesty and the Commonwealth [Akademia Szlachecka Korpusu Kadetów Jego Królewskiej Mości i Rzeczypospolitej, in short: Szkoła Rycerska] in Warsaw. She emphasised how important it was for him to convince Poles of the need for education; he also tried to achieve it in practical terms by establishing schools (Brossowa 1928: 227). Brossowa reported that in his will of 2nd April 1817, Kościuszko abolished serfdom in his estate of Sieciechowice and obliged peasants to fight for schools and the right for universal education (Brossowa 1928: 230). Kościuszko's beliefs were heavily influenced by Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, whom he met during his stay in Paris in 1802 and whom he visited in Solothurn in April 1816 and in Yverdon-les-Bains a month later. During his visits, he even examined several pupils himself. As Brossowa pointed out, they discussed various pedagogical issues in depth, as Kościuszko hoped to establish a similar institution in Poland. The journal also discussed Stefan Żeromski's (1864–1925) involvement in the fight for the Polish school during the partitions of Poland. Jan Hulewicz observed that Żeromski's writings reveal his particular interest in the school (Hulewicz 1929: 131); he was aware of the problems faced by teachers and pupils and described them in his works, and he himself was actively involved in the educational work in the Lublin region (Hulewicz 1929: 131). In 1934, to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the death of Stanisław Jachowicz (1796–1857), his life and work were outlined by Jan Muszkowski, who believed that this distinguished 19th-century teacher was ahead of his time (Muszkowski 1933/34: 97–103) and set an example through his readiness to organise help for poor children, his pedagogical attitude, and his belief that students should not only read literary works but also evaluate them. As a member of the Warsaw Charitable Society [Warszawskie Towarzystwo Dobroczynności], a guardian in a school for boys, and—from 1844—the superior of the orphan section, he searched for all possible ways to release children from poverty, and, as Muszkowski pointed out, throughout his entire life he himself struggled with a lack of financial resources to support his family (Muszkowski 1933/34: 97–98, 101–103). Muszkowski appreciated the significance of Jachowicz's initiative to publish *Dziennik dla dzieci* [*Children's Daily*], which published information on

current social and political events, popularised reading journal among children, encouraged readers and students to reflect, and developed in them the need for a committed life (Muszkowski 1933/34: 103). The following year, to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Bronisław Trentowski's death (1808–1869), Rowid wrote an article devoted to this creator of the original Polish pedagogical system. He observed that the sources of Trentowski's pedagogical convictions stemmed from his deep patriotism, and reminded the readers how much he appreciated the work of elementary schools teachers (Rowid 1934/5: 338). He was of the opinion that a universal, uniform and compulsory school should be supervised by properly prepared inspectors, and that teachers and priests should set an example of proper conduct in the community.

The legacy of the representatives of European thought and pedagogical practice in *Ruch Pedagogiczny*

Ruch Pedagogiczny documented and discussed the achievements of outstanding representatives of global and European pedagogical thought and practice. In 1912, to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the birth of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778), the creator of the concept of natural education, the quotations summarising his main pedagogical assumptions were published in one of the issues of the journal. The article quoted Rousseau's main motto which negated the 18th-century assumptions underlying the theory and practice of education and upbringing (Rousseau 1912: 131) and his postulates to allow children to act, to learn, to experience, and to discover things which helped them behave appropriately. In the following years, the journal informed its readers about the initiatives of the Rousseau Institute in Geneva, founded in 1912, which implemented Rousseau's recommendations in a creative way ("Kronika Pedagogiczna" 1921: 45–46).

At the end of the 1920s, Dr Wanda Bobkowska wrote an article about the life and work of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746–1827), in which she informed the readers that he had developed the theoretical basis for early school education in the early 19th century and listed new objectives for elementary schools. She quoted his view that upbringing was the search for ways that would encourage

people—heavily inclined to choose comfort and pleasure—to perform their social duties and become valuable members of society and citizens of their homeland (Bobkowska 1927: 65). She observed that his achievements were worth popularising because he lived and worked in the period that resembled the second decade of the 20th century, so it was possible to benefit from his experiences. The behaviour of a mother who subordinates herself to a child should serve as a model for teacher-student interactions, as opposed to interactions in which a teacher subordinates a child and the methods of teaching to himself (Bobkowska 1927: 67). She emphasised the relationship between Pestalozzi's views and pedagogical trends prevalent in the 20th century. In her opinion, his attitude could serve as a model of all the values that were expected of Polish teachers in the Second Republic (Bobkowska 1927: 70). The same issue of *Ruch Pedagogiczny* also informed the readers about celebrations for the 100th anniversary of the death of this outstanding pedagogue (“Kronika Pedagogiczna” 1927: 191).

In the 1930s, the readers of *Ruch Pedagogiczny* were still encouraged—by the examples from the pedagogical past—to be courageous in implementing the postulates of democracy, individualisation, and a child-centred approach. First in 1928 and then in 1931, Mikołaj Orłow wrote about Socrates (469–399 BC), his teachings and the way in which he stimulated listeners to think. In his opinion, Socrates' ingenious intuition should be used in teaching people not only how to think, but also how to act in accordance with their knowledge. In his opinion, Socrates introduced the methods of creative work which were further developed by the representatives of New Education (Orłow 1928: 168; Orłow 1931b: 49–50). In his next three articles, Orłow argued that Socrates shaped the civil and moral will (Orłow 1931a: 7), and compared his activity to filling in the framework of democracy (Orłow 1931c: 103). He compared the trial of Socrates and his death sentence to the trial of the creative school (Orłow 1931d: 157). According to Sergiusz Hessen, Leo Tolstoy (1828–1910) occupies a special position in the history of education and upbringing (Hessen 1935/36: 105). Tolstoy, a representative of an extreme approach to individualism, started with negating pedagogical tradition and all theoretical pedagogy, which allowed him to lay the foundations for the positive principles of the new pedagogy

(Hessen 1935/36: 114). Tolstoy was a supporter of Rousseau, but for him it was not enough to write a treatise on the nature of education: he put his pedagogical theory into practice and opened a school for peasant children in Yasnaya Polyana. Count Tolstoy's attitude, described by Hessen as "going out to peasants," was, in his opinion, an extremely rare phenomenon in pedagogical practice (Hessen 1935/36: 106).

Development of elementary education and teacher training

In 1912, when writing about the development of elementary education in the 18th and 19th centuries, Helena Orsza observed that the study of the teaching and upbringing tradition was necessary for the development of pedagogical creativity in the 20th century. It was not only the laws, regulations and formal guidelines organising the school life that had to be learnt, but it was also essential to study the relationship between the school and the life of the nation and the changes that took place in education under the influence of the transformations within social life (Orsza 1912a: 5). She concluded her reflections on the functioning of parish schools before and after the reforms introduced by the Commission of National Education with the statement that the development of schools in the 18th century was hindered by their dependence on "the benevolence of the squire and the parson" (Orsza 1912a: 9). However, in her opinion, the history of elementary education at the beginning of the 19th century demonstrated that even in the most conservative parts of the Polish lands there were squires who understood the need to educate peasant children, for example, G. Piramowicz, H. Kollątaj, and Prince Adam Czartoryski (Orsza 1912b: 75). She appealed to historians of education to write about people who contributed to the creation and functioning of schools (Orsza 1912c: 146). In 1933 Dr Józef Bero wrote an article describing the education received by Marek and John Sobieski, in which he acknowledged the role their elementary education played in their future lives. He emphasised the fact that Jakub Sobieski, the father of King John, valued historical studies the most, and that the attitude of his sons was formed by chivalric traditions, the Nowodworski College, the Jagiellonian University, as well as their travels and historical studies (Bero 1933: 11–12).

Ruch Pedagogiczny celebrated important anniversaries related to the history of elementary schools. In 1923, in order to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the Commission of National Education, Henryk Rowid published an article devoted to this important institution in which he suggested creating “monuments” honouring significant achievements of this educational institution. These “monuments” could include educational foundations whose resources would help schools, students, and future teachers. He also suggested developing school regulations guided by the “spirit of the creators of national education,” i.e. the Commission of National Education (Rowid 1923: 130), and observed that adequate preparation of inspectors controlling both teachers and schools, advocated by the Commission, was still valid. The Commission of National Education wanted this person to be an inspector-pedagogue, not an inspector-official “acting mainly as a controller, wanting to catch a teacher, entering the classroom unannounced, unceasingly suspicious” (Rowid 1923: 131). Moral teaching was to be based on carefully selected texts from the history of a country, and students were to learn from them facts about the deeds of individuals and societies in a way they were able to understand. The events and opinions at first considered right but which later turned out wrong should not be overlooked (Rowid 1923: 137–139). To commemorate 160th anniversary of the establishment of the Commission of National Education, Dr Stefan Truchim wrote a text about the history of education in the years 1773–1933 in which he criticised the activities of the ex-Jesuits and emphasised the positive role played in the educational area by the Piarists. He observed that it was only after 160 years that the Act on the education system and the Act on private education of 11th March 1932 were passed, but, in his opinion, it was still a great achievement. He believed that the difficulties faced by the creators of the 1932 reform were comparable to those faced by educationalists in the 18th century (Truchim 1933: 18).

The journal also published articles summarising the achievements of contemporary teacher education. In 1923 one of them outlined the history of university-level courses for Polish teachers conducted during summer holidays (in July and August) in Zakopane for the previous 20 years. They lasted 4–5 weeks and extended teachers’ knowledge on philosophy, psychology, pedagogy, natural sciences, history, literature, economics and social sciences. The first course, which began on 21st July

1913, was attended by 161 participants, including 56 male teachers and 105 female teachers from Galicia, the Kingdom of Poland, Lithuania, and Silesia, as well as several teachers from Bukovina, Livonia and Bessarabia (no one from the Poznań district). During the next 10 years, nine more courses were conducted: six in Zakopane and three in Puck. The lectures were accompanied by sightseeing tours (“Dzie-sięciolecie...” 1923: 180). In 1928 Rowid once again wrote about the necessity to reform the teacher training system. Summarising the ten-year period of the teachers’ work in the Second Republic of Poland and looking at it from a historical perspective, he concluded that it was one of the most important social issues of its time. He underlined that the reform was a historical necessity resulting from the development of society. In his opinion, one of its main aims was to entrust teacher education to universities (Rowid 1928: 291–297).

As already mentioned, the journal published texts which, while referring to the events from the history of education and upbringing, at the same time described current activities and inspired the professional self-development of teachers. In her article about the pedagogical system of the Swiss pedagogue Philipp von Fellenberg (1771–1844), Maria Papierman concluded that its foundations served as the basis for the creation of numerous educational institutions in the second half of the 19th century and could still be used as the basis for the functioning of a modern school. She observed that, despite the fact that the institution founded by von Fellenberg in 1808 collapsed shortly after his death, his educational and upbringing methods still found followers in many other schools and establishments throughout Europe forty years later. The timeless value of his assumptions can be seen in the creation of a community of teachers and pupils and in the emphasis on aesthetic, moral, and religious education in upbringing (Papierman 1938/39: 30–31).

Innovative working methods in schools and educational institutions and their historical references

In the years 1918–1939, the articles published in the *Ruch Pedagogiczny* journal were mostly devoted to the development of innovative ideas of the New Education trend. From the perspective of the passing years, the authors recalled its beginnings and the first

attempts to implement new teaching methods in schools, and summed up the achievements of those individuals and institutions who undertook the effort to introduce innovative solutions in their work. They highlighted the idea of an individual approach to students, the assumptions of which had been formulated in previous centuries, and observed that the paedocentric attitude and individualisation of teaching were common denominators of new teaching methods (*Sekreta* 1929: 321). When presenting the views of John Dewey (1859–1952), a philosopher and pedagogue and an outstanding creator of American pragmatism, Józef Chałasiński wrote that they included postulates of the centuries-long struggle of progressive pedagogues to root out all the techniques resembling animal training from teaching because they were unpedagogical and ineffective. He reminded the readers that the educational role played by work was known in the history of education, and that Dewey treated work not as a purely mechanical process leading to a material product, but as something creative and constructive (Chałasiński 1927: 18). Other authors wrote that vocational education and the need to prepare students to earn a living had also been advocated in the previous centuries. They paid attention to the need to prepare new curricula for schools of work which would take into account the social history of man and changes in culture, and, above all, which would be aimed at developing students' interests (“Szkola pracy...” 1920: 34; “Idea...” 1921: 34). References to the past and the history of schools were used as the basis for comparing their functioning in the past and in the present. For example, it was observed that the financial situation of schools had not improved for many decades. In 1926 one of the authors stated that modern schools enjoyed dynamic development in England, France, the United States, Germany, and Switzerland, where they were usually located in magnificent buildings, surrounded by parks, gardens and school playgrounds. In Poland, however, they were sometimes placed “in rented houses looking like barracks—in basements, in the middle of big factory towns.” The author added that such a situation had been taking place for many centuries and to a great extent referred to educational institutions introducing innovative methods of teaching, giving the example of the school of work in Łódź, which had existed since 1923 and was managed by Romuald Petrykowski (“Polskie szkoły...” 1926: 290, 295).

The journal did not forget about practical training. Its readers were informed of the achievements of Ovide Decroly (1871–1932), a Belgian psychiatrist, psychologist and pedagogue. Zdzisław Danecki wrote that, among the numerous attempts to introduce reforms of elementary education, Decroly’s method occupied a prominent place and enjoyed quite a lot of interest in Poland. His idea of preparation for life through life offered an opportunity for comprehensive development. Danecki observed that the idea that a school should prepare its students for life had appeared in the history of education before. He believed that it was wrong to cut oneself off from history, especially when the conservative mode of education stood in the way of adapting the school to the changing conditions of a given period (Danecki 1930a: 147–148). In another article, he criticised underestimating the value of physical workers prevalent in Poland at the beginning of the 20th century, which resulted in a lack of interest in practical occupations and—in his opinion—“bordered on contempt towards physical workers” (Danecki 1930b: 265). In his opinion, the views of those he described as “people working in intellectual professions,” who disrespected those who earned their living as physical workers, consolidated over the years. As a result, parents sent their children to high schools for fear that only less talented children went to vocational schools (Danecki 1930b: 265).

The examples of innovative solutions were provided to encourage teachers to implement them in their work. In her article on project-based learning, Dr Zofia Bastgenówna referred to the recent past, i.e. the 1920s, in American education in which new methods of teaching were developed on the basis of Dewey’s idea of “purposeful activity.” She observed that pedagogical practices in America were revolutionised after Dewey’s discovery that children could carry out difficult tasks that require a lot of effort if they are aware of the purpose of what they were doing. She gave the example of a project carried out by 18 teachers in a Polish school over a period of 4 weeks, the aim of which was to decorate a classroom. She summed up her statement with the beautiful statement that “freedom, liberty is the power to do the things you have to do” (Bastgenówna 1930: 272, 274).

Summary

Ruch Pedagogiczny, published since 1912, was a journal devoted to the promotion of new trends in education and upbringing. The analysis of some of its articles from the period 1918–1939 has revealed that it also contained contents devoted to the history of education and upbringing, which primarily focused on the theory and practice of teaching in elementary schools. It should be noted here that the journal strongly emphasised the relationship between the educational achievements of the time and traditions in the field of education and upbringing. In the opinion of the long-time editor of *Ruch Pedagogiczny*, Henryk Rowid, the formation of the pedagogical culture of teachers in the Second Republic of Poland should not take place in isolation from the experiences of the past. He suggested including knowledge of the history of education and upbringing in teacher training, as teachers should not only be familiar with historical issues within broadly understood education, but also, thanks to their understanding, should be able to apply them in their pedagogical work. Between 1912 and 1939, more than forty articles were published in *Ruch Pedagogiczny* in which the authors presented the achievements of previous generations in the field of education and upbringing viewed from pedagogical, psychological and philosophical perspectives. The articles were written by teachers and educational activists who were actively engaged in pedagogical work and in the reform of education and upbringing. They outlined the achievements of outstanding representatives of Polish, European, and world pedagogy working in the area of education, upbringing and care from antiquity to the present day. This group also included those who were indirectly connected with the pedagogical profession but whose activities were important for the functioning of schools and educational institutions. The historical background of the reforms at that time, their implementation, and the difficulties experienced in this process in the past were also outlined. Teachers were advised to refer to successful solutions, models and experiences from the past and encouraged to introduce innovative solutions in their educational work, just as teachers from previous generations had. The presentation of the history of education and of its accomplishments and difficulties served as a basis for emphasising the

continuity of Polish pedagogical culture (“W dwudziestolecie Ruchu Pedagogicznego” 1932: 1; Mieszalski 2012: 6; Radziejewicz-Winnicki 2012: 12). Teachers were invited to follow positive examples and draw conclusions from mistakes made in the past.

Most articles devoted to pedagogical history were written by the editor of the journal, Henryk Rowid, and the other authors included Helena Orsza, Wanda Bobkowska, Anna Brossowa, Sergiusz Hessen, Maria Grzegorzewska, Jan Muszkowski, Aniela Szycówna, Jan Hulewicz, Maria Laskowiczówna, Zdzisław Danecki, Józef Chałasiński, and Maria Papierman. They emphasised the timeless dimension of their pedagogical postulates, and the message that these achievements could be used by the next generations was clear. The life and work of the educationalists described in the articles served as a basis for professional reflection, a point of reference for the evaluation of one’s own situation and comparison with the lives of the pioneers of change. It can be concluded that the *Ruch Pedagogiczny* journal successfully performed the task described by Stanisław Łempicki in the following words: “from the past we should take that which might become the leaven of the future” (Łempicki 1936: 1024).

Bibliography

- Bastgenówna Z. (1930). “Metoda projektów,” *Ruch Pedagogiczny* (hereinafter: *RP*), no. 6, pp. 268–274.
- Bero J. (1933). “Edukacja braci Sobieskich,” *RP*, no. 1, pp. 8–16.
- Bobkowska W. (1927). “Jan Henryk Pestalozzi, a dzisiejsze prądy pedagogiczne,” *RP*, no. 3, pp. 65–73.
- Brossowa A. (1928). “Kościuszko jako szermierz oświaty,” *RP*, no. 8, pp. 225–231.
- Chałasiński J. (1927). “Dewey jako pedagog demokracji,” *RP*, no. 1, pp. 12–20.
- Danecki Z. (1930a). “Podstawy kierunku wychowania Decroly’ego a problem reformy wychowania w Polsce,” *RP*, no. 4, pp. 145–149.
- Danecki Z. (1930b). “Podstawy kierunku wychowania Decroly’ego a problem reformy wychowania w Polsce,” *RP*, no. 6, pp. 264–268.
- “Dziesięciolecie Wakacyjnych Kursów Uniwersyteckich 1913–1923” (1923), *RP*, no. 7–8, pp. 175–184.
- Grzegorzewska M. (1928). “Po zgonie Profesor Józefy Joteyko,” *RP*, no. 5, pp. 129–136.
- Hessen S. (1935/36). “Tołstoj jako pedagog (Z powodu 25-lecia śmierci),” *RP*, no. 4, pp. 105–120.

- Hulewicz J. (1929). "Żeromski wobec zagadnień pedagogicznych," *RP*, no. 5, pp. 129–132.
- "Idea szkoły pracy w zastosowaniu praktycznym" (1921). *RP*, no. 1–3, pp. 34–40.
- Jampoler G. (1930). "O stanowisko pedagogiczne w nauczaniu historii wychowania," *RP*, no. 12, pp. 149–155.
- "Jan Jakub Rousseau (1712–1912). Myśli pedagogiczne wielkiego pedagoga i myśliciela z powodu 200 letniej rocznicy" (1912), *RP*, no. 7, pp. 129–131.
- Koźmian D. (2000). "Henryk Rowid – współtwórca teorii 'Nowego Wychowania' w Polsce międzywojennej," in A. Meissner, Cz. Majorek (eds.), *Pedagogika Nowego Wychowania w Polsce u schyłku XIX i w pierwszej połowie XX wieku*, vol. 14, Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo WSP, pp. 105–117.
- Krochmalska-Gawrosińska E. (2011). "Henryk Rowid – twórca Państwowego Pedagogium w Krakowie," in J. Krukowski, B. Morawska-Nowak (eds.), *Państwowe Pedagogium i Szkoła Ćwiczeń w Krakowie. Z tradycji kształcenia nauczycieli*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego, pp. 11–20.
- "Kronika Pedagogiczna" (1921), *RP*, no. 4–5, pp. 45–46.
- "Kronika Pedagogiczna" (1924), *RP*, no. 1–2, p. 48.
- "Kronika Pedagogiczna" (1927), *RP*, no. 6, p. 191.
- "Kronika Pedagogiczna" (1928), *RP*, no. 5, p. 160; no. 10, p. 316.
- "Kronika Pedagogiczna" (1929), *RP*, no. 1, p. 29.
- Laskowiczówna M. (1912). "Odczyt o Ks. Skardze w warszawskim związku nauczycielskim", *RP*, no. 8, pp. 155–157.
- Łempicki S. (1936). "Polskie tradycje wychowawcze," in S. Łempicki, W. Gottlieb (eds.), *Encyklopedia wychowania*, vol. 1, part 2, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo "Naszej Księgarni" Związku Nauczycielstwa Polskiego, pp. 1024–1080.
- Łuczyńska B. (2000). "Ideologia nowego wychowania na łamach "Ruchu Pedagogicznego" w niepodległej Polsce," in A. Meissner, Cz. Majorek (eds.), *Pedagogika Nowego Wychowania w Polsce u schyłku XIX i w pierwszej połowie XX wieku*, vol. 14, Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej, pp. 211–229.
- Meissner A. (1995). "Galicyjskie koncepcje reformy szkolnictwa z okresu i wojny światowej," *Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny*, no. 4, pp. 161–171.
- Meissner A. (1999). *Spór o duszę polskiego nauczyciela. Społeczeństwo galicyjskie wobec problemów kształcenia nauczycieli* (Galicia i jej dziedzictwo series, vol. 11), Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo WSP.
- Michalska I. (2014). "Jan Władysław Dawid (1859–1914): życie, główne kierunki pracy naukowej," *RP*, no. 3, pp. 7–13.
- Michalski G. (2014). "Kierunki działalności naukowo-pedagogicznej Anieli Szczyrby i jej współpraca z 'Ruchem Pedagogicznym'," *RP*, no. 3, pp. 37–43.

- Mieszalski S. (2012). "O czasopiśmiennictwie pedagogicznym – kilka refleksji na 100-lecie 'Ruchu Pedagogicznego'," *RP*, no. 1, p. 6.
- Muszkowski J. (1933). "Geniusz serca' (Z powodu 75-letniej rocznicy śmierci Stanisława Jachowicza dn. 24 grudnia 1857 r.)," *RP*, no. 3, pp. 97–104.
- "Myśli Hugona Kołłątaja o podstawach i zadaniach wychowania" (1912), *RP*, no. 2, pp. 25–29.
- Orłowski M. (1926). "Szkoła a wytwórczość pracy narodowej," *RP*, no. 4, pp. 97–104.
- Orłowski M. (1928). "Sokrates. Geneza szkoły twórczej," *RP*, no. 6, pp. 161–169.
- Orłowski M. (1931a). "Szkoła twórcza Sokratesa," *RP*, no. 1, pp. 1–14.
- Orłowski M. (1931b). "Szkoła twórcza Sokratesa," *RP*, no. 2, pp. 49–60.
- Orłowski M. (1931c). "Szkoła twórcza Sokratesa," *RP*, no. 3, pp. 97–103.
- Orłowski M. (1931d). "Szkoła twórcza Sokratesa," *RP*, no. 4, pp. 145–157.
- Orsza H. (1912a). "Tradycje polskiego szkolnictwa elementarnego," *RP*, no. 1, pp. 5–9.
- Orsza H. (1912b). "Tradycje polskiego szkolnictwa elementarnego, part II, Organizacja szkolnictwa ludowego w pierwszej ćwierci XIX w.," *RP*, no. 4, pp. 71–75.
- Orsza H. (1912c). "Tradycje polskiego szkolnictwa elementarnego, part III, Rzeczpospolita krakowska," *RP*, no. 8, pp. 145–147.
- Papierman M. (1938/1939). "130 lat nowoczesnej szkoły," *RP*, no. 1, pp. 29–31.
- Podgórska E. (1973). *Krajowy Związek Nauczycielstwa Ludowego w Galicji 1905–1918*, Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.
- "Polskie szkoły doświadczalne. Wrażenia z wycieczki pedagogicznej" (1926), *RP*, no. 10, pp. 289–295.
- Radziejewicz-Winnicki A. (2012). "Sto lat 'Ruchu Pedagogicznego'. Z okazji jubileuszu namysł nad współczesną rolą sędziwego i popularnego periodyku pedagogicznego," *RP*, no. 1, p. 12.
- Rowid H. (1912a). "Od Redakcji," *RP*, no. 1, pp. 1–2.
- Rowid H. (1912b). "Rzut oka na rozwój pedagogii za granicą i w Polsce," *RP*, no. 5, pp. 93–96.
- Rowid H. (1914). "Jan Władysław Dawid," *RP*, no. 1–2, pp. 1–9.
- Rowid H. (1918). "Nowa era wychowania narodowego," *RP*, no. 1, p. 3.
- Rowid H. (1920a). *Podstawy pedagogiki Trentowskiego*, Warszawa–Lwów: Wydawnictwo Książnica Polska Towarzystwa Nauczycieli Szkół Wyższych.
- Rowid H. (1920b). "Stanowisko Ewarysta Estkowskiego," *RP*, no. 9–10, pp. 165–177.
- Rowid H. (1920c). "Szkoła pracy w związku z rozwojem kultury i cywilizacji," *RP*, no. 56, pp. 94–95.
- Rowid H. (1921). "Anieli Szycówna 1869–1921," *RP*, no. 1–3, pp. 1–4.

- Rowid H. (1922). "Dziesięciolecie Ruchu Pedagogicznego," *RP*, no. 1–2, p. 1.
- Rowid H. (1923). "Komisja Edukacji Narodowej a obecne prądy w wychowaniu i nauczaniu. W 150 rocznicę ustanowienia Komisji Edukacji Narodowej 1773–1923," *RP*, no. 7–8, pp. 129–140.
- Rowid H. (1928). "Rozwój systemu studiów nauczycielskich w odrodzonej Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej w ciągu 10-lecia (1918–1928)," *RP*, no. 10, pp. 289–297.
- Rowid H. (1934/35). "Z badań nad źródłami pedagogiki Trentowskiego," *RP*, no. 8, pp. 335–342.
- Sekreta M. (1929). "Przesłanki filozoficzne i psychologiczne podstawy pedagogiki współczesnej (continuation)," *RP*, no. 12, p. 321.
- Ślęczka R. (2017). "Myśl pedagogiczna prezentowana na łamach "Ruchu Pedagogicznego" w latach 1918–1939," *Przegląd Historyczno-Oświatowy*, no. 1–2, vol. 60, pp. 89–102.
- "Szkola pracy w związku z rozwojem kultury i cywilizacji" (1920), *RP*, no. 1–8, p. 34.
- Szycówna A. (1912). "Nowe prądy w dziedzinie nauczania początkowego," *RP*, no. 7, pp. 131–138.
- Truchim S. (1933). "1773–1933," *RP*, no. 1, pp. 17–18.
- "W dwudziestolecie Ruchu Pedagogicznego 1912–1932" (1932), *RP*, no. 1, p. 7.
- Wałęga A. (2016). "Szkola' źródłem w badaniach historyczno-pedagogicznych polskich instytucji edukacyjnych doby zaborów," *Studia Paedagogica Ignatiana*, no. 2, pp. 253–270.
- Winiarzowa A. (1918). "Pierwsze lata polskiego dziecka," *RP*, no. 8–10, pp. 182–190.

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE

Ewa Barnaś-Baran
University of Rzeszów
Rzeszów, Poland
e-mail: ewa.bb@ur.edu.pl