

Research Article**Teaching to love, teaching to recognize love, teaching to be happy—means
teaching to respect yourself and teaching human dignity.****Anton Makarenko, Nikolay K. Chapaev,****Olga B. Akimova and Evgenij M. Dorozhkin**Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University,
Ekaterinburg, Russia*E-mail: chapaev-n-k@yandex.ru

Antinomic dialectics as a methodological tool for solving paradoxes of love in A.S. Makarenko juvenile pedagogy

ABSTRACT

The problem under study is urgent due to existent contradiction between the growing need for the development of an adequate heuristic tool for studying the educating problems of the younger generation, on the one hand, and ignoring the rich positive experience of Makarenko juvenile pedagogy, on the other. On a broader, ontological basis, the study is relevant due to the polymodalization processes of the all aspects of human activity and human existence, which in its turn call for the development of an integral multidimensional human. The multidimensional human is oriented to the plurality recognition of truths and ideas about the world, capable of solving the growing shaft of problems, devoid of one-dimensional and unambiguous direction.

The paper is aimed at scientific identification and legitimation of antinomical pedagogy. On this basis its tool opportunities are disclosed using A.S. Makarenko experience for solving love conflicts-paradoxes in juvenile educational environment.

The main approach to study is an antinomic principle. This allows us to consider opposites as necessary equal components of a certain holistic process (phenomenon) and suggests ways of adapting to them.

The following results are obtained in the study. Firstly, the essential, substantive and instrumental characteristics of the antinomic dialectics are established and scientifically substantiated. Secondly, mechanisms for realizing its methodological potential in Makarenko educational system. Thirdly, some problems and perspectives of the study of antinomy as a pedagogical and educational phenomenon are indicated.

The materials of the article can be useful in modeling, designing and developing modern younger generation education systems, and also as a heuristic tool for studying the problems of development and improving antinomical pedagogy.

Keywords: Antinomies, antinomic dialectics, antinomical pedagogy, juvenile (adolescent-youth) pedagogy; the pedagogy of love; teacher as a top manager.

INTRODUCTION

Philosophers consider antinomy as "... a contradiction formed by two judgments (inferences, laws), each of which is recognized as true" (Gritsanov, 1999). Thus, the semantic dominant of the category under discussion is a contradiction. Consequently, there is reason to believe that antinomy and dialectics correlate. Dialectics is a science of contradictions, the unity and struggle of opposites, the universal laws of the development of nature, society, human and thought (Frolov, 1991). This, in a

sense, leads us to legitimize the existence of antinomic dialectics. In addition to its dialectic filling, antinomic dialectics includes as its heuristic basis the principles of similarity in difference and difference in similarity, and antinomies. According to the first principle, relation of opposites is not dialectical negation of each other, but is harmony and similarity (Malakhov, Filatov, 1990). The second principle complements the first one. In addition to recognizing the equality and equivalence of

polarities, it suggests ways of adapting to them. In their totality, these principles express the essence of the so-called "balancing thinking" (Yarkina, 1992), which forms the heuristic foundation of the antinomic dialectics. However, as it will be seen from below, the antinomic approach does not completely reject the ubiquitous law of the hierarchy (as for example, two-factor approach). Figuratively speaking, one of the opposites, as a rule, is more equal.

The concept of "antinomic dialectics" is by no means the invention of the author of this article. We refer to the article by Gaidenko (1988) "P.A. Florensky antinomic dialectics against the identity law". The interesting is that this work especially emphasizes the statement of P.A. Florensky about the moral, ethical and, to some extent, even the love side of the antinomic dialectics issue. According to Gaidenko, the entire Florensky antinomic dialectics is based on the conviction that the rejection of selfishness and self-assertion presupposes a rejection of the identity law. It is further asserted that the love to the other, according to Florensky, demands the renunciation of the identity law, the abolition of it. This is supported by the thesis (Florensky, 2017) that the of identity law is a synonym for egoism, callousness, lack of love and the skoptsy mind, while antinomy is synonymous with altruism, love, faith and creativity. The intentions of antinomic dialectics are applicable to the modern education. For example, the its direct pedagogical consequence is the concept of a holistic school, developed by German scientists (Winkel, 1988). Its core is the proposition that the universe has paradoxical antinomic properties, suggesting the coexistence of opposing and mutually exclusive ways of being - randomness and necessity, order and chaos, activity and rest. This allows to more accurately deal with such issues as, for example, relationship between the individual and the collective. It contributes to the recognition of the need to build a qualitatively new system of interrelations between organizations and their environment, nature and human down to their subject-object fusion. The latter is determined by the comprehension of the integrating sense of nature as an indivisible triad consisting of the subject, the object and the integration process

that takes place between them. Ultimately, this leads to the realization of the idea of a person's global openness to nature, to taking into account all aspects of life in all its diversity in educational activities, to the realization of the need for global cooperation and co-creation of human and nature, a person and a person, and a person with himself (Yarkina, 1992; Chapaev, 2005).

The heuristic power of Makarenko's antinomic dialectic fully manifested itself in his concept of love. If we look at the consolidated subject index, presented in the last volume of A.S. Makarenko collected works on page 550, we will see that love is not a passing word, but a very significant category that permeates the entire structure of his educational system. In this respect, Makarenko's response to one of the questions asked him when speaking at the Kharkov Pedagogical Institute is characteristic: 'I decided to write a love book, because I involuntarily became an expert in this matter (Laughter in the hall), although I came to this persuasion at the most recent time that love is not at all an influx or a chance, nor an accident, but this is an ordinary case that needs to be organized. Therefore, educating good organizers, you thereby ... bring up good lovers' (Makarenko, 1958, Vol.5, pp.297-298). As they say, no comments. A.S. Makarenko distinguishes four types of love: love for the home country, love for parents, love of parents, love properly, concerning relations in juvenile environment.

We included the phrase "paradoxes of juvenile pedagogy" in the title of the paper. At first glance, it may seem a bit dubious to use it in the topic. Paradoxes look somewhat frivolous alongside such an important and at the same time mysterious category as the antonymic dialectics. But this is only at first glance. Paradoxes are by no means lightweight and not far from the concepts of "antinomy" and "dialectics". Both in Russia and abroad, not infrequently the concepts of "contradiction", "paradox" and "antinomy" are considered synonymous (Getmanova, 1998). From this we also started when considering the paradoxes of love and the ways of their resolution in the A.S. Makarenko system. As for the notion of A.S.

Makarenko "juvenile pedagogy", then in this case we proceeded from the simplest interpretation of it as a direction in pedagogy, designed to solve the tasks of raising children from about 12 to 18 years, which coincides mainly with the age of the pupils of Makarenko. Speaking about "juvenile pedagogy", we mean only that, but nothing else.

2. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Research methods

In the study, to different extents, the following methods were used:

- hermeneutic (interpretation, comprehension, understanding);
- analysis and synthesis, concretization and generalization, universalization and unification, transformation and modification, idealization and extrapolation;
- method of a system purposeful construction of new theoretical concepts, synthesized from a set of elements of knowledge of a different nature;
- method of analogies, based on the dialectics fundamental laws generalization for processes of a different nature;
- thought experiment;
- the method of double entry of basic components into the system (Lednev, 1989).

The general methodological basis of the research were

- dialectics, which is 'the only method capable of seizing living reality as a whole' and 'the law of coincidence of contradictions' (Losev, 1990);
- the principle of global connections and unity of the world; the theory of total-unity (Solov'ev, 1988, 1990, Florensky, 2017);
- Sorokin (1992) idea of a significant component;
- the concept of the integrity of the spiritual organism (Kireevsky, 2003).

Works in the field of general and pedagogical culturology, educology (Benin, 2004; Benin, Frolov, 2014; Bibler 1990; Zagvyazinsky, 2016; Zborovsky, 2000) have heuristic value for the research. When writing the article, we also took into account the instrumental potential of the pedagogical methodology (Bordovskaya, 2001, Atutov, 1985; Novikov, 2002; Korolev, Gmurman, 1967).

2.2. Research stages

The study was conducted in three stages.

At the first stage, the search for methodological approaches to the study of the problem was carried out. As a result, the concept of research was built.

At the second stage, the historical and pedagogical material on the problem was studied. As a result, the approaches to its evaluation were worked out.

At the third stage, the data of the studied material were stratified, generalized. As a result, conclusions were drawn.

3. RESULTS

In accordance with the stated problem, we have considered the paradoxes of love and the ways of their solution in the Makarenko juvenile (adolescent-youth) pedagogy. Here they are:

3.1. The first paradox. Love is a biochemical process and is caused by the action of hormones such as dopamine and oxytocin vs. Love is a socio-cultural phenomenon.

Using antinomic dialectics tools, based on the recognition of equal rights and the equivalence of polarities, A.S. Makarenko dismisses the disjunctive approach to the problem solution. According to the disjunctive approach, one of conflicting sides is recognized as true ("either ... or ..." view). He puts in this arsenal a conjunctively oriented additional approach. In accordance with this approach, contradictory judgments do not mutually exclude each other, but cause coexistence with each other ("both ... and ..." view). Thus, a tolerant attitude to both sides is maintained.

To some extent, such approach correlates with the two factors (heredity and environment) theory (Zinchenko, Meshcheryakov, 2003). But in this theory of convergence of these factors, the heredity dominance role is assumed. While A.S. Makarenko, not ignoring the significance of the biological (hereditary) factor in love, he believes that the sexual act 'can not be isolated from all the achievements of human culture, from the conditions of a person's social life, from the humanitarian path of history, from the victories of aesthetics' (Makarenko, 1958, vol.5, p. 220).

Moreover, according to A.S. Makarenko, the ability to love can be enjoyed by people endowed with a sense of civic responsibility for the fate of the society in which they live. "If a man or a woman does not feel like a member of society, if they do not have a sense of responsibility for his life, for his beauty and reason, how can they fall in love? Where do they get respect for themselves, confidence in some value of themselves that exceeds the value of a male or a female?" From this the conclusion follows that "sex education is primarily the education of a culture of social personality".

Spiritual and social component of love, in the terminology of P.A. Sorokina (1992) is its significant component expressing the inner meaning of phenomena (processes, things). Without it, the national flag turns into a piece of matter, Beethoven's ninth symphony - into a certain number of waves of different length and amplitude, consciousness - into the aggregation of electrons and protons, and the love relationship is reduced to coition.

In general, Makarenko is building a kind of love triad: biological love, spiritual love, sociocultural love. Moreover, Teacher Makarenko goes beyond the two-factor binom. In addition to heredity and environment, there is upbringing. Of course, if you wish, you can embody upbringing in the environment. But the environment is inert, conservative, not immobile.

Education is a focused process of human development. This allows us to separate it into a line in the structure of human development factors. In this case, we get the formula:

$$D = (H + Env) \times Ed,$$

where D is development, H is heredity, Env is environment, Ed is education.

Clearly, love is, so to speak, a self-determination of the person. But for this very reason love simultaneously is a social phenomenon, carrying in itself the reduced specific features of HOMO SAPIENS and features of the representative of a certain society (group, nationality, class, etc.). Otherwise, we will deal with the "love" of a male or a female, as A.S. Makarenko said. And, to think, are people often right in their militant selfishness?

Located at the intersection of the universal (superindividual) and personal (individual) lines of being, a person simultaneously acts as a collective and individual subject. As a collective subject, a person seeks to merge with other people, not stopping at the loss of his- or herself, "the deadly sister of ignorance" (Roerich, 1992). Is not Leo Tolstoy (1985) right, writing in his diary: "Egoism, i.e. life for oneself, for one person, is madness". E. Fromm (1990, 1993) has a similar view that there is the same question in all cultures at all times: how to overcome separation, how to achieve unity, how to go beyond the limits of one's own individual life and gain unity", and the higher man's power manifestation is "giving" (Chapaev, 2005).

3.2. The second paradox. Love is a spiritual essence incomprehensible to the human mind vs. Love is "an ordinary affair that needs to be organized"(Makarenko, 1958, vol.5, p.298). When analyzing the position of Makarenko to solve this dilemma, one can get the impression that he secretly sensed some difficulties in a holistic awareness of the problem, allowed elements of a bifurcated perception of the phenomenon.

On the one hand, he elevates love to understanding it as a transcendental and metempirical phenomenon. As transcendental phenomenon, love, as Makarenko says, expresses the basis of human existence, the peak of human's spiritual development. As a metempirical phenomenon, love, in his opinion, is on a par with such "transcendentals" as goodness, perfection, the kingdom of heaven (ibid., p.519). The transcendental and metempirical elevation of love reaches such heights that it becomes inaccessible to a verbal description. In the "Book for Parents" there is a scene in which the heroine of the narrative says: "I do not know how to say this: I love you. I can not say it... It's so strong. She looked at me, and it was the look of a woman who fell in love" (Makarenko, 1957, vol.4, p.219-220).

On the other hand, the almost mystical elevation of love Makarenko very organically combined with the understanding of love as a pedagogical fact included in the general system of educational relations, which contain, as it's

known, organizational moments. Being a rationalist and social technologist, he is sure that "our behavior must be the behavior of knowledgeable people who know how people, know the techniques of life ...". Spirituality and ethics without knowledge and without organization are impossible. To the fullest extent, this refers to love: "We must be able to love, know how to love" [6, p. 453].

The great teacher-realist Makarov (1958, vol.5, p.300), perfectly understanding the intricacies of human nature, could not agree with the point of view that "at school a person under 18 can not love, because he is at school ..." (let us remember the popular quotation "this can not be, because it can not be"). No, says Makarenko (1958, T.5, p.299), "... it is not only possible but necessary, it is necessary to teach love. Strange as it may seem, but there is such a science ... "

A.S. Makarenko (vol.5, p.300) not just admit to necessity to "teach love," but also sets the parameters for this teaching: "Both girls and boys need to be told about the responsibility for each day lived, for every piece of feeling, because for all you have to pay ... ". Teaching to love "means teaching to recognize love, teaching to be happy, which in turn means teaching to respect oneself, teaching human dignity" (Makarenko, vol.4, p.220).

"Responsibility" is not an occasional word in the text. Responsibility in the higher understanding for Makarenko meant the teacher's responsibility for the fate of the person: the educator should always ask himself whether to dare or not dare to develop certain standard or individual qualities in his pupil.

In this specific case, the word of responsibility is used due to pupils of Makarenko. When organizing the "affair of love," he dealt with girls and boys, who knew a lot in their lives, including in the love field. Among them there were former rapists, and former prostitutes. In the report to the chairman of the state political administration of Ukraine, he writes about the difficulties of working with former prostitutes, who have now become communes of the commune named after them. F. Dzerzhinsky, stating that the activation of such girls "is very difficult due to their backwardness and already established habits and inclinations, early sexual

development and the phenomena connected with them ..." (Makarenko, 1957, vol. 3, p. 459).

Add to this teenagers and young men who are familiar with the "experience" of sexual violence and even without a rich imagination, you can imagine what kind of bedlam the commune would have reformatted to, in the absence of an effective pedagogical system, where the problem of love was taken very seriously. Certainly, it would have turned out into a "good" "flash-house".

It should be emphasized here that during the years of Makarenko's activity in the colonies for juvenile offenders, the joint education of girls and boys was strictly forbidden. It would seem that this is a radical solution to the problem of "flash-house". But Makarenko (1957, vol.2, p.100), on the contrary, believed that such an approach was fundamentally wrong: "As in any normal family, girls and boys live together, and this does not cause any complications. Any healthy children's society can perfectly develop under these conditions". Again, we are faced with a paradoxical situation, now man-made, created by Makarenko himself. And in this act, he again confirms his dialectical-antinomic choice, which does not tolerate single-line solutions.

3.3. The third paradox. "Teaching love" is "analysis of narrowly physiological questions" of love vs. "Teaching love is the education of a great and deep feeling, adorned with the unity of life, aspirations and hopes"

A.S. Makarenko (1957, vol.4, p.413) in this case either does not leave the vale of "balancing thinking", focused on finding areas of common in opposite judgments (as well as in phenomena). Declaring that "teaching love" should be conducted "without too open and essentially cynical analysis of narrowly physiological questions," he is at the same time far from the pharisaical attitude to the problem. Responding to criticism of his assertion about the admissibility of consideration of even "about sexual love" with children, Makarenko (1958, vol.7, p.189) notes: "Comrade A. Boym blushes and shyly turns away: you can read "Romeo and Juliet", but sexual love ... what a passage! Is it

possible that Comrade A. Boym ... does not know that "Romeo and Juliet" tells about sexual love, that platonic love does not appeal to these two heroes. After all, I did not call for the development of a topic about sexual intercourse, but namely, about love”.

Yes, love is sacred and inviolable; it is the intimate value of the human soul. A.S. Makarenko quite agree with such a premise. But this is true when love is viewed in a light of personal relationships. Therefore, in the colony, where, despite the adopted law prohibiting internal love relationships, the words "they are in love" were magical and before them the most ardent "guardians" of this law were powerless, which were, as A.S. Makarenko recognized them, 'lads'. The law is a law, but he often had to report on the board, to the displeasure of many lads (sometimes he was even deprived of the right to speak): "They're really in love, there's nothing you can do" (Makarenko, 1957, vol.2, p.101, p.103).

In a light of social relations, love becomes part of the social environment, which also affects love. But the problem is, how it affects. The Makarenko's commune "... in resolving the sexual problem did not take the path of direct suppression and remained within the boundaries of communal forms of collective influence" (Makarenko, 1957, vol.3, p. 459). It's evident from the fact of family formations within the commune (see below).

The system of joint education affected the most positively the education of the right relationship between the young men and the girls. It contributed to the formation of positive experience of social behavior in general and the development of social skills in relationships with people of the opposite sex, which to a large extent served the purposes of raising a family man. Ultimately, a holistic strategy for the involvement of a person, who respect positive socially significant values, was implemented.

4. DISCUSSIONS

Dialectical and antinomian ideas permeate the entire body of the pedagogical system of A.S. Makarenko. The well-known expression "pedagogy is the most dialectical science" is not just a beautifully formulated idea, but an

original symbol of the faith of the teacher Makarenko. In his attitude to dialectics, he is similar to the outstanding Russian philosopher A.F. Losev (1990), who considered dialectics to be the only method capable of "grasping living reality as a whole". Let us discuss three statements that testify the dialectical and antinomical core of A.S. Makarenko pedagogical system.

1. **The person and the collective are in a constant development mode.** A brilliant expression is found in Makarenko's concept of promising lines for the development of the collective. A.S. Makarenko formulated the law of the movement of the collective, according to which the collective must constantly move forward, to achieve more and more successes through overcoming difficulties and contradictions that fill the living space of pupils. In a sense, A.S. Makarenko, as it seems, agrees with the aphorism of the German Social Democrat E. Bernstein "Movement is everything, the final goal is nothing." However, the antonymic thinking of the great teacher could not be satisfied with such unambiguity. The Makarenko law of "collective movement" is simultaneously the law of personality movement. Yes, the structural, technological and relational (communicative) features of the collective are being improved. But the "collective movement", development process, does not become the absolute criterion of Makarenko pedagogy.

This "movement" has a very specific goal - particular person's joy of tomorrow. The joy is "the true stimulus of human life ... Therefore, to educate a person means to cultivate long-range ways (to build a trajectory of personal development?). The joy of tomorrow will follow these ways (Makarenko, 1958, vol.5).

Developing the "joy if tomorrow" idea, A.S. Makarenko (Ibid., p.74) distinguishes a close, medium and distant perspective. Mastering these perspectives, the person comprehends the hierarchy of goals. First you need to organize the joy itself, bring it to life and put it as a reality. Then, it is necessary to persistently transform the simpler forms of joy into more complex and humanly meaningful. Here is an interesting line: "from the primitive satisfaction

by some gingerbread to the deepest sense of duty."

2. The system organically does not accept the stereotype approach (while its opponents often act armed with a set of all discourse stereotypes), which tends to absolutize any technology, any technique. It is obvious for Makarenko: the choice of a pedagogical tool depends not on the deductive-dogmatic premise, which proves the special value of an approach, but on the specific education conditions, on the individual characteristics of the pupil. Therefore, the "collectivist" Makarenko (1958, vol.5) is able to comment on the collective impact that "sometimes it will be good, sometimes it will be bad." So it is with the individual effect: "sometimes it will be useful, and sometimes it will be harmful."

3. The system finds its solution to the problem of the collective and individual antinomy. The foundations of this antinomy are contradictory judgments, stated by A.S. Makarenko (1958, vol.5, p.469): "Some say: "The collective as a reality does not exist. Only the personality is real. " Others say: "The individual as something independent in social reality does not exist. There is only society." This collision is the genetically grounded basis of antagonism between individualistic and collectivist approaches in the history of education, which is such thoroughly cultivated, by the way, today.

Solving the personal-collectivist dualism problem, A.S. Makarenko, in fact, advocates the principle of indivisible and unshared unity of the individual and the collective. By individual education he means finding identity and development of personal abilities and orientations, not only in the field of knowledge, but also in the field of personality. He is tormented by the question: "Is a soft, malleable, passive temper prone to contemplation, reflecting the world in form of internally non-bright and non-aggressive analysis, should be broken, rebuild or improved?" "Am I really supposed to drive every individual into a single program, standard and to achieve this standard? Then I must sacrifice individual charm, originality, a special beauty of personality, and if I do not sacrifice, then what kind of program I would have!" (Makarenko, 1958, vol.5, p. 118).

Are there many teachers who thought so deeply about the question: what, in fact, what right do I have to interfere with the life of another person? Most often, the teacher, by default, considers himself worthy, and having the right to do it. Even advocates of personal-oriented education do not make an exception here, because "... education can be called, where the student is not the subject of educational interaction, but the object of more or less sophisticated pedagogical influence" (Gusinsky, Turchaninova, 2000).

Makarenko did not immediately get the answers to the above questions. For years he groped for answers. It took him almost ten years of titanic practical and intellectual work until he could confidently say: we need a common standard program and an individual correction to it. Such qualities as courage, honesty, diligence, collectivism, citizenship should become standards. A corrective is necessary with an orientation to inclinations, abilities, talent. A.S. Makarenko (Ibid., P.119) believed that the teacher has the right to interfere in the movement of character, in order to follow the inclinations of personality, to direct it to the side most needed for it. But with such a Solomon solution, the need for an appropriate dialectical method arises, "which, while being general and unified, at the same time enables each individual person to develop his own features, preserve his individuality" (Makarenko, 1958 p. 353).

The principle of the inseparable and un-confluence unity of the individual and the collective is antinomical in nature. It gave made A.S. Makarenko possibility to create an educational system on the principle of parallel action: in the pedagogical process, changes occur primarily due to the growth of the importance of self-management components in it, while minimizing didactic, instructive moments.

Speaking in modern terms, the teacher plays a role of a top manager, who decides the most important, strategic tasks, while less significant of them are delegated to individual members or organizational structures of the collective. In this context a well-known principle of the Eisenhower matrix occurs to us. It suggests professional, in terms of managerial science and

practice, distribution of tasks depending on the degree of their significance.

At a certain stage of the development of the collective a qualitative leap in its development takes place. On the one hand, the self-management component in the organizational organism of the collective sharply increases: at its mature stage of development of the collective, each of its members makes demands to itself. Self-management becomes the need of members of the collective and a necessary condition for its existence. On the other hand, it is thanks to the increased importance of the personal component in the management of the team that a self-developing educational system is created that can exist under changed conditions. Even when, for one reason or another, the "top manager" is excommunicated from her, and moreover, when the new "bosses" are working against her. So, after the departure of Makarenko from the educational institutions that he organized, despite the disorganizing actions of the leaders who replaced him, it took a lot of effort and time to destroy this well-organized system in them.

At a certain stage of the collective development, a growth spurt takes place. On the one hand, the self-management component in the organizational body of the collective sharply increases: at its mature stage of the collective development, each of its members makes demands to him- or herself. Self-management becomes the need of members of the collective and the necessary condition for its existence. On the other hand, as a result of the increased importance of the personal component in the team management, a self-developing educational system is created that can exist under changed conditions. Even when, for one reason or another, the "top manager" is excommunicated, and moreover, when the new "bosses" are working against it. So, after Makarenko left the educational institutions that he organized, despite the disorganizing actions of the leaders who replaced him, it took a lot of effort and time to destroy this well-organized system.

Let us briefly discuss A.S. Makarenko (1958, vol.5, p.421) statement that "many attitudes towards love, friendship, loyalty, honor have not yet been balanced and become normative." Is it

possible to develop regulations on love, honor? A.S. Makarenko admitted such a possibility. But what did he mean here? First of all, the need for public recognition of these categories. This is, in fact, about the thirties, it was very complex and contradictory, and somewhat antinomic period. By no means all considered love and honor, as well as concepts close to them, as worthy to be applied in a new society. Repeatedly, rejection of the past culture relapsed, which were especially typical for the 1920s ("Let us burn Raphael, trample on flowers of art").

The issues such as "Is jealousy, and even love, a remnant of capitalism or not?" were discussed most seriously. A.S. Makarenko had to participate in such discussions. But it is remarkable that agreeing formally with some arguments of supporters of the idea of "remnants of the past" (which is, by the way, not over yet: one "big" Russian official was not so long ago going to fight "Soviet" bureaucracy), he actually softly but persistently corrected them. A.S. Makarenko (1958, vol. 5, p. 450) in the spirit of his time writes that "the phenomena of a relaxed ethic of "goodness" contradict our revolutionary movement, and we must fight this relic." However, after that he immediately takes the arrows to the other side: towards solving the real problems of the present life, and not yesterday. The proximity to practical life, to simple common sense, solution of pressing practical problems are crucial, in Makarenko's opinion, for the successful society development, but not an endless criticism of the so-called "remnants" of the past.

They considered the notion of honor as a remnant of the past. Surely, Russian 'white officers' used to say "This is an honor!" when there were no 'red officers' yet. And in 1937-38 A.S. Makarenko is working on the story "Honor". For which he got hard time from critics. But the teacher bravely defended himself, and not only defended himself, but also counterattacked. In his article with the self-explanatory title "Against stereotypes" (1938) A.S. Makarenko insists that "our criticism has long ago discouraged writers from bravery and active penetration into life . . . , people, who are equip with nothing but stereotypes, play roles of critics ... "(Makarenko, 1958, vol.6, p. 416). The

stereotypes prevent writers from showing a multicolored picture of the life of Soviet society. "There are 170 million individualities in our Union, completely different, unique, each is exceptional in its own way" (Ibid., P.418).

In that article A.S. Makarenko (1958, vol.6, p.419-420) sharply opposes the theory of conflictlessness, proceeding from the metaphysical understanding of the unity of the Soviet people. He states that "on the contrary, a characteristic feature of our life is its conflict nature." Life in the Soviet Union, according to the teacher, "is built on the **dialectical principle of movement and improvement**." Accordingly, he concludes quite in dialectical style: "The secret and charm of our life is not in the absence of conflicts, but in our readiness and ability to solve them." In accordance with the criterion adopted by the critics, A.S. Makarenko pointed out bitterly: "... the notion of honor is an officer-gentry concept" (Ibid., P.430). With this he could not reconcile as he could not reconcile with rejection of love. And just as he confirms his position with deed. In the first case, he writes the book "Honor" (in 1937!). In the second case, as we saw above, he in practice, in the conditions of a special educational institution, proves the necessity and possibility of organizing "affair" of love.

5. CONCLUSION

1. There are teachers-romantics, teachers-conceptualists. A.S. Makarenko is a teacher-realist, like Janusz Korczak, who is close to him in spirit and deeds (Korczak, 1990). Janusz Korczak was extremely respectful for Makarenko's word and deed. As a teacher-realist, Makarenko aspired that the educational community, entrusted to him, would, to the utmost degree, integrate real-life situations, the infrastructure of natural forms of human existence.

Educational collective is a family, as a result, it should be endowed with all its attributes, including such a characteristic as different gender composition. Such a "life" philosophy is consistent with the dialectical and antinomic methodology. First of all, because life itself is antinomic: it is intertwined with a variety of phenomena and processes, which are often as

much opposite to each other as to how much they are interdependent. A.S. Makarenko did not put border posts between his educational and life processes.

Education and life are inseparable from each other for all their differences. The commune enters life, life enters the commune. So, the commune took it for granted to help the inmates adjust their family life, provide them with work, apartments and initial assistance. This type of assistance had not only a material side, but also an educational one. "The appearance of these family formations on the commune's territory has cooled many people, since it proved that love is associated with real responsibility" (Makarenko, 1957, vol.3, p.460).

2. A.S. Makarenko is an innovator, a creator, and therefore very often he walked off the map and contrary to the instructions coming down from above. You can imagine how he risked, taking responsibility for co-education. But Makarenko would not have been Makarenko, if he hadn't kept his eye on the ball. It is always difficult for such people. And it turned out that he was fired from his job, almost for anti-socialist methods of education. And after decades he got a lot for socialist education. Unfortunately, his compatriots stood on top of this case. The "fault" of Makarenko and the misfortune of his opponents lies mostly on his paradoxical multidimensionality (Morgun, 1989) of the perception and creation of the human world.

His critics view the world, including Makarenko's world, from the only one point, often from that one which gives them advantages at the moment. Others view Makarenko's world dualistically, lumping everything under a general umbrella, hoping there is some "harmful" element in it. Then they start searching, or rather, quote phrases, and even individual words, at random. It results in 'cabbage soup', in the first case, or confusion (or kind of 'a cock and bull tale'), in the second case.

It is worthy to note that in search of overly ideological statements of Makarenko, his opponents do not notice that the degree of their own ideology is much higher than the ideology degree of the person they criticize. For all their

activities are focused on the solution of a purely ideological task, which is mainly, to debunk the socialist component of A.S. Makarenko educational system. In other words, this is not about education, but about fighting, as they used to say, for ideological purity. That is why people from the other disciplinary spheres often study Makarenko. It is hard to imagine a person as a teacher who, as far as one can understand from a very uneasy text, reproaches Makarenko that there is nothing in his writings that would evoke such unconcealed hatred, contempt, indignations - neither bandits in the corrective labor colony with whom he had to work for many years, and who repeatedly destroyed what he created, not even their customs, to which he treated with understanding (Dobrenko, 1987). The piquancy of the situation is that the quoted author even whitens, idealizes Makarenko. This can be seen from the fact that Anton Semyonovich did not treat all actions of pupils with "understanding", he was often outraged by their behavior and even there was a case when he strong-armed. The teacher admitted to that (Makarenko, 1957, vol.1).

A.S. Makarenko, within the framework of his pedagogy of life, has solved the real tasks of education, determined by the needs of society, and, as specialists find out, not only of the socialist society. By the decision of UNESCO in 1988 A.S. Makarenko along with John Dewey, Georg Kershensteiner, Maria Montessori was ranked among the teachers who determined the way of pedagogical thinking in the twentieth century.

As for Makarenko's ideology, it should be noticed, it was natural. The fact is that education does not form a person in general, but a person in a certain society and for a certain society. Accordingly, the goals of education can not be adequately understood in society as long as they are separated from the certain situations in which each age group is, and from the social system, in which they are formed (Mannheim, 1994).

3. Education, as the ancients used to say (they assume, generals who did not lose a single battle, used to say it), is the most difficult thing. But there was definitely no teacher who would achieve a 100% result. Not always A.S.

Makarenko succeed, he did not hesitate to admit it.

Different things happened. There was even a dead child. A colony mother Raisa killed him and hid him in a basket for dirty laundry. She was sentenced to eight years probation, and they offered to take the criminal girl back to the colony. A. S. Makarenko agreed with this. But he did not envisage the reaction of other colony girls. Soon he heard from them: "Eject Raisa from the colony, otherwise we will get her off ourselves." What did A.S. Makarenko do? Secretly from other girls he got Raisa a job. Once, having met him by chance in a few years, she said that she was "all right". She said finally: "Thank you, you did not let me sink then. As I went to the factory, I forgot by-gones" (Makarenko, vol.1.1957, pp. 119-120). A.S. Makarenko did not let people "sink", but he saved people, rising them up from the very lowlife. But he was took down. "Sunked" then. There are those who wish to "sink" him today. But he again and again "rises up" and continues his eternal voyage through the waves of the obstinate and endless ocean, the name of which is pedagogy, in which Makarenko's pedagogy of love occupies a worthy place.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper may be recommended to scientific and practical education workers, undergraduates, post-graduate students; to people involved in educational policy; to representatives of business circles; to all who are interested in the present and future of our education and upbringing.

Notes on contributors

Nikolay K. Chapaev is Doctor of pedagogical sciences, professor of Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, Russia.

Olga B. Akimova is PhD, Doctor of philological sciences, professor of Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, Russia.

Evgenij M. Dorozhkin is Doctor of pedagogical sciences, professor, rector of Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, Russia.

REFERENCES

1. Winkel R. (1988) Antinomische Padagogik und kommunikative Didaktik. Studien zu den Widerspruchen und Spannungen in Erziehung und Schule. Dusseldorf, Schwann, 40 p.
2. Benin V.L. (2004) Pedagogicheskaya kulturologiya [Pedagogical Culturology]: Kurs lektsiy: Ucheb. posobie. – Ufa: Izd-vo BGPU, 515 p.
3. Benin V.L., Frolov O.V. (2014). Socio-philosophical problems of the higher vocational education in the context of culture crisis. The Education and science journal. 1:44-54. DOI:10.17853/1994-5639-2014-1-44-54
4. Bibler V. S. (1990) Ot naukoucheniya – k logike kultury: dva filosofskikh vvedeniya v XXI vek [From the science to the logic of culture: two philosophical introductions to the 21st century]. Moscow: Politizdat, 413 p.
5. Bolshoy psikhologicheskii slovar [Great psychological dictionary]. (2003) Moscow: Praym-Yevroznak. Edited by B.G. Meshcheryakova, acad. V.P. Zinchenko. 672c.
6. Bordovskaya N.V. (2001) Dialektika pedagogicheskogo issledovaniya: Logiko-metodologicheskie problemy [Dialectics of pedagogical research: Logical-methodological problems] / RKhGI. SPb., 512 p.
7. Gaydenko P.P. (1988) «Antinomicheskaya dialektika P.A. Florenskogo protiv zakona tozhdestva» [Florensky Antinomic Dialectics against the law of identity]. // Kritika nemarksisitskikh kontseptsiy dialektiki XX veka. Dialektika i problema irratsionalnogo [Criticism of non-Marxist concepts of the dialectic of the 20th century. Dialectics and problem of irrational]. Moscow: Izd-vo MGU, <https://antimodern.wordpress.com/2012/09/13/antinomy/#more-11021>.
8. Getmanova A.D. (1998) Logika: slovar i zadachnik [Logic: dictionary and task book] // Uchebnoe posobie dlya studentov vuzov. — Moscow: Gumanit. izd. tsentr VLADOS, 336 p.
9. Gusinskiy E.N., Turchaninova Yu.I. (2000) Vvedenie v filosofiyu obrazovaniya [Introduction to the education philosophy]. Moscow: Izd. korporatsiya «Logos». 224 p.
10. Zagvyazinskiy V. I. (2016) O tsennostno-orientatsionnykh osnovaniyakh obrazovatelnoy sistemy strany [On the value-orientational foundations of the country's educational system]. . The Education and science journal. № 6 (135). P. 11–20. DOI: 10.17853/1994-5639-2012-4-3-15.
11. Zborovskiy G.Ye (2000) Obrazovanie: ot XX k XXI veku [Education: from the 20th to the 21st century]. Yekaterinburg: Izd-vo Ural. gos. prof.-ped. un-ta., 301 p.
12. Kireevskiy I.V. (2003) Razum na puti k istine [Mind on the way to the truth]. Moscow: Izd-vo «Pravilo very», 661 p.
13. Korchak Ya. (1990) Kak lyubit detey: kniga o vospitanii [How to love children: a book about parenting]: Translated from Polish. – Moscow.: politizdat. 493 p.
14. Lednev V.S. (1989) Soderzhanie obrazovaniya [Educational content]: Ucheb. posobie. Moscow: Vyssh. shk., 360 p.
15. Losev A.F. (1990) Filosofiya imeni [Philosophy of a name]. Moscow: Izd-vo Mosk. un-ta, 269 p.
16. Makarenko A.S (1957, Vol.1) Sochineniya v semi tomakh [Works in seven volumes]. Moscow: Izd-vo APN RSFSR, 783p.
17. Makarenko A.S (1957, Vol.2) Sochineniya v semi tomakh [Works in seven volumes]. Moscow: Izd-vo APN RSFSR, 527p.
18. Makarenko A.S (1957, Vol.3) Sochineniya v semi tomakh [Works in seven volumes]. Moscow: Izd-vo APN RSFSR, 496 p.
19. Makarenko A.S (1957, Vol.4) Sochineniya v semi tomakh [Works in seven volumes]. Moscow: Izd-vo APN RSFSR, 552c.
20. Makarenko A.S (1957, Vol.5) Sochineniya v semi tomakh [Works in seven volumes]. Moscow: Izd-vo APN RSFSR, 558c.
21. Makarenko A.S (1957, Vol.6) Sochineniya v semi tomakh [Works in seven volumes]. Moscow: Izd-vo APN RSFSR, 445p.
22. Makarenko A.S (1957, Vol.7) Sochineniya v semi tomakh [Works in seven volumes]. Moscow: Izd-vo APN RSFSR, 583p.

23. Mankheym, K (1994) *Ideologiya i utopiya* [Ideology and Utopia] // Karl Mankheym. *Diagnoz nashogo vremeni* [Diagnosis of our time]. Moscow: Yurist, 704 p.
24. Metodologicheskie problemy razvitiya pedagogicheskoy nauki [Methodological problems of the development of pedagogical science] (1985)/Edited by. P.R. Atutova et al. Moscow: Pedagogika, 240 p.
25. Monisticheskaya kontsepsiya mnogomernogo razvitiya lichnosti [Monistic concept of multidimensional personality development] (1989) : Annot. bibliogr. ukaz: [s 1984 po 1988 gg.] / Compiled by V.D. Morgun. Poltava, B.I. 56 p.
26. Noveyshiy filosofskiy slovar [The newest philosophical dictionary] (1999) / Compiled by A.A. Gritsanov. — Minsk.: Izd. V.M. Skakun, 896 p.
27. Novikov A.M. (2002) *Metodologiya obrazovaniya* [Methodology of education]. Moscow: Egves, 320 p.
28. Obshchie osnovy pedagogiki [General principles of pedagogy] (1967)/ Edited by F.F. Koroleva i V.Ye. Gmurmana. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 392 p.
29. Politekonomiya sotsrealizma [Political Economy of Socialist Realism] (2007)/ Ye. Dobrenko . – Moscow : Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, . – 586 p.
30. Rerikh N.K., Rerikh Ye.N. (1992) *Zhivaya etika* [Living Ethics]: Izbrannoe / Compiled by M.Yu. Klyuchnikova. Moscow: Respublika, 414 p.
31. Sovremennaya zapadnaya filosofiya [Modern Western Philosophy] (1991).: Dictionary / Compiled by Malakhov V.S., Filatov V.P, - Moscow: Politizdat, 414 p.
32. Solovev V.S. (1990) *Sochineniya: V 2 t. T.1* [Works in 2 volumes. Volume 1] / Edited and Compiled by A.F. Loseva i A.V, Gulygi. Moscow: Mysl, 892 p.
33. Solovev V.S. (1990) *Sochineniya: V 2 t. T.2* [Works in 2 volumes. Volume 2] / Edited and Compiled by A.F. Loseva, A.V. Gulygi. Moscow: Mysl, 822 p.
34. Sorokin P.A. (1992) *Tsivilizatsiya. Obshchestvo* [Civilization. Society]: Transl. from English. / Edited and Compiled by A.Yu. Sogomanova. Moscow: Politizdat, 543 p.
35. Tolstoy L.N. (1985) *Sobr. Soch. V 22 tt. T.22. Dnevniki. 1895-1900* [Collected works in 22 volumes. Volume 22. Diary 1895-1900] / Compiled by A.I. Shifmana. Moscow: Khudozh. Lit.404 p.
36. *Filosofskiy slovar* [Philosophical dictionary] (1991) / Edited by I.T. Frolova. Moscow: Politiz-dat, 560 p.
37. Florenskiy P.A (2017) *Stolp i utverzhdenie istiny* [Pillar and establishment of truth]. Moscow: Izd-vo «Akademicheskiiy proekt». Seriya «filosofskie tekhnologii». 908 p.
38. Fromm E. *Iskusstvo lyubvi. Issledovanie prirody lyubvi* [The Art of Loving. An Enquiry into the Nature of Love] (1956) / Translated by L. A. Chernyshevoy. — Moscow: Pedagogika, 1990. 80 p.
39. Fromm E. *Psikhoanaliz i etika* [Psychoanalyse & Ethik] (1946) / Compiled by S. Ya. Levit. — Moscow: Ast, 1998. — 568 p. s.
40. Chapayev N.K. (2005) *Pedagogicheskaya integratsiya: metodologiya, teoriya, tekhnologiya* [Pedagogical integration: methodology, theory, technology]: 2-e izd. ispr. i dop. Yekaterinburg: Izd-vo Ros. gos. prof.-ped. un-ta; Kemerovo: Izd-vo Kemerovskogo gos. prof.-ped. kolledzha.. 325 p.
41. Yarkina T.F. (1992) *Kontsepsiya tselostnoy shkoly v sovremennoy pedagogike* [The concept of a holistic school in modern pedagogy] . Pedagogika. (7-8) P. 110-116.