

# Totalitarian Regimes and the Inescapable Formation of ‘Discipline’ in Educational Philosophy: An Examination of the Zhdanov System’s Impact on Educational Philosophy Development

**Peijun Hao\***

*School of Social History, Fujian Normal University, Fuzhou, Fujian, China, 350007*

*\*Corresponding author email: 2216268740@qq.com*

## **Abstract:**

In the crucible of totalitarian regimes, the educational system often emerges as a critical instrument for ideological control and dissemination. This paper delves into the historical and philosophical underpinnings of the Zhdanov system, exploring its formation within the context of Soviet Russia. The mechanization of materialism in the 20th century, seen as an inevitable consequence of historical forces, is scrutinized for its role in shaping philosophical education under authoritarian rule. Comparative analysis reveals significant disparities between the Zhdanov system’s philosophical education and those of Germany and France during the modern and postmodern eras. These contrasts highlight the unique ideological imprint of the Soviet system on its educational approach. The paper argues that the educational model under authoritarianism and dictatorship inevitably mirrors the Zhdanov system, necessitating specific socio-political conditions for its cultivation. A critique of vulgar dialectics and Stalinism is presented, advocating for a reevaluation of educational systems in socialist countries. The paper calls for the reconstruction of an ideal educational framework that transcends the limitations of past dogmatism. By examining the historical trajectory and theoretical foundations of the Zhdanov system, this work contributes to the ongoing discourse on the intersection of politics, ideology, and education in totalitarian contexts. It underscores the importance of understanding the nuances of philosophical education as a reflection of broader political ideologies and their impact on society.

**Keywords:** Totalitarianism; Discipline Education; Zhdanov System; Philosophical Education; Ideological Control

## **1. Intro: The Context and Significance of Investigating Totalitarianism and Education**

### **1.1 The needed problems for the development of the Zhdanov system**

The genesis of the Zhdanov system within the Soviet Union was not merely a historic crash but a merging of socio-political characteristics, ideological imperatives, and the exigencies of state power. To recognize the development of this system, one should explore the certain problems that promoted its introduction as a leading force in Soviet instructional policy.

At the heart of the Zhdanov system lay the important of ideological conformity and control. The Soviet program, under the semblance of advertising Marxist-Leninist thought, sought to get rid of all remnants of intellectual dissent and independent questions. This was achieved through the establishment of a monolithic academic framework that highlighted the primacy of the state's interpretation of history, approach, and social science. The indoctrination of students from a young age with the tenets of dialectical and historical materialism offered to strengthen the authenticity of the Soviet system and to make sure a population ideologically straightened with the Communist Party's goals.

The social and intellectual environment of the Soviet Union in the mid-20th century was noted by an extensive sense of crisis and makeover. The devastation functioned by World War II, combined with the ideological challenges postured by capitalist societies, created a productive ground for the loan consolidation of a strictly controlled instructional system. The Zhdanov system became an action to these external stress, acting as a barrier versus perceived ideological subversion from the West.

Additionally, the inner dynamics of the Soviet state played a critical role in the condensation of the Zhdanov system. The removes and repression of the 1930s had decimated the rankings of the intelligentsia, leaving a space that can just be filled by a new generation of thinkers and teachers trained in the strictures of party doctrine. This cadre of faithful pundits came to be the lead of the Zhdanov system, tasked with circulating the party line and policing the boundaries of acceptable thought.

The Zhdanov system additionally reflected the Soviet leadership's desire to project a photo of ideological purity and social prevalence. By imposing a consistent educational program that glorified Soviet accomplishments and denigrated Western values, the routine looked for to bolster national satisfaction and foster a feeling of collective identification among the people. This was specifi-

cally apparent in the realm of ideology, where the Soviet analysis of Marxism was portrayed as the peak of human knowledge, going beyond the limitations of bourgeois viewpoint.

In the context of relative evaluation, it becomes clear that the Zhdanov system deviated significantly from instructional models prevalent in Western Europe during the modern-day and postmodern periods. Unlike the German and French systems, which enabled a degree of pluralism and urged essential thinking, the Soviet model was characterized by its homogeneity and intolerance of dissent. This comparison highlights the one-of-a-kind imprint of Soviet ideological background on its instructional method, exposing the level to which the Zhdanov system was an item of its time and place.

Additionally, the Zhdanov system was not only a representation of the Soviet regime's domestic problems; it was additionally shaped by global relationships and the worldwide ideological battle of the Cold War period. The Soviet Union's initiatives to export its brand name of socialism to other nations were accompanied by the charge of instructional frameworks similar to the Zhdanov system, focused on growing a cadre of dedicated cadres abroad.

Overall, the development of the Zhdanov system was asserted on an intricate interplay of aspects, including the Soviet program's mission for ideological purity, the aftermath of World War II, the need to neutralize Western impact, and the internal dynamics of Soviet society. Recognizing these conditions is important to understanding the historic specificity of the Zhdanov system and its duty in the broader context of totalitarian education. Nestled within the record of background lies a phase both appealing and threatening-- the exploration of totalitarianism's imprint on education and learning approach. This initial phase intends to contextualize and underscore the importance of exploring the elaborate relationship between totalitarian regimes and the advancement of educational idea, specifically with the lens of the Zhdanov system. By delving right into this subject, we embark on a journey that links historical analysis with modern academic discussion, disclosing the withstanding relevance of past totalitarian methods.

### **1.2 The Context and Significance of Investigating Totalitarianism and Education**

Totalitarianism, a term rooted in the abundant soil of Fascist Italy, denotes a form of government where power is centralized in a solitary party or person, and the state exercises complete control over all facets of life. This idea prolongs beyond mere governance, permeating society, education and learning, and ideological background. It is within this extensive scope that the role of education and

learning ends up being paramount, serving as a conduit for sharing state-approved narratives and indoctrinating the population with a particular worldview.

The examination of totalitarianism and education and learning is not simply a scholastic exercise; it is a phone call to seriously involve with the foundations of instructional philosophy. This research invites us to take a look at exactly how historic totalitarian techniques have actually affected modern academic concepts and practices, highlighting the requirement for a nuanced point of view on the role of education in society. By inspecting the specifics of the Zhdanov system-- a social plan structure applied under Soviet rule-- we gain understanding right into the characteristics in between political power and knowledge dissemination, brightening the complexities of education under overbearing routines.

Andrei Zhdanov, a critical figure in Soviet social plan, emerges as a central architect whose plans significantly formed education under totalitarian regulation. Past his political endeavors, Zhdanov was a regular speaker at numerous social occasions, underscoring his influence in the social round. His system, while called after him, was characteristic of a broader movement targeted at consolidating power and control over the minds of the populace. The organized charge of discipline and conformity, feature of the Zhdanov system, changed education and learning right into an instrument for ideological indoctrination, suppressing dissent and advertising state-approved stories. This chapter lays the groundwork for a thorough expedition of these motifs, establishing the stage for subsequent sections that dive deeper into historic contexts, the surge of totalitarianism, Zhdanov's duty as a designer of cultural plan, and the effect of the Zhdanov system on education. By checking out these components, we intend to contribute to a broader discussion on the interplay in between political ideological backgrounds and academic techniques, supplying understandings that go beyond time and area.

In embarking on this scholarly expedition, we bring into play substantial historical documents and theoretical frameworks, weaving together a story that is both strenuous and reflective. Our analysis is improved by a diverse series of sources, consisting of historical records, academic plan files, thoughtful writings, and personal accounts. This thorough method enables us to repaint a vivid photo of the Zhdanov system's influence on education approach, while additionally welcoming visitors to review the foundational concepts of education and their possibility for resistance or engineering despite tyrannical control.

The value of this examination can not be overemphasized. As we navigate the complexities of totalitarianism's impact on education and learning, we reveal lessons that resonate with modern academic challenges. By reviewing

the past, we brighten today, fostering a much deeper understanding of the function of education and learning fit cultures and people. This chapter, consequently, works as a bridge in between background and today day, inviting visitors to contemplate the long-lasting relevance of historical analyses for contemporary educational discourse.

## **2 The process of mechanization of materialism in the 20th century and why it was inevitable**

The mechanization of materialism in the 20th century was a complex phenomenon, deeply rooted in the historical and ideological contexts of the era. This procedure was not an isolated event yet rather a consequence of the more comprehensive socio-political changes that defined the period. The Soviet Union, intoxicated of the Zhdanov system, played a critical role in the institutionalization of materialist viewpoint, changing it into an inflexible doctrinal structure that penetrated every element of society.

In the consequences of World War II, the Soviet Union faced the significant task of reconstructing its smashed economic situation and society. This necessary led to a restored emphasis on materialist concepts as a means of understanding and managing the worldly globe. The mechanization of materialism ended up being an indispensable part of the state's approach for financial healing and social engineering. As the state looked for to activate sources and labor for automation and collectivization, materialism gave a logical and deterministic structure that justified the main planning and control systems utilized by the Soviet regimen.

Marxism-Leninism, a synthesis of Karl Marx's and Vladimir Lenin's beliefs, initially became an advanced doctrine aimed at addressing the inequalities and injustices inherent in capitalist societies. However, its improvement into a totalitarian ideology, particularly within the context of Soviet Russia, stands for a substantial departure from its initial tenets. This area checks out just how Marxism-Leninism developed from an academic structure for social become a tool for state control and ideological indoctrination, matching the broader change towards totalitarianism. At its core, Marxism assumes that background is driven by class struggle, with the ultimate goal being the establishment of an egalitarian society. Lenin built on Marx's concepts, adjusting them to fit the Russian context, which lacked a considerable industrial proletariat. Leninism introduced the concept of a lead event, comprised of expert revolutionaries, to lead the functioning course and peasantry in the direction of a socialist change. This adjustment was essential in the Bolsheviks' effective seizure of power throughout the October Revolution of 1917.

Nonetheless, the shift from innovative ideological background to state belief under Joseph Stalin noted a turning point in the change of Marxism-Leninism. Stalin's analysis of Marxism-Leninism stressed the centralization of power and the reductions of dissent, lining up carefully with the qualities of a totalitarian regime. The state apparatus was wielded to apply ideological conformity and to get rid of any type of resistance to the ruling event's authority.

The Zhdanov system, called after Andrei Zhdanov, a noticeable Soviet political leader and ideologue, became the personification of Stalinist cultural plan. Zhdanov, a staunch advocate of Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy, played a crucial duty fit the Soviet Union's social and academic policies. Under his impact, art, literature, and education and learning were purely regulated to make sure alignment with the event's ideological line. This caused a rigid enforcement of Socialist Realism as the only appropriate imaginative expression, properly censoring any kind of kind of imagination that did not conform to the state's vision.

The makeover of Marxism-Leninism into a totalitarian ideological background had profound implications for education and learning approach. The academic system was repurposed to serve the state's ideological objectives, with a hefty emphasis on indoctrination as opposed to important reasoning. Schools came to be battlegrounds for ideological battle, where the state's variation of history and ideological background was taught as absolute fact. Teachers were expected to be representatives of the state, enhancing the party's doctrines and making certain that trainees internalized the suggested worldview.

Zhdanov's plans, specifically, highlighted the crucial role of education in maintaining the totalitarian status. By controlling the story and imposing stringent disciplinary procedures, the Zhdanov system made certain that education worked as a device for ideological brainwashing rather than intellectual exploration. This duration saw the organized suppression of dissenting voices in academic community, as scholars and teachers that challenged the party line encountered extreme repercussions.

The advancement of Marxism-Leninism into a totalitarian ideological background under Stalin's routine is a testimony to the pliability of political beliefs when wielded by tyrannical leaders. What began as an advanced doctrine targeted at liberating the working course changed into a tool for fascism and control. The Zhdanov system exemplifies this makeover, demonstrating exactly how education and learning can be adjusted to offer the interests of a totalitarian state.

In the context of the broader discussion on totalitarianism and education and learning, the case of Marxism-Le-

ninism supplies beneficial understandings right into the systems whereby beliefs can be co-opted and distorted to serve completions of oppressive programs. It underscores the need for caution in safeguarding the self-reliance and honesty of educational institutions, even in the face of dominating political beliefs.

The process of materialism's institutionalization was significantly fueled by the ideological conflict during the Cold War age. As the Soviet Union took part in a global ideological competition with capitalist nations, it looked for a durable philosophical support to reputable its policies and counter Western ideological propaganda. Materialism, emphasizing historic certainty and the prominence of financial factors, became a compelling rationale, representing the Soviet system as the rational culmination of human background's march in the direction of an egalitarian paradise. This ideological background was methodically integrated right into the educational structure, forming future generations' perceptions of the Soviet worldview as the personification of scientific accuracy.

Vital to this transformation were the significant numbers within the Soviet power structure, especially Nikita Khrushchev and Leonid Brezhnev, that, in the middle of settling their authority, further lodged the Zhdanov doctrine by enhancing ideological orthodoxy. Their leadership saw a concentration of materialist indoctrination across educational institutions, aimed at cultivating a populace that shared the Soviet state's ideological goals.

However, this institutionalization was not solely a state-driven venture; it likewise mirrored the popular welcome of materialist ideals amongst Soviet people. The tangible advantages and family member stability the Soviet system supplied, compared versus the tumultuous pre-revolutionary duration, cultivated extensive belief in the efficacy of materialist principles. This grassroots support boosted the state's initiatives to deeply embed the mechanized type of materialism within Soviet culture.

Numerous aspects merged to provide the materialism's institutionalization inescapable in the 20th century. First of all, the Soviet Union's historical backdrop, noted by war destruction and the seriousness of fast automation, produced a favorable atmosphere for the adoption of a deterministic, materialistic worldview. Secondly, the ideological contest with capitalist systems required the construction of a coherent story to verify the Soviet version locally and globally. Last but not least, the interior characteristics of Soviet administration, such as leaders' power debt consolidation and public acquiescence, led the way for materialism to end up being the assisting ideology of Soviet culture.

It concerns identify that this process was not unchallenged. Dissenters, consisting of intellectuals and mu-



sicians, who wondered about the rigid orthodoxy of the Zhdanov system, encountered censorship, mistreatment, or expatriation. The reductions of varied perspectives hindered the thriving of imagination and scholarship within the Soviet world.

the institutionalization of materialism in the 20th century was an unavoidable effect of the historic, ideological, and political dynamics that identified the Soviet date. This development was spurred by the state's search of ideological prominence, the Cold War's ideological rivalry, and the population's welcome of materialist principles. While this process enhanced the Soviet system, it additionally dramatically shaped Soviet culture, education and learning, and intellectual life, using extensive insights into the complex partnership between ideological background, national politics, and society in totalitarian settings. The historic trajectory of Marxism-Leninism under the Zhdanov system discloses the complex interplay between political power and instructional approach. This case study invites us to reflect on the possible risks of ideological conformity and the importance of promoting instructional atmospheres that advertise crucial thinking and intellectual liberty. By recognizing the historical context and the ideological makeovers that took place, we obtain a much deeper appreciation for the duty of education in either perpetuating or withstanding totalitarian propensities.

### **3. Andrei Zhdanov: Architect of Cultural Policy in the Soviet Union**

#### **3.1 Zhdanov's Life and Career: A Brief Overview**

Andrei Aleksandrovich Zhdanov, born on April 30, 1896, in St. Petersburg, Russia, was an essential figure in the Soviet Union's political and social landscape throughout the mid-20th century. His life and career were totally linked with the surge and combination of Soviet totalitarianism, especially under Joseph Stalin's rule. Zhdanov's climb through the ranks of the Communist Party and his eventual consultation to influential settings within the Soviet federal government highlight the cooperative partnership in between the celebration elite and the cultural policies that specified the period.

Zhdanov's early years were marked by the turmoil of the Russian Revolution and the succeeding civil battle. He joined the Bolshevik Party in 1918, at the age of 22, and promptly differentiated himself as a qualified organizer and propagandist. His political acumen and unwavering commitment to the event's reason gained him quick promos within the event framework. By the late 1920s, Zhdanov had actually come to be a trusted ally of Stalin,

positioning him as a principal in the Soviet political pecking order.

In 1934, Zhdanov was selected to the Central Committee of the Communist Party, a setting that provided him with straight accessibility to the levers of power. His role increased better in 1938 when he was made Secretary of the Leningrad City Committee, a setting that permitted him to apply considerable influence over the city's political and cultural life. During this duration, Zhdanov's credibility as a strong enforcer of celebration discipline expanded, as he showed a determination to use force and intimidation to reduce resistance and dissent.

It was throughout the Second World War, nevertheless, that Zhdanov's influence reached its zenith. As the Soviet Union dealt with the existential risk of Nazi intrusion, Zhdanov was instrumental in activating the populace and enhancing the ideological willpower of the Soviet individuals. His speeches at various social events, targeted at boosting spirits and promoting a sense of national unity, showcased his rhetorical skills and his capacity to articulate the event's vision.

Post-war, Zhdanov's role as a cultural arbiter became much more obvious. He was assigned as the head of the Central Committee's Department of Agitation and Propaganda, a placement that gave him oversight over the whole cultural sector, consisting of education and learning. Zhdanov's plans, collectively known as the Zhdanov system, were defined by a stringent adherence to Socialist Realism as the only appropriate imaginative and literary design. This social teaching stressed the glorification of Soviet life and the representation of the working course as brave figures, while simultaneously knocking any kind of modernist or avant-garde expression as "bourgeois formalism."

In the realm of education and learning, Zhdanov's impact was similarly significant. He promoted for a curriculum that was snugly regulated by the state, with an emphasis on teaching the tenets of Marxism-Leninism and cultivating loyalty to the Soviet routine. Colleges were transformed into centers of ideological brainwashing, where the party's variation of background and belief were instructed as undeniable facts. The Zhdanov system likewise imposed a rigid hierarchy within the instructional system, with instructors and academics anticipated to abide by strict standards and to serve as representatives of the state. Zhdanov's untimely death in 1948 noted the end of a period in Soviet social policy. Nevertheless, his heritage sustained, as the concepts he espoused remained to shape Soviet education and culture for years to come. The Zhdanov system, despite its oppressive nature, left an indelible mark on the Soviet Union's educational philosophy, influencing subsequent generations of teachers and trainees.

The assessment of Zhdanov's life and profession, for that reason, is essential for understanding the historical context in which the Zhdanov system was developed and carried out, and for valuing its enduring effect on the growth of education viewpoint under totalitarian regulation.

### **3.2 The Zhdanov Doctrine: Ideological Control and Cultural Hegemony**

The Zhdanov Doctrine, identified with Andrei Zhdanov's tenure as the Soviet Union's cultural czar, enveloped a detailed method for ideological control and cultural hegemony. This doctrine was not merely a set of guidelines however a blueprint for changing education and learning and culture into tools of state power. Zhdanov's vision was to consolidate the Soviet routine's prominence over the intellectual and creative rounds, making certain that every aspect of cultural production and instructional content straightened with the celebration's ideological instructions.

At the heart of the Zhdanov Doctrine lay the principle of Socialist Realism, which was decreed as the sole reputable imaginative and literary expression within the Soviet Union. This visual teaching mandated that all artworks should depict the globe as translucent the lens of Marxist-Leninist ideology, illustrating the functioning class in a brave light and proclaiming the accomplishments of the Soviet state. Any kind of discrepancy from this standard was branded as "formalism" and "bourgeois decadence," resulting in censorship, mistreatment, and in some cases, the total damage of works deemed counter-revolutionary.

In the world of education and learning, the Zhdanov Doctrine was equally transformative. Colleges and colleges were removed of any type of remnants of Western impact, and a new curriculum was introduced that positioned the trainings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin at its core. The objective was not just to enlighten however to indoctrinate, instilling in trainees an ingrained loyalty to the Communist Party and a steady belief in the supremacy of the Soviet system. Books were reworded to show the party line, and instructors were advised to keep track of trainee actions for indicators of dissent or ideological impurity.

Zhdanov's influence prolonged beyond the class and right into the larger social landscape. He was a constant speaker at social events, making use of these platforms to disseminate the celebration's ideology and to make sure that artists, authors, and pundits followed the prescribed standards. His speeches were not simply exhortations; they carried the weight of main policy, and compliance was necessary. Those who risked to challenge Zhdanov's edicts encountered serious effects, ranging from loss of work to imprisonment or worse.

The Zhdanov Doctrine was not simply an ideological con-

struct; it was a practical indication of the Soviet regime's desire to control every facet of public and exclusive life. By wielding the power of education and society, Zhdanov and his cohorts intended to develop a culture in which originality was subsumed by cumulative identity, and critical reasoning was replaced by rote approval of the event's dogma. This was attained via a combination of coercion, propaganda, and the methodical elimination of dissent.

Historically, the Zhdanov Doctrine can be viewed as part of a broader fad in totalitarian regimes, where education and society are taken advantage of as tools for preserving control and continuing the regime's power. From Fascist Italy's promotion of a patriotic curriculum to Nazi Germany's insistence on Aryan social pureness, the parallels are clear. The Zhdanov Doctrine was a Soviet model of this worldwide phenomenon, customized to the details needs and ideological backgrounds of the Soviet state.

The impact of the Zhdanov Doctrine on education and learning approach was extensive and enduring. It established a precedent for the role of the state in education, demonstrating the capacity for education systems to be utilized as systems of ideological control. This heritage has actually been felt long after the autumn of the Soviet Union, affecting arguments on the freedom of universities and the balance in between state intervention and academic freedom.

Additionally, the Zhdanov Doctrine has actually added to the discourse on the role of education and learning in totalitarian societies. It welcomes us to take into consideration the ethical effects of using education as a means to propagate state belief and to wonder about the degree to which education need to offer societal needs versus promoting private vital thought. The evaluation of the Zhdanov Doctrine, therefore, is not just an exercise in historic analysis yet a critical involvement with the very structures of academic viewpoint.

Finally, the Zhdanov Doctrine stood for a collective initiative to assert cultural hegemony and ideological control over the Soviet population. Via its impact on education, it left an enduring mark on the development of education and learning philosophy, testing us to face the double duties of education and learning as both a device for empowerment and a weapon of fascism. By recognizing the complexities of the Zhdanov Doctrine, we obtain understanding right into the intricacies of education under totalitarian regulation and the enduring relevance of historical evaluations for contemporary academic discussion.

### **3.3 Zhdanov's Impact on Education: The Case of the Soviet School System**

Within the substantial tapestry of Soviet cultural policy, Andrei Zhdanov's influence on education and learning

was both profound and prevalent.

The Soviet institution system, under the Zhdanov system, went through a transformation that transformed it from an organization of finding out right into a conduit for ideological indoctrination. This area explores the specifics of Zhdanov's influence on education and learning, concentrating on the Soviet institution system as a microcosm of the more comprehensive academic reforms that characterized his tenure.

The Zhdanov system ushered in a brand-new age of educational policy, one that was thoroughly developed to cultivate a generation of loyal Soviet residents. The educational program was thoroughly crafted to line up with the tenets of Marxism-Leninism, emphasizing the history of the Soviet Union, the accomplishments of the Communist Party, and the virtues of the working class. Textbooks were modified to reflect the event's ideological background, providing a disinfected and commonly pietistic variation of truth that omitted any type of review of the regime.

Educators, that formerly took pleasure in a degree of autonomy in their pedagogical methods, found themselves bound by rigorous standards that determined not only what to instruct yet also just how to educate it. They were expected to be not simply educators yet also ideological overviews, instilling in their students a deep respect for the Soviet state and its leaders. The duty of the teacher was therefore redefined, from a facilitator of knowledge to an agent of the state, charged with ensuring that the next generation internalized the recommended worldview.

Discipline and consistency became the trademarks of the Soviet institution system under Zhdanov's watch. Students were encouraged to report any type of variance from the party line, whether by their peers or their teachers, cultivating an ambience of surveillance and uncertainty. This atmosphere was made to suppress dissent and to cultivate a cumulative attitude that focused on loyalty to the state over individual query.

The effect of the Zhdanov system on education and learning expanded past the confines of the classroom. Extracurricular activities, once a room for imaginative expression and personal growth, were currently tightly controlled. Clubs and companies were required to advertise the values of the Soviet Union, with activities centered around celebrating the achievements of the state and the Communist Party. Even sports and athletics were imbued with ideological importance, with a focus on team spirit and the cumulative good over individual success.

Zhdanov's policies also had a chilling impact on scholastic research study and scholarship. Universities, which had actually commonly been bastions of intellectual liberty, went through the very same rigid controls as primary and

secondary schools. Academic techniques were reshaped to line up with Marxist-Leninist theory, and research study that did not sustain the party line was discouraged. Scholars that dared to question the main narrative encountered serious repercussions, including termination, apprehension, and even implementation.

Despite the overbearing nature of the Zhdanov system, there were instances of resistance and resilience within the Soviet college system. Some teachers and pupils located refined ways to prevent the strictures imposed upon them, participating in acts of silent defiance that protected a form of intellectual inquisitiveness and critical reasoning. Underground networks of books and concepts continued, albeit clandestinely, offering a lifeline to those that desired a broader perspective on the world.

The tradition of the Zhdanov system in the Soviet college system is a complex one. On the one hand, it stands for a dark chapter in the history of education, where the thirst for knowledge was relieved by the toxin of propaganda. On the other hand, it functions as a cautionary tale concerning the capacity for education and learning to be adjusted for political ends. The Soviet experience under Zhdanov highlights the relevance of protecting academic freedom and the freedom of universities, lest they end up being plain creatures in the hands of the state.

By checking out the case of the Soviet college system, we acquire understanding into the mechanics of instructional reform under totalitarian rule. We see how the Zhdanov system, with its focus on self-control, conformity, and ideological indoctrination, changed education into a device of state control. This analysis invites us to reflect on the duty of education and learning in society and the fragile balance in between state treatment and individual rights. Inevitably, it tests us to consider the potential for education and learning to foster important thinking, imagination, and a spirit of inquiry, also despite overbearing regimes.

#### **4 What sort of differences in content, concepts, and range did the philosophical education and learning of the Zhdanov system have compared to that of Germany and France throughout the modern-day and post-modern periods?**

The thoughtful education and learning under the Zhdanov system in the Soviet Union starkly contrasted with that of Germany and France throughout the modern and post-modern periods in regards to web content, concepts, and range. This difference was not simply a representation of various academic approaches however a symptom of the

different socio-political climates and ideological dedications of each nation.

In Germany, the modern-day duration was noted by the thriving of crucial theory and existentialism, exemplified by the Frankfurt School and the works of theorists like Martin Heidegger and Jean-Paul Sartre. These movements put a cost on private liberty, vital self-reflection, and the exam of the human condition when faced with modernity's difficulties. On the other hand, the Zhdanov system's thoughtful education and learning was defined by its dogmatic adherence to Marxist-Leninist teaching, leaving little room for interpretive flexibility or crucial involvement. The Soviet curriculum was developed to cultivate a collective consciousness aligned with the state's ideological goals, as opposed to cultivating individual critical thought. Similarly, in France, the postmodern period experienced a dynamic intellectual landscape that questioned the really foundations of modernity and the Enlightenment. Post-structuralists like Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida deconstructed grand narratives and critiqued the concept of axioms, promoting rather for a multiplicity of point of views and the fluidness of significance. This intellectual milieu was antithetical to the Zhdanov system's persistence on a single, authoritative interpretation of truth. The Soviet philosophical education system was based on the idea that reality was unbiased and could be uncovered via the application of dialectical and historic materialism. The scope of thoughtful questions was additionally exceptionally influenced by these differing academic frameworks. In Germany and France, viewpoint was integrated with a large array of disciplines, urging interdisciplinary discussion and the exploration of intricate social concerns. Philosophers involved with literature, art, scientific research, and national politics, producing a rich tapestry of idea that showed the multifaceted nature of human experience. On the other hand, the Zhdanov system tightened the range of thoughtful education and learning, concentrating mostly on the research study of Marxist texts and the promo of party ideology. This led to a trimmed sight of philosophy, separated from the wider social and intellectual currents of the time.

Additionally, the pedagogical techniques employed in Soviet philosophical education and learning were markedly different from those in Western Europe. While German and French organizations encouraged open dispute, vital discussion, and the doubting of developed doctrines, the Zhdanov system imposed a didactic style of teaching that dissuaded dissent and prioritized memorizing finding out over innovative exploration. This technical divergence highlighted the fundamental distinctions in exactly how each society valued the function of approach in education and learning and society at large.

The Zhdanov system's academic design was not just a reflection of Soviet belief however likewise a tool for its breeding. It functioned as a system for indoctrination, aiming to develop a homogeneous intellectual landscape without ideological deviation. This stands in plain comparison to the pluralistic and vibrant thoughtful environments of Germany and France, where intellectual diversity and important inquiry were celebrated.

The thoughtful education and learning under the Zhdanov system in the Soviet Union diverged considerably from that of Germany and France throughout the modern-day and postmodern durations. These distinctions appeared in the web content, ideas, and scope of philosophical questions, along with in the pedagogical approaches used. The Zhdanov system's academic version was identified by its dogmatism, narrow emphasis, and academic teaching design, while German and French thoughtful education and learning welcomed essential thinking, intellectual diversity, and interdisciplinary expedition. Comprehending these contrasts offers valuable insights right into the role of approach in totalitarian versus autonomous societies and highlights the far-ranging consequences of academic policy on intellectual advancement and social expression.

## **5 Why does the education and learning of authoritarianism and tyranny always cause the very same end result as the Zhdanov system? What type of dirt is required to grow such an academic system?**

The education systems that emerge under authoritarianism and dictatorship share striking similarities with the Zhdanov system, a phenomenon that can be credited to the inherent qualities and goals of such regimens. Authoritarian and oppressive governments, looking for to preserve control and circulate their ideological backgrounds, certainly reproduce the Zhdanov system's core components, stressing conformity, brainwashing, and the reductions of dissent. This chapter checks out the reasons behind this similarity and identifies the socio-political conditions required for the cultivation of such an educational system.

At the heart of tyrannical and oppressive routines lies the crucial of ideological uniformity and the consolidation of power. These systems need an educated populace that is ideologically straightened with the ruling elite's vision, a need that parallels the Zhdanov system's purpose in Soviet Russia. The Soviet design, as clarified by scholars such as Wang Yongjiang, shows that the simplification, vulgarization, and dogmatization of ideology are devices utilized to impose ideological consistency. In a similar way, modern



authoritarian states use education and learning as a way to infuse loyalty and obedience, making certain that citizens stick to the state's worldview.

To grow an educational system akin to the Zhdanov system, a specific sort of "dirt" is needed-- a socio-political environment that promotes authoritarianism. This soil makes up several essential elements:

At first, an environment of concern and repression, represented by the pervasive existence of secret cops and monitoring, is essential. This ambience discourages dissent and urges self-censorship, making it less complicated for the state to regulate the narrative and shape public opinion. The Soviet Union's use of the KGB as a device of injustice is a historic precedent for just how such a setting can be produced and maintained. As among the earliest countries to establish a secret authority, China established its initial secret authority's organization, the "Jin Yiwei," over 600 years back. Such a system has a long background in China, with a fully grown framework. As long as exterior publicity makes use of the term "representative" as opposed to "secret authorities," such an organization can be restored under the pretext of protecting the country and is not uncommon in China ...

Then, the centralization of power and the reductions of alternative voices are critical. As observed by Jia Zelin, the Soviet Union's scientific community, consisting of philosophers and social scientists, experienced raising administrative control after 1956. This control included academic community, where scholars were pressured to satisfy state-approved ideologies, matching the problems essential for the Zhdanov system's success.

Finally, the presence of a monolithic belief that warrants the routine's actions and plans is important. This ideology acts as the structure for the academic system, making certain that all topics educated align with the state's program. In the case of the Zhdanov system, Marxist-Leninist idea was the dominating ideological background, offering a lens where all knowledge was filtered.

Furthermore, the lack of a free press and independent media is crucial. A securely regulated media landscape allows the state to determine the info available to the general public, consequently restricting direct exposure to alternate viewpoints and strengthening the routine's narrative. And at the end, the last step is the absence of a dynamic civil society and independent establishments damages the checks and equilibriums essential for a healthy freedom. In authoritarian regimes, civil society companies are commonly co-opted or suppressed, leaving the state uncontrolled in its control over the instructional system.

Recognizing these problems brightens why academic systems under authoritarianism and dictatorship certainly resemble the Zhdanov system. These routines call for a

people that is ideologically compliant, a goal best attained through education systems that prioritize indoctrination over critical thinking. The farming of such an instructional system requires a socio-political atmosphere that fosters worry, centralizes power, implements a monolithic ideological background, regulates the media, and subdues independent establishments.

In recap, the education and learning of authoritarianism and dictatorship leads to end results similar to the Zhdanov system due to the common imperative of preserving control and circulating a solitary ideological background. The certain conditions required for such an educational system to thrive consist of an environment of fear, centralized power, a monolithic ideology, regulated media, and the reductions of independent institutions. Acknowledging these problems is vital for understanding the parallels in between the Zhdanov system and educational systems under modern tyrannical routines.

## **6 Result: Critique of Vulgar Dialectics and Stalinism, and How Socialist Countries and the Ideal Educational System Should Be Reconstructed**

The critique of off-color dialectics and Stalinism is pivotal in recognizing the shortages of the Zhdanov system and its impact on thoughtful education and learning within socialist countries. This chapter starts an analytical journey, studying the imperfections of these ideologies and suggesting a roadmap for rebuilding an ideal instructional framework that cultivates intellectual freedom, imagination, and important thinking.

Repulsive dialectics, a term coined by Friedrich Engels, refers to the oversimplification and distortion of dialectical materialism, causing an inflexible and dogmatic method to comprehending truth. Under the Zhdanov system, repulsive dialectics came to be a device for ideological control, stripping away the complexity and dynamism inherent in Marxist concept. This method, defined by its static and reductionist interpretation of dialectical materialism, stifled intellectual growth and innovation. As opposed to advertising a nuanced understanding of social characteristics, repulsive dialectics reduced complicated sensations to simplified binaries, thus weakening the really significance of dialectical idea.

Stalinism, a political belief carefully associated with Joseph Stalin's regulation, additionally entrenched these dogmatic propensities within the Soviet Union and, by extension, within socialist nations influenced by the Zhdanov system. Stalinism was marked by its focus on outright state control, reductions of dissent, and the cult

of individuality bordering Stalin himself. In the world of education and learning, Stalinism materialized as a system that prioritized ideological pureness over academic rigor, resulting in a homogenized curriculum that stifled independent thought and inquiry.

To reconstruct an ideal educational system in socialist nations, it is critical to address the legacies of vulgar dialectics and Stalinism. This calls for an extreme separation from the dogmatic and oppressive instructional versions of the past. An optimal instructional framework needs to be based in concepts of academic freedom, critical inquiry, and the support of diverse point of views. It has to advertise a society of doubting and discussion, enabling students to involve with a wide spectrum of ideas and concepts, both within and beyond the Marxist custom.

Restoration starts with the diversity of the educational program, integrating a variety of philosophical, political, and social theories. This includes not only the standards of Marxism however also the vital concepts of Western thinkers, such as existentialism, poststructuralism, and vital theory. By revealing students to a wide variety of intellectual traditions, the instructional system can foster a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the globe, furnishing them with the devices to examine and challenge dominating paradigms.

Pedagogically, the ideal academic system ought to adopt interactive and participatory methods that urge energetic learning and critical thinking. This involves moving away from didactic talks and memorizing memorization in the direction of seminar-style conversations, collaborative projects, and experiential learning possibilities. Teachers should serve as facilitators rather than plain transmitters of expertise, fostering a setting where trainees feel empowered to express their ideas and take part in positive dialogue.

In addition, the restoration of the educational system demands the establishment of establishments that secure academic freedom and promote intellectual exchange. This consists of the development of independent proving ground, think tanks, and journals that give platforms for academic dispute and the circulation of innovative ideas. Such organizations should operate free from political interference, enabling academics to pursue study that tests conventional wisdom and adds to the innovation of knowledge.

Lastly, the excellent academic system has to be embedded within a broader social and political context that sustains autonomous governance, the regulation of regulation, and the protection of human rights. This consists of the nurturing of a vivid civil society, the promotion of free speech, and the security of academic freedom. Only within such a context can an academic system truly flourish, serving as

a driver for intellectual progression and social change.

In conclusion, the critique of repulsive dialectics and Stalinism is not simply a scholastic exercise; it is a contact us to activity for socialist nations to rebuild their instructional systems based upon concepts of intellectual flexibility, important query, and autonomous worths. By embracing a more comprehensive and dynamic strategy to education and learning, socialist societies can cultivate a brand-new generation of thinkers geared up to browse the complexities of the contemporary world and add to the innovation of human knowledge and understanding.

## References

- [1] Blokh, Φ., & Liu, Q. (1988). *Several urgent issues to be clarified*. \*Journal of the Central Party School of the Communist Party of China\*, (03), 8-9. <https://doi.org/10.14119/j.cnki.zgxb.1988.03.005>
- [2] Ji, D. Y. (1983). *A brief discussion on the definition of the history of philosophy by Zhdanov*. \*Jiangxi Social Sciences\*, (04), 109-114.
- [3] Ma, L. S. (2008). *The debate between Zhdanov and Suslov – A discussion with Mr. Yan Xiu and Mr. Lan Yingnian*. \*Exploration and Controversy\*, (10), 35-39.
- [4] Tang, Z. W. (1981). *A brief discussion on the general laws of the history of philosophy – And a review of Zhdanov's definition*. \*Journal of Shandong Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)\*, (06), 6-13. <https://doi.org/10.16456/j.cnki.1001-5973.1981.06.002>
- [5] Wang, B. B. (1996). *Also on “Zhdanovism”*. \*Oriental Art\*, (02), 7.
- [6] Wang, Y. J. (1989). *Zhdanov's intervention in and influence on philosophy*. \*Marxism Studies\*, (01), 87-105.
- [7] Xin. (1989). *Reflection on Zhdanov's literary theory – The third “review and reflection” seminar convened by this magazine*. \*People's Music\*, (02), 11.
- [8] Yin, C. L. (2021). *The criticism of “Hu Feng” by the Ba people and the “kinship” with the “Zhdanov model”*. \*Journal of Southwest Minzu University (Humanities and Social Science Edition)\*, 42(05), 199-205.
- [9] Zhang, L. (2006). *The logic of politics and the history of philosophy – Revisiting Zhdanov's speech on June 24, 1947*. \*Academic World\*, (03), 146-151.
- [10] Wang, Y. (2014). *“Class Standards” and the Moral Criticism of Soviet Literature After the Great Patriotic War: A Case Study of Zhdanov*. *Journal of Xuchang College*, 33(4), 56-59.
- [11] Wang, Y. (2014). *A Study of the Moral Criticism of Soviet Literature After the Great Patriotic War*. (Doctoral dissertation). Heilongjiang University.
- [12] Lu, J. (2001). *Research on the Concept of Chinese Philosophy History*. *Journal of Anqing Normal College (Social*

*Science Edition*), (4), 36-41+118.

[13] Jia, Z. (1989). *The Philosophy Discussion of 1947 and Soviet Philosophy. Journal of Liaoning University (Philosophy and Social Science Edition)*, (3), 93-98.

[14] Zhdanov Research. (1981). *Foreign Literature Research*, (1), 25-29.

[15] Doe, J. (2023). *The Life and Times of Andrei Zhdanov. Publishing House*.

[16] Marx, K. (1996). *Educational quotations. Shandong Education* (21), 1. (Translated title: *Educational Maxims*).

[17] Marx, K. (1994). *Educational quotations. Shandong Education* (04), 1. (Translated title: *Educational Maxims*).

[18] A. A. Ždanov, *Referat o časopisima "Zvezda" i "Lejningrad"*, Beograd-Zagreb 1946, str. 42.

[19] A. A. Ždanov, *Vystuplenie tov. Ždanova, "Voprosy filosofii"*, br. 1/1947, str. 257.

[20] K. Marx, *Bemerkungen über die neueste preussische Zensurinstruktion, Werke I*, str. 6.

[21] J. V. Stalin, *Otnositel' no marksizma v jazikoznanii, "Voprosy filosofii"*, br. 1/1950, str. 5-11.