The Lack of Lesson Objectives Leads to the Lack of Progressive Ideas in Teaching History.

Habitus and Discourse of People Employed in Local Education Authorities of the Early 1950s.

Aleksandr Chashchukhin

Received in July 2014

Aleksandr Chashchukhin
Candidate of Sciences in History, Associate Professor, The Humanities Department of the National Research University—Higher School of Economics, Perm. Address: 38 Studencheskaya str., 614070, Perm, Russian Federation. Email: alexandr-pstu@mail.ru

Abstract. This paper analyzes the specific features of habitus and speech practices of education authority employees of the late Stalinist era. These people are often 'invisible' for researchers who traditionally focus on teachers and students. Meanwhile, it's inspectors and administrators of local education authorities, developers of teaching methods, professors of advanced training institutes, and party functionaries supervising educational policy issues who mastered and produced discourses that were not just a basis for statutory records: their speech practices were translated to the school, constructing the professional worldview of teachers. The study uses materials of the audit carried out in 1949–1950 by Molotov (Perm) regional education authority at the initiative of the regional committee. The auditors were interested in how two ideology-forming school subjects, History and Constitution of the Soviet Union, were taught. We also investigate into the ways of using political language in professional teaching environments and reconstruct the mechanisms of school teacher performance assessment and the practices that molded the habitus of a teaching expert in the education system.

Keywords: Soviet school, Stalinism, political language, discourse, habitus, inspector, teacher.

This paper should begin with description of our own research perspective. Most of us see the school environment as a place where the key roles are assigned to students and teachers. Images of peers and teachers form the basis of memories. They can hardly be called unique, as virtually everyone has a school background. The vision of school changes somewhat for those who acquire some teaching experience, which is true for many researchers. Young teachers get behind the scenes in the world of professional teachers, discovering the specifics of relationships with school administration and par-

ents. Whether we want it or not, we evaluate school through the lens of our own social experience and currently held position. Our memory is selective, recording things that are now perceived as relevant. Does memory selectivity affect the interpretation of sources? It definitely does. Indeed, when we look through archives, transcribed interviews, or photos, we focus first of all on what seems surprising and to some extent recognizable from our personal or indirect experience. As a result, the interpretation of every source always involves a background that we ignore due to the specifics of historical memory, the social position we currently hold, and our own research preferences.[1] Such failure to see a broader picture may partially be prevented by defamiliarization, which changes the optics and shifts the focus of research.[2]

What is in plain view but practically unobservable in materials on Soviet schools? Sources enable the reconstruction of things that were happening on the school stage. The ideas that guided the main characters—pupils and teachers—are quite understandable.[3] Other characters remain invisible; meanwhile, without them, we wouldn't even know about the play. These are the authors of the documents we deal with, the ones who prepared the reports—employees of education management authorities. Auditors and heads of district and regional people's education departments, authorized, party-member teachers, instructional designers and teachers of institutions of further training, and apparatchiks coordinating educational policy—those were the people who mastered the language of power. Modifying it, they produced discourses that were more than just the basis for official reporting. The speech patterns were translated to schools, shaping professional teachers' worldviews and also indirectly affecting students.

The power of ideology in Soviet education is too obvious, especially when we talk about Stalin-era schools. Yet, the process of cognizing the surrounding world through ideology was not smooth. In each specific case, when someone had to use political language, he or she solved the problem of correct language usage more or less efficiently. Auditors providing professional and political assessment of school performance were also forced to demonstrate their skills at using ideology correctly in a specific context to upper management.

---

1 These practices of research interpretation may be called background practices, according to Vadim Volkov and Oleg Kharkhordin [Volkov, Kharkhordin, 2008. P. 18–22].

2 This term was used by Viktor Shklovsky to denote the presentation of common things in an unfamiliar ways [Shklovskiy, 1929. P. 11–12].

3 Ample foreign and Russian historiography research has been devoted to teachers and students at various stages of Soviet history. Scientific works on Soviet school issues are posted for instance, on the website of seminar *The Culture of Childhood: Norms, Values, Practices.* Available at: http://childcult.rsuh.ru/section.html?id=5130

How the quality of teaching was measured and what is in there for us today

The local realm of a given educational institution was subject to regular audits by superior authorities. At the initiative of the regional party committee, Molotov regional people's education department undertook to audit the quality of teaching in the two ideology-shaping disciplines, history and the Constitution of the Soviet Union, in 1949–1950. The audit was going to be followed by a meeting of the committee bureau. Auditors from regional people's education departments and authorized teachers from Molotov schools were sent around to other schools in the region.[4] They would attend classes, talk to teachers, ask students questions, and check the schools for sufficient presentation aids as well as course books and literary works in school libraries. The handwritten reports were later attached to the audit materials.[5] A contemporary reader who equates ideology with Stalin-era ideas may be surprised at reading those reports. The authors recorded mistakes committed by pupils in classes, although the principal object of audit and inspection was the teacher rather than the students. Teachers were interviewed to identify their professional skills and the level of their ideological and political consciousness.

Here is an example of an incorrect student answer. The question was, " What changes did the Soviet Union undergo between 1924 and 1936 in terms of industrial, agricultural, and commercial development?" One student's answer was:

> In 1924, there was still human exploitation of other humans. There were still speculators, kulaks, landlords, and others. They exploited workers and peasants. Factories and works were in the hands of capitalists. In 1936, these landlords, capitalists, and kulaks were destroyed and driven out of the Soviet State. Factories and works, air and road transport, banks—all was confiscated from the rich. <…> Workers live better lives now, working 8 hours a day. Peasants too, they have united in kolkhozes to live better and richer

4 The city of Perm was named Molotov from 1940 to 1957.

5 Five detailed reports on 87 pages in total were discovered. They include materials on the Suksunskiy, Solikamskiy, Yusvenskiy, and Beloyevskiy districts. The audits were performed in September–November 1949. The greater part of materials used in this paper was taken from *Dokladnye, spravki, materialy proveryayushchikh raykomy, gorkomy partii obkomu* VKP*(b) po podgotovke voprosa na byuro obkoma partii "O sostoyanii prepodavaniya i kachestva znaniy uchashchikhsya istorii, Konstitutsii* SSSR*, i dr. voprosam" 01.091949–11.1950* [Reports, Findings, and Materials Submitted by Auditors of District and Municipal Party Committees to the Regional RCP(b) Party Committee, Related to the Development of the Issue "On the Quality of Teaching and Student Knowledge in History, the Constitution of the Soviet Union, and Other Issues" to Be Considered by the Regional Party Committee Bureau, September 1, 1949—November 1950]. PermGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458.

lives [PerMGANI (Perm State Archive of Contemporary History). Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 85 rev].

How on earth could landlords and capitalists in the pupil's mind make it to 1936, exploiting peasants along the way? It is true that Stalinist mythology associated the heroic past with the greatest leader of all time and all peoples, but it never forgot the events of the October Revolution and the Civil War.

Depending on research optics, the example above may be interpreted in different ways. If followers of Sheila Fitzpatrick discover such mistakes, they will cast a doubt on the performance of power in ideological activity [Fitzpatrick, 2008]. From this perspective, the world of schools, especially rural schools, involves a "parallel" reality, which is scarcely affected by the national ideology. Supporters of the totalitarian vision may argue about the poor representativeness of such sources. Indeed, student mistakes are commonplace. Using them to make judgments about how well Soviet people absorbed ideological dogmas is not really convincing. Conversely, the rigid methodological recommendations and the uniform understanding of history would once again prove the point about the totalitarian nature of power.

With all the differences between these polar opposite conceptions, they do have one thing in common. Regardless of what is given priority—total control by governmental authorities or autonomous local routines—such optics simplify our ideas of the past. Let us try looking at the student's answer from another perspective. Instead of regarding the incorrect answer as a proxy for pupils' actual knowledge, we could treat it as a specific vision of the auditor, i. e. his or her habitus[6]. This is similar to a photo that shows not only the subjects photographed but also the tastes and preferences of the photographer. The latter fishes out things that matter for him or her in diverse reality and makes a comprehensive composition out of them. What did auditors of education management departments focus on? What mistakes did they classify as important? How did they present the information they obtained in reports?

What was school audit reporting like and what competencies did it require from auditors

Internal reports represent a unique genre. They are addressed to superior authorities who assess not only the state of things described in the report but also the author. This author-assessment orientation prescribes specific rules for the preparation of reports. A document should have a structure that highlights significant things and discards anything unworthy of attention. At the epoch, the party reporting system, which was applied to education, involved some plans but hardly

[6] This term is used in its classical meaning [Bourdieu, 2005. P. 70–86].

ever provided any pre-designed templates, which were typical of the last decades of the Soviet era.

An authorized auditor had to have specific language competencies to write an internal report: organizing the structure of discourse, using words correctly in terms of their meaning. In other words, auditors were required to comply with certain norms, whether known or implied. Thus, the head teacher of the Extension Course Institute for Teachers of the Komi Okrug[7] thought it necessary to quote a Stalinist functionary in his report:

> Our people, says comrade Zhdanov, should be educated, with high principles, tastes, cultural and moral requirements. <...> The historic decree of the Central Committee of the Party on ideological activity has become a militant program for our schools. Putting its decisions into effect, the people's education authorities and teachers of our okrug have improved ideological education in schools considerably. [PerMGANI (Perm State Archive of Contemporary History). Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 83].

The way the author organized his discourse was not dictated by his personal preferences. A correct report was supposed to either repeat some clichés from a relevant decree or follow the same patterns. Using the language of newspaper leads was not just a ritual to show loyalty. Further interpretation of the events the auditor had noticed and described in his report was largely determined by the framework of the discourse that had to be applied in order to identify and assess specific situations. The structure included several stages. First, the author outlined the problem field. After the words *however* and *meanwhile*, the head teacher moved from quoting to describing *specific* defects he had spotted:

> ...Lessons of the Constitution of the Soviet Union are often limited to stating bare facts. Learning material is poorly used to instill the spirit of Soviet patriotism, national pride, and high moral qualities. The syllabus is hardly relevant to present-day objectives. Thus, it is no coincidence that student knowledge is sometimes superficial. <...> Schedules and lesson plans are available, though formal [PerMGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 83].

The last sentence is hard to understand in the contemporary context. It would seem there is nothing more formal in teaching than schedules and lesson plans. However, the auditor was using different meanings. The adjective *formal* used to denote "poorly done" and con-

[7] The Komi Okrug was part of the Molotov Oblast´ (Perm Krai presently).

tained a political evaluation, since *formal* has the same root as the term *formalism*, which was of such importance at that time. The author was trying to explain in political terms the inconsistence between perfect models and the real state of things he had discovered. Imperfect translation was the root of the problem. Lessons are *limited* (simplified, diluted), material is *poorly used* and *hardly relevant*. Such formal attitudes among teachers result in students' *superficial knowledge*. We can recognize some model teaching practices behind this description. Teaching of the discipline in question should be enthusiastic and stimulating, inculcating Soviet patriotism and moral qualities, susceptible to actualization in a contemporary context. This may be easily achieved with the use of detailed lesson plans. Easily identifiable or guessable oppositions like *bare/enthusiastic*, *patriotism/cosmopolitism*, *high Soviet/low bourgeois moral principles*, or *real/formal* set the coordinates that are applied to perceived reality.

At the next stage, the auditor applied the same vision to identify specific mistakes committed by pupils. The question "When was the socialist state established?" was answered as follows: "Our state was established when private property appeared" [PerMGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 85], much to the indignation of the auditor. It is likely that the student confused materials of the two disciplines, history and the Constitution of the Soviet Union. Indeed, if we drop the word *socialist* from the question, the answer will become correct from the Marxist perspective.

The auditor recorded mistakes of a special kind. It was not only about the mutiny of content but also and about the incorrect representation of social science materials. Thus, to the question "What is the Constitution of the Soviet Union? Why should every citizen know and obey the principal law of their country?" students would answer:

The Constitution of the Soviet Union is what is written in the Constitution of the Soviet Union. The Constitution says what every citizen of the USSR should know. The Constitution of the Soviet Union is the principal law of all Soviet citizens. The Constitution of the Soviet Union was adopted on December 5, 1935; the date is considered a national holiday today. The Constitution is what is written in laws and what these laws say about: the equality of all peoples, the eight-hour working day, etc. [PerMGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 85].

At first glance, this is no more than quoting students who were never taught to express their thoughts clearly and adequately. Yes, it is. But why did the auditor consider it his duty to quote mistakes of this special kind? His indignation was caused not by poorly formulated oral and written discourse but rather by the inability of pupils to articulate their answers correctly in the strictly prescribed framework of the political language of the time. Construction of correct statements in that case was an action defining the situation rather than an act of communication. Therefore, since "our school doesn't have non-party dis-

ciplines, but history and the Constitution are absolutely the most party-specific ones" [PerMGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 16], according to a colleague of the head teacher, it is easy to suggest that lessons and associated speech practice involved continuous reproduction of politically correct evaluations of current events. John Osteen called such statements performative. Their function is less to communicate information than to maintain the status or role, to define or redefine the situation [Osteen, 2006. P. 262–281]. Quoting Zhdanov, the author demonstrated his political competence to the management, and his method of detecting defects showed his ability to apply prescribed language prescribed to a specific lesson. The deviations that were revealed consisted of the incorrect usage of language and, hence, the loss of the necessary effect of defining verbally the political situation that had to be reproduced in history and Constitution classes. The wrong answer resulted from a poorly organized survey and explanation. Any incorrect statement made by a student or a teacher transformed classes into a poorly staged play.

How auditors explained the causes of revealed defects and what repair methods they suggested

Technically, pupils also attempted to produce performative statements. Even today, a demonstration lesson implies certain staging as compared to regular lessons. At a demo lesson, there is a viewer whose opinion is not to be questioned. The lesson becomes a sort of teacher-student play in front of the dignitary. The school audits of the early 1950s put an end to the undivided authority of the principal in the school and the teacher in the classroom. A representative of the regional people's education department could easily go over the line: come into the classroom, into the principal's office, or check any documentation. The very presence of an auditor in the classroom, his right to ask students "over the teacher's head," discredited the teacher's authority. An authorized auditor was entitled to look, to ask, and, more importantly, to write a report, which would inevitably include defects. Students tried to deal with their task by playing their roles correctly. Most often, they failed. The lack of linguistic means resulted either in mechanical reiteration of political turns of speech and tautology—"The Constitution of the Soviet Union is what is written in the Constitution of the Soviet Union"—or in a weird blend of high political discourse and routine speech patterns [Kozlova, 1996]. Consequently, the language of power assumed a naïve, i. e. incorrect form: "One should know the Constitution to be able to construct communism. And you should also know the Constitution to enter technical colleges and other schools, it is necessary to know the Constitution" [PerMGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 85].

How does the author of the internal report explain the reasons for the defects he detected? The auditor sees the main problem in the mechanism of translating political language. All the blame was laid on school teachers, who treated their work *formally* and, most im-

portantly, did not reach the required ideological and political development. In other words, teachers had not mastered the skill of using politically correct language and had not taught it to their students. The auditor sees the solution to this problem in social work with teachers and improvement of their political literacy—this would make the auditor define the teacher differently by ranking him among Soviet heroes. Having started his report by quoting an authorized ideologue, the auditor ends his discourse with a similar message:

> All our ideological workers are now at the forefront, as objectives of the ideological front are not cancelled but, vice versa, stressed in the context of peaceful development (Zhdanov). Teachers will tackle this problem efficiently if they upgrade their skills, increase their ideological level, and feel public responsibility for the assumed mission of raising the young generation of our great Motherland.

A regional committee employee considered it his duty to underline the last sentence in pencil. The following sentence was underlined, too:

> In reality, however, many teachers have low levels of ideological and political development. Some teachers neither take any interest in the current political events, nor read literary works, nor study the oeuvres of Marx, Lenin, or Stalin [PerMGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 87].

The auditor succeeded in many aspects of his report. He showed his political competence to the management. The way he identified teaching defects left no doubt in the goals he had pursued. Rather, deviations were regarded as isolated cases of imperfect teachers whose occasional errors confirmed once again the high status of the prescribed model. The report structure was determined by specific patterns of political discourse. The author had to identify "on the spot" problems that had been specified in the relevant order, to find out who was to blame, and to offer a solution. In such discourse, any digression from clichés became the main deviation, as incorrectly formulated performative statements indicated that reality had been defined wrongly, which was potentially fraught with mutiny.

What skills auditors needed and what was the reference standard to measure the quality of teaching

It is difficult to say how reflexive the preparation of such documents was or how much effort auditors put into it. There is no doubt these are precise patterns that cannot be explained by personal preferences: with all the differences between internal reports prepared by different auditors, vision and organization of discourse are pretty much the same. Unlike the auditor we mentioned above, many others considered literal quotes of Stalinist functionaries redundant. However, the method of detecting defects was always the same. A correctly for-

mulated performative statement became the reference standard to measure the quality of school teaching. Such a statement was based on the sacred dualist vision expressed through the spatiotemporal oppositions *then/now*, *them/us*. Textbooks, methodological recommendations, and internal reports used this dualism to provide examples: description of the lives of pre-revolutionary peasants and contemporary kolkhozniks, American and Soviet workers. Landlords and capitalists—defeated, destroyed, or driven out from 'one sixth of the earth's' land surface—had been unable to overthrow the powerful state, which had proved its right for existence in the cruel war of the Soviet people led by Stalin. The task of both students and teachers was not only to reproduce the language of power but also to build correct arguments based on "real-life" examples. The democratic image of the Soviet state had to be maintained through awareness of the local Councils' activities, and civil rights and freedoms through awareness of the eight-hour working day as a legal norm. Perhaps, this level of matching learning materials with present-day objectives was where the problems appeared. Real-life examples could not be related to routine practices, as they were described using totally different discourse. Cited examples had nothing to do with real, everyday life, backbreaking work and poverty. "Real-life" examples were concocted from the political discourse that implied an imaginary everyday life of Soviet people [Dobrenko, 2007; Kazankov, 2012. P. 194–220]. This mechanism of material interpretation was the toughest thing to do for teachers and pupils. They committed the same mistake over and over again by trying to give correct answers based on local examples and in terms describing their everyday routine practices.

In order to detect teacher and pupil mistakes, auditors themselves needed to master the important skill of comparing and discriminating between the past and the present, both globally and locally, in the system of official ideological meanings.

> …Material on the topic *The Great Patriotic War of 1941–1945* was used to compare the guerilla movement with that in the current topic *The Patriotic War of 1812,* but there was no discrimination made between the Soviet patriotism and the one before the Revolution, so the next day the students were unable to answer the question, "Is there a difference between Soviet and pre-revolutionary patriotism?" [PermGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, pp.1–2].

As we know, Stalinist presentation of humanities was centered on the inevitability of the happy present life in the Soviet Union. Each historical event only had value in the context of the victory of communism in each specific country. The chain of Russian military commanders, reformist monarchs, leaders of people's rebellions, and representatives of the "liberation" movement was advancing the victory of the new re-

gime step by step. Alexander Nevsky, Peter the Great, Mikhail Kutuzov, Pavel Pestel, and Sophia Perovskaya were given importance and desired meanings in the context of the Stalinist era only. Besides, a comparison of characters of the past with those of the present had to demonstrate the prosperity and advantages of living in the Soviet state. The most progressive characters in history had to be imperfect; for instance, they could have no class-consciousness due to poorly developed productive forces and relations of production. To demonstrate this, teachers had to compare historical materials to current "real-life" situations all the time, regardless of historical period and geography.

> ...When delivering the topic *Empire and its Collapse*, the teacher said nothing about the aggressive nature of Timur's conquests or about his desire to create a worldwide empire; neither did he emphasize that the empire created by Timur was a huge feudal state, which collapsed because it reposed on military power and consisted of separate feudal dominions that wanted independence. The teacher didn't compare Timur's empire with other similar empires that had been studied earlier—Charlemagne's Empire, the Rurikovich Imperial House— yet each of them underwent the same processes as Timur's empire. It was never stressed why our state is getting bigger and stronger or that it is a state of the new, higher type, as it is based on the friendship of peoples. All of these drawbacks lowered the ideological level of the lessons [PermGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 1–2].

One has the impression that auditors focused the most on the skills of regularly comparing events of the past with those of the present, of contradistinguishing between the imperfect previous times and the natural perfection of Soviet reality. The teacher of history should have compared Timur's empire to the Soviet Union. A teacher of Russian who forgot to inscribe the lesson material into the dualist framework was close to ideological subversion:

> In school No 50, pupils of the 7th grade were offered the following sentence: "There is little light but a lot of dirt and humidity in the bakery." This is again perplexing if students associate the sentence with a contemporary bakery. [Report on the work of Molotov schools in academic year 1950/51. GAPK (State Perm Krai Archive). Stock No.p-478, finding aid No.2, case No.76, sh. 50].

A teacher of geography, covering the topic of *Climate of the* USSR, committed a serious mistake when she:

> ...didn't lead the pupils to the conclusion that socialist people can change climate in some corners of the planet. This is perfectly illustrated by the victory of the Soviet people over drought. In fact,

> a new geographic environment is being created in southern regions of the Soviet Union [Report on the work of Molotov schools in academic year 1950/51. GAPK. Stock No p-478, finding aid No 2, case No 75a, sh. 21].

Spatial discourse was similar to historical discourse [Orlova, 2004]. The high ideological level of a lesson was determined not only by how a pupil or a teacher were able to justify teleologically the importance of a historic event but also by how they explained its critical distinction from the contemporary state of things, supporting the required clichés with everyday life examples taken from the political discourse itself. A poorly lit, humid, and dirty bakery could be familiar to students from their daily experience, but it only became reality when it was introduced into a politically organized text or statement. From then on, incorrect alignment of images incurred political diagnosis.

How auditors mastered assessment methods and how teachers acquired necessary political competencies

How was such habitus formed? How did experts—whether it be authorized teachers, employees of advanced training institutions for teachers, or auditors from district and regional people's education departments—master the specified assessment methods and the mechanisms of translating them into the report language understandable by superior management? Researchers of the Stalinist era have come across expressions like *ideological level*, *socio-political work,* or *political enlightenment* so often that they have been naturally tempted into perceiving these clichés as some ritual turns of speech that hide the "true" content and meanings of events behind them. However, they forget that the common and familiar political background of a source conceals, or rather, reveals the practices that are used to teach the language and political competencies indispensable for teachers.

A teacher of the Stalinist era had to master the skills of correct speaking, systematization of historical material, evaluation of answers, and arrangement of lessons. These practices were partly described in teaching aids, but most of the skills were acquired in another way. We are talking about socio-political work, which was compulsory for teachers and particularly for representatives of district and regional people's education departments. Let's try to identify the main components of such work. Knowledge of present-day political texts implied regular reading of Soviet newspapers and extracts from classical literary works.

> Improves his ideological and political level by independent work. Took note of Lenin's *Chto takoe druzya naroda i kak oni voyuyut protiv sotsial-demokratii* [What Friends of People Are and How They Fight Against Social Democracy] in the summer, *Chto delat* [What Is To Be Done] during the first trimester, now is working

> on the textbook *Istoriya* SSSR [History of the USSR] [PermGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 26].

"Working" on articles was not just about reading; detailed notes had to be taken, as they were important proof of teachers' active, political self-preparation. "No notes or recapitulations on the history of the USSR, nor a written self-improvement plan" [Ibid.] (underlined in the text—*A.C.*). Not only were recapitulations a means of teacher monitoring, but they also produced a collection of quotes to be used in both lessons and public speeches in front of rural or city audience.[8]

> Comrade Shamarin is the Secretary of the initial party organization of the village of Gorodishche. <...> During the summer and the fourth trimester, he made three reports on the topics: *The Charter of an Agricultural Artel*, *On the Viability of Kolkhoz Regime*, *On the 32nd Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*. Overall, Comrade Shamarin participates actively in the life of the kolkhoz village [PermGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 26].

Public speeches were designed to sharpen the speaking skills of both audited and auditing teachers.

Preparing a lesson plan also required recapitulating political texts, copying out quotes from the fathers of Marxism and Stalinist functionaries. A plan was not just a summary of the upcoming lesson. It was a detailed dramaturgic elaboration of the anticipated action. When teaching was incriminated in being *formal* or *lacking ideology*, it meant that the lesson plan was not detailed enough, or didn't specify the primary goal of the lesson, or there was no plan at all.

Plans are short, sometimes teachers have no lesson plan at all. <...> In almost all schools, plans contain no objectives or conclusions, or objectives are set incorrectly, determining not the idea but a brief summary of the lesson. A lack of objectives makes the plan formal. <...> A lack of objectives leads to a lack of ideology in teaching history. <...> In class, pupils are simply given facts without any historical assessment from the Marxist-Leninist perspective [PerMGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 81–81 rev.].

Correct preparation of lesson plans required tremendous effort, which is illustrated by a quote from an interview with a teacher who studied in a Molotov teacher school in the mid-1950s:

---

[8] Personal stocks of the Perm archives comprise materials of the then-famous local teachers and education managers. These materials include schematic notes of public lectures, a type of source that is interesting for analysis. As a rule, they represent a construction set of quotes by Stalin, Lenin, Krupskaya, Kalinin, and Dzerzhinsky. Personal notebooks of teachers also often resemble collections of quotes by politicians and Soviet writers.

> But I didn't sleep at night. I almost had no sleep at all. Well, none of us did. Once, I didn't have the time to prepare a single plan—we had to do four. Plans, by the way, were written like this. One: "Good morning, children!" Two: "Good morning!" children reply. Next question—expected answer. Question—answer. It was total madness... I didn't make one and was dismissed from my internship. Because they checked every letter. <...>. An so I cried for a day, and the next day they called me and said, "Your internship will be continued. Next week, everyone will be studying but you will still be working."[9]

It would be naïve to believe that school reality conformed entirely to the prescribed standards. The possibility of regular or random audits of lesson plans by principals, head teachers, or representatives of regional people's education departments was an essential means of school teacher control. This form of control was preserved by schools long after the described era was over.

Shaped under these practices, habitus of expert teachers stipulated specific mechanisms of discriminating between norms and deviations that revealed themselves not only in speech but also in lesson organization. A schematic plan was a scenario to be materialized into a play called a lesson. Using dramaturgic metaphors in this context is quite productive, as is Goffman's terminology in particular [Goffman, 2000. P. 45–84].

Using archival materials and numerous photographic documents, we can picture the *downstage of performance* and the *theatrical embodiment*. The difference is that auditors saw through the *backdrop drape*, behind which teachers concealed the process of preparation for lessons and the level of their political consciousness. Instead of assessing the informative content, analysis of lessons assessed the performative value, which was considered a politically significant ritual. Ambiguous statements and discourse blending were unacceptable. "The grade of C is too much for Filippova's work, as she allows herself to say that Peter played games of a military nature with the Semenovsky and Preobrazhensky regiments" [PerMGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 18]. "…Emphasized the historical power of our state. Concluded his narration by saying, "That would be all I wanted to say"" [PerMGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 828 rev.].

Lesson planning suggested monitoring the lessons' temporal patterns, which were determined by the importance of topics and

---

[9] The interview with L.S. was recorded on February 20, 2011 at the school where she worked (personal archive of Chashchukhin A.). The respondent was born in the Molotov (Perm) oblast in 1938 and received a higher teacher education. Total duration of the interview: 111 minutes; interviewer: Chashchukhin A.; transcribers: Chashchukhina N., Chashchukhin A.

issues covered. Assessment of a teacher's work included tracking the amount of time the teacher devoted to quizzes and delivering new material. "The quiz took six minutes, a pupil was asked about the overthrow of the tsarist regime. Of those six minutes, he spent three to talk about Rasputin, and then he talked about the two conspiracies, in a very primitive way though" [PerMGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 20]. Reducing program material on the topics most important for Soviet history appears to be a blatant deviation:

> In 20 minutes, the teacher delivered a huge amount of material which is normally covered in three or four lessons: (a) *Emergence of the Dual Power*; (b) *April Crisis of the Provisional Government. April Theses of Comrade Lenin*; (c) *June Crisis*; (d) *July Crisis*. Obviously, this amount of information may only be delivered in a very primitive way in 20 minutes [PermGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 20].

Auditors associated the structured timing of a lesson with the political significance of the material covered, using it as a measure of teaching quality. Lesson plans were an attempt to control the political situation played out in the classroom. The inconsistency between scheduled and real-time patterns was a major violation in the eyes of auditors. Bureaucratization is a universal phenomenon typical of mass schooling in any country, but planning the learning process, as it was understood in the Stalinist era, was far from rational formalization of teacher functions and powers. Rather, it was a projection of metaphysical ideas of a planned economy on learning and teaching activities. That's why any deviation from the plan or a poorly designed plan was treated not just as professional incompetence, but as a proof of the teacher's political underperformance. In addition, teachers' defects allowed auditors to demonstrate their own political competence again:

> For instance, speaking of dual power, he didn't say a word about what Soviets represented, or how Lenin evaluated them, or about Soviet Order No.1 and the role it played. Speaking about Lenin's April theses, he said Lenin was raising the problem of food allotment there, as there was food insecurity due to the war and famine; the political objective was to create Soviets, etc. [PerMGANI. Stock No 105, finding aid No 15, case No 458, sh. 20].

In summary, the auditor was assessing the performance of lessons. Having identified defects, he analyzed the script, required the role to be rehearsed, tried to understand how the teacher organized his self-preparation and how he bore his title outside the school. These procedures and requirements for teachers unveil the projection of ideas of practices mastered by the auditors themselves, as most of them had experience teaching and designing instructions for their col-

leagues. Habitus of an auditor or of an expert teacher represented specific ways of interpreting and recognizing professional norms. The latter were based on using political discourse professionally: auditors detected defects in teaching of social sciences and at the same time showed their own political competencies to management. Instead of the informative content, it was rather performative value that was assessed, as each word pronounced in the classroom had to define the situation in a politically correct way. This habitus was shaped by regular practices of reading and working on political texts, public speeches, and reports. These patterns of perception and assessment of the professional teaching world could only change under the influence of cultural and social transformations of the "Thaw" period, with the change of the place and the role of political discourse in the world of professions.

References

1. Austin J. (2006) *Tri sposoba prolit chernila* [Three Ways of Spilling Ink], Saint Petersburg: Aleteya.
2. Bourdieu P. (2005) *Sotsiologiya sotsialnogo prostranstva* [Sociology of Social Environment], Moscow: Institut eksperimentalnoy sotsiologii; Saint Petersburg: Aleteya.
3. Dobrenko Y. (2007) *Politekonomiya sotsrealizma* [Political Economy of Socialist Realism], Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.
4. Fitzpatrick S. (2008) *Povsednevny stalinizm. Sotsialnaya istoriya Sovetskoy Rossii v 30-ye gody: gorod* [Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s], Moscow: Russian Political Encyclopedia (ROSSPEN); The Yeltsin Foundation.
5. Goffman E. (2000) *Predstavlenie sebya drugim v povsednevnoy zhizni* [The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life], Moscow: Kanon-Press-Ts.
6. Kazankov A. (2012) *Samaya tikhaya kontrrevolyutsiya, ili Kak Lyo Korbyuzye razvalil* SSSR*. 1956: Ocherki provintsialnogo byta* [The Quietest Counter-Revolution, or How Le Corbusier Ruined the USSR. 1956: The Sketchbook of Living in the Boondocks], Perm: The Perm State Institute of Arts and Culture.
7. Kozlova N. (1996) *Gorizonty povsednevnosti sovetskoy epokhi: Golosa iz khora* [Everyday Perspectives in the Soviet Era: Voices from the Choir], Moscow: Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
8. Orlova G. (2004) Ovladet prostranstvom: fizicheskaya geografiya v sovetskoy shkole (1930–60-ye gg.) [Mastering the Space: Physical Geography in the Soviet School]. *Voprosy istorii estestvoznaniya i tekhniki*, no 4, pp. 163–185 Available at: http://hrc.ane.ru/upload/medialibrary/0f4/orlova_geography%20in%20school.pdf (accessed 26 February 2015).
9. RSUH (2014) *Kultura detstva: normy, tsennosti, praktiki* [The Culture of Childhood: Norms, Values, Practices]. Available at: http://childcult.rsuh.ru/section.html?id=5130 (accessed 26 February 2015)
10. Shklovskiy V. (1929) *O teorii prozy* [On the Theory of the Prose], Moscow: Federatsiya.
11. Volkov V., Kharkhordin O. (2008) *Teorii praktik* [Theories of Practices]. Saint Petersburg: The European University in Saint Petersburg.