Philosophy of Education An Encyclopedia

Editor J.J. Chambliss

ichusetts, Boston ipaign onal, as well as his other eved in an era of severe

> James W. Garrison Thomas C. Hunt

ELIGIOUS EDUCATION

re I Stand: A Life of w York: Mentor,

er as an Educator. Greenwood Press,

Luther the Educational ther and Learning,
J. Harran, 95-114.
ed University Presses,

in Luther: An In-Life and Work. Philaress, 1986.
r's Works. General Pelikan, vols. 1–30; nn, vols. 31–55. St. Iphia, 1955–1976. eping Children in ol. 46, 207–58. "To bility of the German g the Reform of the (1520), vol. 44, 123–ncilmen of All Cities They Establish and " (1524), vol. 45,

m Education. St.
Publishing House,

's House of Learning. Iopkins University

M

Macaulay, Catharine (1731-1791)

Historian, republican reformer, and educational and social theorist; an influential Whig historian of seventeenth-century England, eloquent opponent of aristocratic privilege, and pioneering advocate of coeducation. Her most important writings were The History of England from the Accession of James I to that of the Brunswick Line (1763–1783) and Letters on Education (1790), but she also published several other works on historical, political, and philosophical topics.

Catharine Sawbridge was one of four children born to John Sawbridge, a reclusive antimonarchist, and Elizabeth Wanley Sawbridge, who died in Catharine's infancy. Little is known of her upbringing, except that her father refused to provide his daughters with the tutors he granted his sons. She had access to his library, however, and developed there the love of classical history and passion for democratic political reforms that guided her in later life. She also formed a close attachment to her younger brother and political ally John Sawbridge, later a radical Whig alderman, lord mayor of London, and member of Parliament.

At twenty-nine, Catharine Sawbridge married George Macaulay, a member of the Scottish circle in London and a physician in his mid forties, who seems to have encouraged her work on her eight-volume History of England, from the Accession of James I to That of the Brunswick Line. The first of eight volumes appeared three years after they married, and the second three years later. Dr. Macaulay died in 1766, leaving Catharine to raise their one daughter. Between 1767 and 1771 she completed three more volumes of the History and began a series of radical pamphlets that in-

cluded Loose Remarks on . . . Mr. Hobbes' Philosophical Rudiments of Government and Society (1767) (against Hobbes's authoritarianism) and Observations on a Pamphlet Entitled "Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents" (1770) (a critique of Edmund Burke's antireformism). Her characteristic blend of idealism and sharp sarcasm brought her much publicity, and contemporary political cartoons often posed "defenders of liberty" by volumes of Macaulay's History. In the 1770s, she moved for her health to Bath, where she continued her writing and met and corresponded with contemporary proponents of reform and revolution, among them the American patriots Benjamin Franklin, James Otis Warren and Mercy Otis Warren, and George and Martha Washington. After the American Revolution, she traveled to the United States in 1785 to gather material for a projected history of the Revolution and stayed with the Washingtons at Mt. Vernon.

Macaulay's opponents found a female intellectual and political reformer difficult to bear, and James Boswell recorded Samuel Johnson's dismissive remark in 1776: "She is better employed at her toilet than using her pen. It is better she should be reddening her own cheeks than blackening other people's character." In 1778 she married and retired to Berkshire with William Graham, a twenty-one-year-old surgeon's mate without rank or wealth; the union was a happy one, but her detractors claimed to find it scandalous. In the reactionary atmosphere of the post-French Revolutionary era, her writings fell into obscurity after her death in 1791. The year before, she had published Letters on Education with Observations on Religious and Metaphysical Subjects (1790), a three-part treatise on theology, the nature of an ideal society, and humanist education, which became her most reflective and comprehensive work.

In the first section of Letters Macaulay presents a model of education from infancy onward, with comments on the equality of the sexes, the proper social and physical environment for young people, and romantic love. Macaulay's work contributed substantially to an extended Enlightenment debate on education, and she took careful note of her predecessors, including John Locke (Some Thoughts Concerning Education, 1696), Jean-Jacques Rousseau (Emile, 1762), Madame de Genlis (Adele et Theodore, 1782), François Fenelon (Traite de l'Education des Filles, 1687), and Claude Helvetius (De l'Homme, des ses facultes intellectuelles et de son education). Like them, she discussed children's health, modes of reward and punishment, and ways to encourage intellectual curiosity and independence of character. She shared with Locke, Rousseau, and de Genlis the assumption that children should not be beaten, encouraged in luxury, or permitted to depend on servants, but her position mediated between Locke's training in self-discipline and Rousseau's laissez-faire "naturalism." With Locke, she emphasized the need to teach through personal example and to adapt curricula to children's temperaments, and the necessity of befriending and trusting them as rational beings. With Rousseau, she wished to limit meat-eating, teach compassion for animals, postpone religious discussion until later life, and warn pupils of the evils of the world, lest they suffer them without preparation. Locke's education was designed to produce a successful man, and Rousseau's a practical and happy one. Macaulay's was intended to nurture a virtuous and widely intelligent person.

Macaulay thought it would be desirable to have government-supported education, beginning with "public nurseries for infants of all ranks, where a perfect equality was preserved in all the regulations which affect the health and well being of the race," but she feared that existing governments would use public education to control and indoctrinate. She placed great emphasis on the need for physical health, an emphasis shared by Locke, Rousseau, and de Genlis, and one that was desperately needed in eighteenth-century Britain. Like most others who surveyed the field, she condemned virtually all of the literature written for children, and she reserved special venom for the "virtue is the

path to success" genre and plots that portray "the constant union of virtue with personal charms." She opposed the views of most contemporary educational theorists, including Helvetius and to a lesser extent Rousseau, that children should be taught to perform actions for extrinsic future rewards.

fei

w

te

pŀ

n(

be

136

Ŋι

W

rá

П

Like Fenelon, Locke, and Rousseau. Macaulay advocated a teaching method that would appeal to children's natural interests rather than impose authoritarian discipline, and one that sought to inculcate simplicity and clarity of speech. Her fervent emphasis on children's need for independence reflected an essentially political contempt for the weaknesses of aristocracy, and rationalism as well as compassion prompted her to warn against the common practice of terrorizing children: "Other means will be found to prevent [children] from running into mischief, than the trite caution of not doing this or that action, lest they should die and be put into a hole." She also wished children to appreciate the simple, everyday variations of life, and wanted them to respect a simple and nondoctrinal form of rational deism, exemplified through benevolent and ethical behavior. Above all, she advocated compassion for the real needs of humans and animals, and a latitudinarian tolerance for any traditions that exhibited simplicity, liberality, and good sense. Children who are kindly treated, she believed, are most likely to become kind in their turn.

Macaulay's greatest innovation, however, was her steadfast advocacy of women's full and equal education. Locke had held that women should engage in physical exercise but not receive a liberal education, and Rousseau denied them education of any sort. Macaulay, by contrast, outlined the first equitable system of education for both sexes. The sexes should not be separated, she believed, nor should their education be different; girls' feet should not be constrained in unnaturally tight shoes (an eighteenth-century practice), and boys as well as girls should learn manual skills such as needlework. She advocated physical exercise for both boys and girls, and noted that the diseases of adult women were often furthered by the rearing of middle-class girls to artificial delicacy and frailty. Like most women reformers, Macaulay, who believed that the ability to captivate and flatter men is ultimately degrading to women, was disgusted by affectations of weakness, and she commented with asperity on Edmund Burke's arch pronouncement in The Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful (1756) that "we are more inclined to love those we despise."

Even more harmful than proscription of female physical vigor, Macaulay contended, was the virulent prejudice against women's intellectual development. She considered men physically stronger than women, but admitted no other differences of character or intellect between the sexes, for "knowledge is equally necessary to both sexes in the pursuit of happiness," and "all those vices and imperfections which have been generally regarded as inseparable from the female character, do not in any manner proceed from sexual causes, but are entirely the effects of situation and education."

The Letters strongly influenced Mary Wol-Istonecraft, who described Mrs. Macaulay in her 1792 Vindication of the Rights of Woman as "the woman of the greatest ability, undoubtedly, that this country has ever produced." Like Macaulay, Wollstonecraft opposed the charge that a learned education would distract women from other "duties," and criticized the practice of calling a vigorous mind "masculine." Both attacked the double standard that makes sexual behavior the sole criterion of female conduct, lacerated convention and social hypocrisy, and attacked the practice of keeping women in sexual ignorance. Both denounced women's civil disabilities, and quoted sardonically from the hostile pronouncements of chauvinist authors, a method since employed by many feminist critics.

At the end of her own polemic, A Vindication, Wollstonecraft expressed sorrow that Macaulay had been unable to live to read A Vindication, acknowledged the extensive nature of her debt to her, and observed that Macaulay "had been suffered to die without a sufficient respect being paid to her memory." But she hoped that "posterity, however, will be more just; and remember that Catharine Macaulay was an example of intellectual acquirements supposed to be incompatible with the weakness of her sex." Macaulay's contributions to British Enlightenment thought and political history have never been adequately appreciated, but recent feminist histories of education have acknowledged the striking originality of her arguments in the Letters.

Macaulay tended to slight more practical forms of education and disregard issues of social class, and later polemicists and reformers championed the cause of women's education and gender equality with greater rhetorical fervor, but

Macaulay's early insistence on coeducation and her categorical denial of innate sexual differences—both straightforward consequences of Enlightenment humanism— anticipated a wide range of "liberal" and "radical" positions, and her vision of a sexually egalitarian education was virtually unique in her time.

Florence Boos

See also Feminism; Girls and Women, Education of; Helvetius; Locke; Rousseau; Wollstonecraft

Bibliography

Boos, Florence. "Catharine Macaulay's Letters on Education (1790): An Early Feminist Polemic." University of Michigan Papers in Women's Studies 2.2 (1976): 64-78.

——, and William Boos. "Catharine Macaulay: Historian and Reformer." International Journal of Women's Studies 3.1 (1980): 49-65.

"Catharine Macaulay." Dictionary of National Biography. Vol. 12, 407-9.

Donnelly, Lucy Martin. "The Celebrated Mrs. Macaulay." William and Mary Quarterly 6 (1949): 173-207.

Macaulay, Catharine. History of England, from the Accession of James I to That of the Brunswick Line. Vols. 1–8 [1763–83].

The History of England, from the Revolution to the Present Time, in a Series of Letters. Vol. 1. Bath, 1778.

Letters on Education with Observations on Religious and Metaphysical Subjects. New York: Garland, 1974.

Loose Remarks on Certain Positions to be Found in Mr. Hobbes' "Philosophical Rudiments of Government and Society" [1767].

. Observations on the Reflections of the Right Hon. Edmund Burke on the Revolution in France, in a Letter to the Earl of Stanhope [1790].

——. A Treatise on the Immutability of Moral Truth. London, 1783.

Schnorrenberg, Barbara. "Catharine Macaulay Graham: The Liberty of Luxury." Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 303 (1992): 391-93.

——. "An Opportunity Missed: Catharine Macaulay on the Revolution of 1688." Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture 20 (1990): 231–40.

Staves, Susan. "The Liberty of a She-Subject of England: Rights Rhetoric and the Female Thucydides." Cardozo Studies in Law and Literature 1.2: 161-83.

Makarenko, Anton (1888-1939)

Anton Makarenko was an educator and author in the former Soviet Union in the 1920s and 1930s. He is best known for his work in dealing with a major problem facing Soviet society after the war and revolution—large numbers of orphaned, homeless, and often violent youth. One way in which the government attempted to deal with the threat posed by these juveniles was to set up youth colonies. Makarenko participated in this effort by first establishing the Gorky Colony in 1920 and later, in 1927, the Dzerzhinski Commune. What occurred at these two colonies is portrayed by Makarenko in *The Road to Life* and *Learning to Live*, popular novels that made him famous.

Makarenko's contribution may be looked at from two perspectives. First, as distinct from what happened at many other such settlements, Makarenko was able to achieve practical results and instill a sense of discipline and order into the chaotic lives of his charges. In addition, they found purpose in life through cooperative, constructive labor that included producing their own food as well as manufacturing items needed in the larger society. In his writing, Makarenko emphasizes the psychological changes that took place in the young people and how they eventually acquired an enthusiasm for work and an excitement in meeting challenges as a group.

Second, there evolved in Makarenko's thinking an idealized conception of society, education, and the family. This ideal focused on an interrelated network of "collective" bodies. Although Makarenko had not carefully studied Marxist philosophy and tended to be disdainful of "theoreticians," he was strongly critical of the "individualism" embedded in capitalist societies. In these contexts, Makarenko saw each person seeking as much freedom as possible from the control of others in order to gain private wealth and advantage. Motivated by greed and self-interest, each was in competition against the other with no sense of shared concern or mutual responsibility.

In contrast to this, Makarenko posited the idea of an organized community of "personalities" pursuing a clear and common objective—a "collective." Makarenko viewed the ideal

family and school as the first collectives for the nurturing and upbringing of children. Education would center on the process of developing a spirit of collective life in preparation for participation in the interconnected collectives of socialist society. He saw his work at the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzhinski Commune as the development of experimental models that could set the stage for the eventual collectivization of society as a whole.

Makarenko had little use for the educational theory and psychology officially endorsed in the Soviet Union in the 1920s that stressed "child-centeredness" and the cultivation of the "interests" of the child. He was often in conflict with the educational authorities on this and other issues, but his views did come into official favor during the Stalinist era in the 1930s. The important thing for Makarenko was to discover the most effective techniques for absorbing a child into the collective whole. This meant that a child must not only conform to the collective will, but also develop a devotion to it and to the collective's mission. However, Maka renko did not think that this meant undermining or distorting the formation of human personality. For him, great tasks could be accomplished only through group effort, not by means of autonomous individuals freely charting their own paths in the world. Accordingly, being a participating member of a collective that was in the process of pursuing and achieving a particular goal would bring about the most substantial realization of a person's potential. Makarenko often spoke of the collective in aesthetic terms as an object of beauty, a kind of living organism in which the various components contributed to achieving its proper form. For this to occur, obedience to the collective was essential. Since the ultimate source of authority is to be found in the decisions of collective bodies, morality can have as its source only collective opinion. Challenges to this authority by appeal to independent criteria of right and wrong, personal conscience, or some higher authority would constitute deviance that had to be purged.

Makarenko criticized traditional Western ideas, such as the value placed on the autonomy of the individual and the importance of treating persons as ends rather than only as means. He also challenges us to reconsider how we should understand the relation between the individual and the group and the meaning of such concepts as "freedom," "authority," and "mo-