UNIVERSITY OF LATVIA

FACULTY OF PEDAGOGY, PSYCHOLOGY, AND ART

EFFECTS OF AUTHORITARIANISM ON THE TEACHING OF LATVIAN HISTORY

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

Author: AIJA ABENS

Advisor: Dr. paed. IVETA ĶESTERE

RĪGA 2011

Acknowledgements

I wish to express thanks to all the individuals for their cooperation and help in conducting this study. I also wish to thank my advisor, Iveta Ķestere, for her support and assistance in completing this dissertation. Special thanks go to my husband, Ēriks Mikelšteins, for his moral support. This dissertation received support from the European Social Fund Doctoral Study Support Program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

School has traditionally been viewed as an instrument of socialization; part of the process is instilling a sense of belonging to society in general or a specific social group. Education has been at the centre of the process to ensure the development of a sense of belonging and understanding acceptable to the ruling order. One issue commonly agreed upon is the significance of the teaching of history, because it is inextricably tied not only to the past, but also gives understanding of the values of modern society and resulting assessment of those values. Knowledge of history gives understanding not only about the the development of society in general, but also about the status of each individual within society, which, in turn, facilitates the development of a sense of identy – an awareness of belonging to a social group and/or nation. Not only does teaching history help define national identity, but how history is taught can also determine how one observes events – does one pass judgment or search for explanations?

Political agendas of the ruling elite have traditionally affected this subject. Political ideologies are the basis of government policy, and it is the ruling elite that determines how these policies are carried out. Political regimes have often rewritten history to validate their worldview, and how this is presented is a window revealing the belief system and ideals of the regime and what it expects its citizens should believe and accept. However, the ideology expounded in written text does not always correspond to reality experienced in society.

Much has been written about Stalin and his total control of the educational system as a means of creating the Soviet citizen, and Nazi Germany and Hitler's worldview is also well documented, but little has been written about the effect of these nationalistic dictatorships on those most affected by the education system – teachers and pupils. While authoritarian dictatorships took hold in almost every East European country during the interwar period, the focus of research has largely taken place on the political and ideological ties these right-wing movements had with Germany's Nazism, and comparatively little is written about the nature of the dictatorships in the individual countries and their influence on education, local society, and life in general. This is in part due to the absorption into the USSR of several Eastern European countries and the sphere of influence by the Soviet Union and associated Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist philosophy exerted upon others that fell behind the Iron Curtain.

Until 1991 documents and other primary sources relating to history teaching during the interwar years were difficult to access in Latvia and other countries behind

the Iron Curtain. Researchers in the West were also denied access to these documents. Many historians and teachers went into exile in 1944, and some continued to work as professional historians. The most notable of these exiles is Edgars Dunsdorfs (1904-2002), but the work of Ādolfs Šilde (1907-1990) and other historians educated in the West, such as Andrievs Ezergailis, Andrejs Plakans, and Kārlis Kangeris, is important. The importance of their research is attested to by the creation of the Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies (AABS) that united exiled researchers from all three Baltic nations, as well as others interested in studying issues relating to the Baltic states.

The inaccessibility of primary sources resulted in a lack of substantive critical research within exiled Latvian communities and Latvia about the education system during the interwar period. Thus, the effects of authoritarian regimes on the education system of nations such as Latvia that, although authoritarian in nature, were nevertheless national and independent, remained outside the realm of in-depth research. This holds true for members of other exiled Eastern European communities who also had severly limited access to materials before the dissolution of the Soviet Union and associated sphere of influence.

Henry (1955) notes that the precise nature of citizenship as the dominating aim of education has been obscured by confusion over political ideals. The 20th century witnessed a struggle for political power first between varieties of autocratic-monarchic institutions, and later between fascistic and communistic, as well as between varieties of "democracy-laissez-faire individualism, benevolent paternal new-dealism, and a pragmatic liberalism" strongly supported by many professional leaders of teachers (p. 6). Citizenship education in democratic societies claims to prepare students for participation in the democratic process by learning about the process and participating in this process on a school level. However, patriotism, or nationalism, may be a better definer for history teaching in an authoritarian regime where saluting the flag, showing reverence to portraits of leaders, and other outward adulation replaces true citizenship practices.

Nationalism is a term with a multitude of definitions, but is most commonly linked to modern history. For the purposes of my discussion I will cite Wiebe's (2002) defintion: "Nationalism is the desire among people who believe that they share a common ancestry and a common destiny to live under their own government on land sacred to their history" (as cited in Agnew, 2004, p. 223). Gellner's seminal work *Nations and Nationalism* (1983/2006) offers much discussion about the role of culture and education in nationalism and includes Wiebe's territorial aspect along with

elements of cultural diversity, access to education, and power-holding. He highlights language as the medium of instruction and the cement of modern society in early stages of nationalism in education, but that it later became secondary to the role of the mass public education system in the creation of citizens (Smith, 1998, p. 35). It is precisely the combination of the mass public education system and its use of history teaching as a way to create identity by embracing connections between the past and present that makes history teaching an integral part of creating nationalism. However, there is no universal definition of the concept of nationalism, and each country's unique historic experience has coloured its society's views on the value of nationalism as a desirable trait. Most Latvians would certainly be able to define, in their interpretation, what it means to be Latvian – what makes up Latvian identity. However, the question remains as to the value and worth they assign those markers. In the Latvian context, the theoretical Marxist/Leninist definition and long-term experience of over-emphasized Soviet nationalism are embedded in the Latvian psyche resulting in uncertainty, distrust, and self-censorship for many, but not all Latvians.

It is not the purpose of this dissertation to analyze the minutia of each period's educational structure and personalities, but rather to examine the major factors that affected the creation of the educational system and how these factors affected the teaching of history in Latvia during the 20th century. It is also beyond the scope of this dissertation to compare in detail the teaching of history in general and national history specifically in Latvia with other nations during this century. The purpose of history teaching continues to be an issue of debate, and I hope my research will add relevant information to a relatively small body of knowledge about the effect of authoritarianism on the teaching of history. In addition, this research may offer some insight on how to avoid biased teaching of history, if that is even possible.

Considering that the relationship between authoritarianism and the teaching of history has not been researched fully, I have chosen ***Effects of Authoritarianism on the Teaching of Latvian History*** as the topic of my dissertation.

Research Question: How does authoritarian political rule manipulate the teaching of national history to further its political goals, and what are the resulting effects?

Subject of Research: The teaching of Latvian history under authoritarian regimes in Latvia (1934–1940, 1940–1941, 1945–1991).

Research Goal: Analyze the teaching of Latvian history in democratic and authoritarian societies and define the traits characteristic to authoritarian regimes.

Research Objectives:

1. Research the background of history teaching in Latvia in a sociopolitical and cultural context during the periods of authoritarian regimes (1934 – 1940; 1940 – 1941, 1945 – 1953, 1954 – 1991) and democratic regimes (1918 – 1934; 1991 – 2008).
2. Based on the analysis of history teaching, determine the:
   - purpose of history teaching as determined by the ruling order,
   - goal of history teaching,
   - curriculum,
   - methodology and materials, and
   - teacher status

   under authoritarian regimes and democratic regimes.
3. As a result of comparisons between democratic and authoritarian regimes, identify the traits of authoritarian rule in history teaching and resulting effects.

Limitations of this study

This study focuses on a subject that has only recently become topical. Much of the study of conflicting histories had focused initially on critical discussion of European interpretations of the history of people of colonized lands. Recent ethnic conflicts in Cyprus, the former Yugoslavian territories, and the Balkans, among others, have raised issues of identity and how history textbooks and education in these areas of conflict have been influenced. There has been some discussion of Soviet, and more specifically Stalin's, interpretation of history, as well as discussion of Nazi Germany's worldview, but the effect of these regimes on education, and history teaching in particular, has been less researched in other countries occupied by these powers. This study does not address the role of authoritarianism in education in general, and I also do not go into details on the role of other subjects in the history curriculum or the actual implementation of professed methodology, such as progressive education methods or critical thinking skill development. The questions posed to teachers were not updated, and one of the respondents pointed out a flaw in the structure which allowed respondents to fall back on the 'difficult to say' option rather than commit to a positive or negative response. This option also did not allow for differentiation between refusal

to answer and the inability to clearly agree or disagree with the question. However, many teachers and pupils elaborated on their responses in the structured interviews.

I relied on the help of some local Latvians to find participants, which may have resulted in a disproportionate amount of Latvians sensitive to the role of history having completed them. My own circle of friends and acquaintances in Latvia generally includes people who are politically aware and/or culturally active. This may also explain why so many of the pupil respondents spoke so highly of history lessons and their teachers in general.

Although all teachers in Latvia are required to speak basic Latvian, my lack of knowledge of Russian prevented me from interviewing several non-Latvian teachers who may have given some personal insight on the non-Latvian view of history teaching as a point of comparison. Also, post-Soviet society in Latvia continues to remain uninviting to strangers who ask what some may consider personal questions. The questions I asked would recently have been considered unthinkable to pose, let alone answer. This may explain why so many teachers declined, almost half of those I contacted, to speak to me.

The historic sections pertaining to Latgale are sparse in that materials are predominantly in Russian, and many materials are also located in Russia.

Research type

In keeping with the research question, this is an historic research project.

Research methods

In keeping with the nature of the research question, I have used a cultural-historic and phenomenological approach using the following methods:

Hermeneutics are used to analyze pedagogical journals, textbooks, and documents in the context of the time period.

Quantitative methods (content analysis and triangulation) are used to analyze data gathered from pedagogical journals, textbooks, and documents, as well as interview responses from teachers and pupils.

Comparative analysis is used to compare the values expressed by totalitarian regimes with those of humanism in the educational process.

Theoretical Basis

The theoretical basis of my research is based on the work of classic Latvian pedagogical thinkers (Dreimanis, Dēķens, Kaudzīte, Kronvalds, Pētersons, Valdemārs, Zālītis, and others) and other authors' (Dewey, Broudy, Depaepe, Milton, and others) work on the significance of history teaching in the development of democratic and civic educational ideals. I also base my research on modern critical theorists' work on power, language, gender equity, and other issues (Depaepe, Derrida, Fanon, Gundare, hooks, Kaomea, Ķīlis, Popkewitz, and others), and how critical pedagogy in history teaching relates to the individual, society, and the nation.

The cultural historic approach is based on literature about the historic foundation of the nation-state through the interconnectedness of societal, cultural, and educational aspects as discussed by the previously mentioned Latvian classics, as well as other Latvian researchers (Anspaks, Ķestere, Krūze, Kurmis, Plakans, Saleniece, Staris, Švābe, Vičs, Žukovs, and others) and work of English-language authors (Breuilly, Depaepe, Gellner, Leerssen, Pocock, among others). Contrast and comparison of methods of history teaching under democratic and authoritarian regimes is based on the research of both Latvian- (Bleiere, Ķīlis, Staris, Zīds) and English-language authors (Arendt, Brandenberger, Halfin, Heer, Markwick, Menschel, Yurchak, among others).

Discussion of subject-specific didactics relating to history are based on research by several authors (Gundem, Piaget, Preiswerk, Perrot, Taylor, Vygotsky, Žogla, among others) that offer insight into the principles of humanism, which is the basis of democratic education practice, as well as revealing the normative practices associated with authoritarian regimes.

Methodological Basis

The methodological basis of my dissertation reflects the interconnectedness of philosophy, psychology, sociology, politics, and pedagogy, and reveals the acknowledged ties between historic memory and identity, the effects on individual and societal development of historic understanding, and resulting development and assessment by the individual, society, and the state.

Potter (1996) stresses ethnomethodology's focus on the study of how people make sense out of everyday life and its emphasis of process over product. Meaning-making of text is more significant than the content of the text. In this context, the available Soviet books and articles used by both teachers and students formed society's understanding of historic events and societal relationships. Analysis of this

understanding and these relationships are based in theories of critical pedagogy (Depaepe, Derrida, Fanon, Forbes, hooks, Kaomea, Ķīlis, Popkewitz, Taylor, and others).

The use of oral histories is a relatively new, yet acknowledged research method that gives insight into views and tendencies peculiar to the Latvian situation (Bela, 2007; Skultans, 1998). Žogla (2001) notes that teachers tailor their teaching methods and materials to suit the needs of their students focusing on the most important. Interviews with teachers support the theory that the characteristics of authoritarian teaching methods are often more efficiently revealed through discussion with those who taught and learned under those circumstances, rather than by reading texts created at that time.

Hermeneutics are the primary axioms of the use of post-modern critical pedagogical textual analysis that assesses the importance of interconnectedness of history, the role of history teaching, and the interpretations and conceptualization of civic and national identity.

Data Collection

The major primary sources analyzed consist of Latvian State History Archive and Latvian State Archive sources that discuss history books, history curriculum, and history teaching didactics. I also analyzed history books written and published in various historic timeframes:

- 19th c. (Klein, 1860),
- democratic period, 1918-1934 (Birkerts, 1920, 1923, 1924, 1925),
- authoritarian period, 1934-1940 (Balodis, Tentelis, 1938; Grīns, 1935; Zālītis, A., 1936; Zālītis, Fr., 1937),
- Soviet totalitarian period, 1945-1991 (Aņisimova, Strods, Kanāle, 1977; Cimermanis, Kripēns, Plaude, Ziemelis, 1960; Kanāle, Stepermanis, 1967; Plaude, Kripēns, Lielā, 1958; Strazdiņš, 1956),
- democratic period, 1991-2008 (Goldmane, Klišāne, Kļaviņa, Misāne, Straube, 2006; Kurlovičs, Tomašūns, 1999).

I did not limit my textbook selection to strictly primary or secondary school textbooks, but I chose books across grade levels to ascertain the overall emphasis placed on content and language used during each period. Archival materials and books were analyzed qualitatively using content and triangulation analyses methods.

Another major source are pedagogical journals – primarily *Izglītības Ministrijas Mēnešraksts* (*IMM*) [*Education Ministry Monthly*] from 1920 to 1940 and *Padomju Latvijas Skola* (*PLS*) [*Soviet Latvian School*] from 1940 – 1941 and 1944 – 1954. These journals gave insight about the major aspects of the work of history teachers, history curriculum development, and didactics. While these journals were published in politically different eras, they were essentially the same in that the journals served as a prime source of information at a point in history when material about the new education system being introduced was virtually non-existent in Latvian. The respective governments published the journals as a resource for educators of students in all levels of education. Articles, written by professors, teachers, as well as Ministers of Education, ranged from theoretical discussions of pedagogical practice to concrete examples of lessons as experienced by subject teachers in Latvia, as well as examples of pedagogic practice in other parts of the world. The journals also published government regulations regarding daily operations of schools such as designated holidays, notice of who has been appointed to various positions in schools and the Ministry of Education, and book reviews. The journals also discussed various concerns regarding student performance and learning outcomes and offered solutions to some of the problems. These journals are similar in their purpose as teaching aids, but they do differ according to era in ideology, which influences tone and a sense of responsibility placed upon teachers to educate according to the current ideological requirements.

Part of my primary research also included interviews with history teachers who had taught during the Soviet era and students of history during the Soviet era. I had little hope of finding any teachers who may still be living that had taught during the Ulmanis era, yet there are people who recall attending school then. I interviewed several students of the Ulmanis era for a sense of the type of history taught during this period. It was more difficult than I had imagined finding retired Soviet era teachers to interview. I placed one advertisement in the Friday, 20 October 2006 edition of one of Latvia's national newspapers, *Latvijas Avīze*, briefly describing whom I wished to interview and for what purpose. I chose this national newspaper as it is more widely read outside Riga and I wanted a diverse group of teachers not based solely in the capital. However, I received no response to this single advertisement so I repeated the advertisement but ran it for an entire week (six days) and received only three responses. I also tried to contact the chair of the Latvian History Teachers' Association via e-mail three times, but received no response. I was most successful in finding teachers through the snow-ball effect or the convenience sample method whereby the interviewer finds people to

interview and during the interview asks for names of other people (Potter, 1996, p. 107) and through casual conversations with various acquaintances and colleagues. Even so, many teachers I contacted refused to be interviewed claiming old age, ill health, or lack of anything to contribute to such research.

I received information from a total of 20 teachers from various parts of Latvia. Nineteen teachers participated in a structured interview (appearing in Appendix A) in which they evaluated the Soviet school system. These questions were based upon Iveta Ķestere's (2002) pilot study among prospective teachers who were students in a master's program in pedagogy and students in a nursing program. In addition, ten teachers participated in semi-structured interviews (appearing in Appendix B) in which they gave more detailed descriptions and evaluations of their experiences. I also adapted these questions to create structured interviews (appearing in Appendix C) with other members of Latvian society who studied history in Soviet Latvian schools, but are not teachers. The purpose of these interviews was to see how both teachers and pupils used the resources available to them as teachers and students of history, and how they related to the information found in them. A total of 27 former students participated in these interviews. The nationalistic orientation of the vast majority of both teachers and former pupils may appear to negatively slant the results of these findings towards the Soviet regime. Nevertheless, they offer an insight into the views of a segment of society educated during that same period.

Literature is varied ranging from analyses of Stalin's Soviet Union and Hitler's Nazi Germany and their respective education systems to philosophical and political treatises about totalitarianism, authoritarianism, and history and its importance and influence on the teaching of history. Discussion of the history of the teaching of history in Latvia is based almost exclusively on primary sources, as this is a relatively unresearched topic. Available literature discuss the teaching of history in Latvia in various time periods only in passing.

In my discussion of the early history of Latvian pedagogy prior to winning independence, I identify regions of Latvia using their modern Latvian names, and not those used by Baltic Germans or Russians of the day. Thus, Vidzeme corresponds to Livland, Kurzeme (which includes the region known today as Zemgale) corresponds to Courland or Kurland, and Latgale which was known as Inflanty or part of the Vitebsk province.

Data Analysis

History textbooks and other pedagogical texts and government documents were analyzed primarily using qualitative methodology. I used content analysis methodology as well as the comparative method and analyzed specific references and language use in relation to nationalism, language, and other issues of power and identity. Language use was analyzed qualitatively to shed light on how individuals, ethnic groups, and states are portrayed historicly, their relationship with others, and their role in history. Using these indicators, I compared and contrasted textbooks, pedagogical journals, and government documents of the first period of Latvian independence with those primarily of the Stalin era as well as later during Soviet occupation. I conclude the comparison with an overview of history textbooks and teaching materials created since Lavia regained its independence in 1991. Macfarlane (2004) stresses the need to compare the comparable and, although several colleagues have questioned the validity of comparison of the relatively mild authoritarian Ulmanis dictatorship with Stalin's totalitarian regime, I am comparing the general effect of authoritarianism, as well as individual idiosyncrasies of each regime on form and content of educational texts and teaching practice, and not the regimes themselves.

Interview data were analyzed qualitatively in order to gain an understanding of the teachers' and former students' evaluation of the Soviet education system. I used the feminist-interviewing ethic as defined by Denzin and Lincoln (1998) in that I used a semi-structured approach, and that unlike the scientific, positivist approach of interviewer and respondent, I posited myself as a coequal discussing a mutually relevant topic (p. 36). In my semi-structured interviews with the teachers, I asked basic questions about the teacher's educational background, teaching experience, and professional development. Questions also addressed issues of personal or professional retribution during the Soviet era because of family background, real or imagined political views, language use and ethnicity, as well as teaching experiences. The responses were analyzed qualitatively to help determine issues that resonate with the teachers regarding political ideology, teaching practices, and ethnicity and language issues. As a result of discussion on a research paper about my interviews with teachers presented at the Association of Teacher Education in Europe conference in Riga in 2008, I created a structured interview to glean information about history lessons from respondents who had attended history classes in school during the Soviet era. The questions corresponded to those asked of teachers, and I have included the results from this history pupil survey and compared them to those of history teachers.

I should also place myself as researcher within the context of my research. I am a teacher by profession and have taught Canadian history to students in public schools in Toronto and Latvian history to students in the Latvian Heritage Language Program on Saturdays in Hamilton and Toronto. My ethnic heritage is Latvian – both my parents were born in Latvia, fled from Latvia as children in 1944 when the Soviets reoccupied Latvia, spent time in Displaced Persons camps in Germany, and ultimately moved to the United States where they still live. I speak and write Latvian fluently even though it is the language of an older generation of teachers taught in Latvian Heritage Language schools on Saturdays, and is in some ways unlike the Latvian spoken today in Latvia. Thus, I consider myself a member of Latvian culture in general, yet firmly outside the local educational experience. Srinivar (2004) discusses the merits of locals studying their own culture but warns against too much familiarity. However, the benefits of being an insider and knowing the local language often give great insight to behaviour and comparisons. I have received comments from some that my nationalistic upbringing in the exiled Latvian community may bias my discussion of both the pre-war Latvian educational system (positively) and the Soviet Latvian educational system (negatively), however, I have no direct experience of either which posits me in a more neutral situation than my Latvian-born colleagues. My position outside the experience of teachers and pupils of history during the Soviet era may give some insight in the comparison between expressed values and lived reality.

Research Time Frame

1st period, 2005-2007. Research question formulation; research framework and planning, compilation and review of primary and secondary sources.

2nd period, 2005-2009. Literature and primary source analysis; teacher and pupil interviews and analysis.

3rd period, 2006-2011. Write, present, and publish articles on the history of the teaching of Latvian history in various historic periods.

4th period, 2008-2011. Additional research of primary and secondary sources, complete conclusion and outcomes; format dissertation.

Research Material Source Locations:

- Latvian State History Archive (approx. 50 sources)
- Latvian State Archive (approx. 50 sources)
- National Library of Latvia (approx. 50 sources)

- Latvian Academic Library (approx. 100 sources)
- University of Latvia Library (approx. 20 sources)
- Museum of Latvian Pedagogy Library (approx. 30 sources)
- York University Library, Toronto, Canada (approx. 60 sources)
- Tartu University Library, Tartu, Estonia (approx. 10 sources)
- Internet data bases (approx. 60 sources)

Research Discoveries

This dissertation is the first, to my knowledge, that analyzes the teaching of Latvian history in a cultural context by comparing democratic and authoritarian approaches to education, and through this comparison, reveals the results of such approaches on history education and resulting values as deemed acceptable by the ruling order.

This dissertation adds to the body of literature on history teaching through its discussion of the differences between history teaching under democratic and authoritarian regimes, and how the goals of each are represented through:

1. creation and presentation of curriculum,
2. creation and implementation of methodology, and
3. teacher education and performance review.

This dissertation compares Ulmanis' authoritarian regime and Stalin's totalitarian regime:

1. the role of political power in the identification of 'the self' and 'the other',
2. teacher alienation from the teaching process,
3. Marxist emphasis on the state at the expense of the individual, and
4. the role of authoritarian rule in the creation of a sense of national identity.

This dissertation also reveals the development of 'official' and 'unofficial' Latvian history under totalitarian rule resulting in the 'folklorization' of Latvian history.

This dissertation adds to the body of literature that already exists on the effects of history teaching on identity, as well interpretations of history in areas of conflict and adds to it through discussions of this topic through the lens of this interpretation of Latvian history.

1. THEORIES ON THE TEACHING OF HISTORY

1.1. History Teaching and Politics

The study of history and humanities in general was once considered an indicator of social status. Broudy (1984) refers to antiquity when Aristotle defined liberal studies as those undertaken for self-cultivation by men who were not constrained by careers and duties owed to the state and family. While this remained true for many years, the link between social status and the study of humanities has weakened in a society where the road to socioeconomic status is paved through professional, not liberal studies (p. 16). Pocock (1996) describes how the study of history later became associated with the actions of men in ancient Greek and Roman times, and was also recorded by authors who tried to imitate the ancient authors and actors. One aspect of 'modern' historic sensibility questioned how far a 'modern' recorder of ancient history could identify himself with the 'ancient' simply by imitating the 'ancient's' words or deeds. These were military, political, and masculine activities, and finding a woman writing about it was rare. During the Renaissance, the investigation of context led to an erudite elite who possessed specialized knowledge and the critical techniques needed to interpret it, and thus became the writers of 'history', as we use the term. Pocock describes this as a defeat of pure classicism, particularly with the use of non-classic languages. Soll (2003) discusses the change in the teaching of history that occurred slowly as part of the scholarly practices of the Renaissance when a gradual shift from religious and classical authority to rationalist thinking, part of a general move toward empirical methodology, occurred. He cites Butterfield's 1940 work *The Statecraft of Machiavelli* in which Machiavelli's inductive use of historic examples are noted to be one of the first examples of the use of observation and deduction.

By the mid-18th century, historians were moving between the classical narratives of action and studies of personality and examinations of structure and their change in the realm of religion, law, literature, and manners, and were combining the two in their writings (Pocock, 1996). The precision of humanism as a movement was the desire to imitate the practices of the ancient Romans, in particular, and more specifically the aspects of humanistic culture that appeared free of any trace of religious or political subservience that could be particularly easily imported into school curriculum. "The aim was to turn the past from legend… to history, in something like the sense that we ourselves now understand it." (Milton, 2000, p. 160). The study of philosophy, a central component of the Enlightenment, was thoroughly immersed in the study of human

nature, and the study of historic thought in the 18th century was the study of the change in the condition of human life, which humanism and philology had been discovering over the previous several centuries. The resulting question was whether this study had escaped from the study of philosophy to the point where 'history' had become an autonomous mode of knowledge. 'Civil history' could also be called 'philosophical history' and the 'history of civil society' implied that people were members of a civil, rather than a religious, societal order (Pocock, 1996). The label for whole massive program was erudition (Milton, pp. 159-160). In Europe, geography was generally more apparent as a course of study, and history lessons would often be incorporated within this subject.

Historic fact as a foundation for history did not become relevant until the 19th century when positivism was introduced into the study of the past (Popkewitz, 2001, p. 154), and value was placed on individual initiative and human purpose in the direction of the affairs of civilization (Popkewitz, p. 159). French philosopher Auguste Comte (1798-1857) first used the term positivism to describe observation and experience as the source of all genuine knowledge. Metaphysical and speculative attempts to gain knowledge were to be abandoned as knowledge could be acquired by reason alone through orientation to facts and natural phenomenon (Beck, 1979 as cited in Cohen, Manion, Morrison, 2000, p. 8). The choice of facts and objective accounts, so deemed by the persons and institutions choosing them, became the basis for history teaching. The choice of what should be taught suddenly became more relevant in a society that was discovering and redefining its identity and could be used as a tool to influence this process. Taylor (2000) states that since the mid-19th century, history as a school subject has been controversial, the least immediately relevant, and simultaneously one of the most consistently boring subjects in the curriculum. History teaching has emerged, disappeared, recovered, and been forced again to retreat because of ideological debate and curriculum reform. This unfortunate situation has also been made worse by poor teaching (p. 843). In modern U.S. context, this poor teaching is often attributed to teachers lacking certification in history, or certification to teach social studies in general, but not history specifically (Vinovskis, 2009, p. 224). In addition, history teaching appears to have remained a relatively passive endeavor on the part of the learner for quite some time.

Easly (1998) describes the teaching of history in the 1900s in the United States as having changed little over many generations. Lessons took place in lecture format where the instructor presented information and the student acted as passive recipient.

The newest innovation at that time was the chalkboard (p. 65). In North American and British universities in the early 20th century, the teacher/scholar was commited both to the moral development of the student, as well as to the creation of new research (Booth, 2004, p. 248). Dewey (1938/1974) describes traditional education as a body of information and skills that had been worked out in the past to be transferred to a new generation, and that textbooks are the chief representatives of the lore of the past; it is a static finished product imposed from above and outside, and the teacher's job is to connect the pupils with the material. Barr (1926) calls verbalism the "bugaboo" of history teaching, and the antidote to this is humanism (p. 13). Vinovskis (2009) notes that throughout the 20th century, students in the U.S. have been recorded as having poor knowledge of history (pp. 225-226) indicating a long-standing debate about the purpose of history teaching and the efficacy of existing programs. History has also historicly been an unpopular subject in that it traditionally focuses on the past, not the future, demands careful and rigorous examination of evidence, and requires advanced explanatory skills rather than superficial discussion and skimming of material (Taylor, 2000, p. 852). In addition, historians tend to write for each other, and the most common tendency in the history of education is the combination of highly political zeal with sloppy historiography resulting in misrepresentation of the past. Indeed, history is not the past (except philosophically), but rather descriptions and interpretations of the past (Button, 1979). These assertions highlight the difficulties of connecting curriculum with good teaching practice, which has plagued history teaching.

The development of the teaching of history has moved from classicism to rationalism, and from religious, societal order to civil order based on facts chosen by institutions or individuals. In modern Western societies, history as a subject has often been replaced by social studies, citizenship education, or civics that incorporates the teaching of history as a basis for the value system that guides society. Taylor (2000) classifies three political systems which have exhibited quite different approaches to teaching history in schools – totalitarian, paternalistic democracies, and pluralistic democracies (p. 850). Each of these political systems also tends to exhibit some sort of sociocentric distortion when writing history textbooks (Preiswerk, Perrot, 1978).

Pluralistic democracies tend to be aware of incorporating a variety of interpretations in history texts, but can still come under political ideological pressure, and present mono-perspective history teaching (Bergmann, 2000, pp. 18-19). Pluralistic democracies suppose to educate for democracy, which includes participation in the democratic process, and also involves general moral education (Berkowitz, 2000) as

part of an un-admitted sociocentric tendency to see things through a middle-class lens (Preiswerk, Perrot, 1978, p. 27). Dewey (1916/1968) argues that experience lies at the core of education and that educating for democracy requires participation in the democratic process. Key elements for education for democracy include promotion of a moral atmosphere in class and school in general, acknowledgment of role models exhibiting good character within the school and general community, guided peer discussion of moral issues and participation in school and classroom governance, learning about character through curriculum, inclusion of the family, particularly parents in moral education, and finally, practical experience in moral behaviour. Nevertheless, there is some disagreement about what encompasses moral education, particularly in the realm of instilling desirable habits – for some it is reduced to a form of attitude change, but for others it means a more liberal cognitive orientation (Berkowitz, 2000, p. 897). While pluralistic democracies may teach history to represent the guiding moral values as accepted by society in general, they allow discussion, unlike totalitarian regimes and paternalistic democracies that exhibit more regimented adherence to values expressed by the ruling order.

Paternalistic democracies, such as Japan and Malaysia, have a strong link between political ideology and history teaching in that they have government approved textbooks that check for negativity in the way certain historic issues or events are portrayed. The sociocentric lenses in these types of democracies are ethnocentric and nationalistic in that the history of the author's nation is glorified or exhibits prejudice against other nations (Preiswerk, Perrot, 1978, pp. 15, 23).

Totalitarian regimes are the master of "one-eyed" history curriculum as textbooks are carefully "sanitized" and approved by the government. The only acceptable history justifies the existence of the regime and glorifies heroes of the ruling regimes while denigrating and denying political, social, ethnic, or religious alternatives. This glorification finds its roots in history. Alexander the Great (356-323 B.C.E.) was the first to recognize the use of propaganda as a tool, and statues and representations of his portrait could be found everywhere in his kingdom so as to be a constant reminder to the various subjugated peoples just where the centre of power resided (Jowett, O'Donnell, 2006, p. 53). Julius Caesar (100-44 B.C.E.) created legends out of ordinary events, and by making himself seem supernatural, he led the republican-minded Romans towards monarchical rule and imperial goals (Jowett, O'Donnell, pp. 55-56).

There is also no leeway for free and open examination and discussion of alternative forms of evidence that may contradict state ideology (Taylor, 2000, pp. 850-

852). Totalitarian regimes may include several, or, as in the case of the Soviet Union, aspects of all three types of sociocentrism – ethnocentrism, nationalism, and class sociocentrism.

Wild (1955) discusses authoritarian nature and its effects on the teaching of history. The young and their physical weakness and mental confusion are manipulated through fear and force, and disagreement is crushed through fear of punishment. Wild continues that in higher levels of education, this weakness is more pronounced in that authoritarianism encourages imitation and discourages questions and discussion. This method often succeeds in the intact transmission from one generation to the next of a rigid social order wiping out spontaneity and originality and offering little chance of correcting previous mistakes. A population educated in such a manner acts well, as long as conditions remain the same, but fails when a situation changes, because of the population's lack of original thought and self-direction. Over time, such systems are apt to be rife with secret skepticism on the part of the teachers and rebellion on the part of the students (p. 49). Fromm (1947/1999) notes that "[Man] can adapt himself to a culture permeated by mutual distrust and hostility, but he reacts to this adaptation by becoming weak and sterile" (pp. 22-23). He also adds that the human capacity to differentiate between good and bad is denied through the imposition of power and fear, and one tends to answer the question of what is good or bad in terms of the interests of the authority, not the subject. These aspects of authoritarian ethics are apparent in the unreflective value judgements made by the average adult (Fromm, pp. 9-10). Ironically, this must inevitably lead to inherent distrust and skepticism of any concepts or thought not sanctioned by the ruling order, even though the sanctioned is itself looked upon as lies. In the totalitarian approach to history, the state smothers all thought with its pervasive ideology, and it becomes pointless to give any serious consideration to opinions voiced within such an ideology (Markwick, 2001, p. 5).

Although pluralistic democracies appear to offer the greatest opportunity for participation and expression, it is clear that the purpose of this system is the transmission of societal values as determined by society through elected representatives. Paternalistic democracies and totalitarian regimes are more direct in determining which societal values are acceptable, but the rigid nature of indoctrination characteristic of totalitarian regimes only succeeds in creating a social order mistrusted by the members of society themselves, and the longer totalitarian order rules, the more difficult it becomes for citizens to be capable of finding alternative voices.

The deconstruction of authoritarianism after World War II, and totalitarianism in particular, during the latter half of the 20th century, involves much discussion about the typical characteristics of authoritarian and totalitarian states and the effects on nationalism and personalities as well. The Authoritarian Personality, as defined by Adorno and colleagues in 1950, was initially widely accepted as a means of determining authoritarian attitudes within a society. The obvious references to McCarthy and the sharpening atmosphere of the Cold War resulted in new theories being put forth that included political left-wing authoritariansm. What authoritarian oriented thinkers considered to be human norms was a reflection of their own norms and interests and not the result of objective inquiry, as reflected upon by Fromm (1947/1999). As a result, Adorno's validity of methodology and theories have come under considerable criticism (Altemeyer, 1981 as cited in Duckitt, 1989; Roiser & Willig, 1995; Feldman & Stenner, 1997) with much of the research moving beyond the hypothesis of a direct relationship between perceived societal threat and authoritarianism. Altemeyer (1993) clarifies his Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) scale in that right-wing does not refer to politics, but rather to personality. The RWA personality feels a strong desire to submit to established authority, regardless of left- or right-wing political views. He reduces the scale to three major traits: a) authoritarian submission – a high degree of submission to authorities within society who are perceived to be established and legitimate; b) authoritarian aggression – a general aggression directed against various persons that is perceived to be sanctioned by established authorities; and c) conventionalism – a high degree of adherence to social conventions perceived to be endorsed by society and established authorities (pp. 132-133). While many of the traits attributed to the Authoritarian Personality were considered conventional and middle-class (Forbes, 1985, p. 33) and based heavily on Freud's interpretations of people's obsessional neuroses (Forbes, p. 44), the success of authoritarian regimes was heavily dependant upon mob mentality and mass support. Dictatorship is often associated with authoritarianism but can exhibit greatly varying degrees of authoritarian behaviour.

Kalyvas (2007) describes the role of dictatorship in antiquity as a legally appointed constitutional office with the concrete task of the elimination of a threat during a crisis and a return to the status quo. This action was generally considered to be inspired by a strong civic commitment to the public good and a true manifestation of the patriotic attachment of the republican citizen. The dictator appealed to the exception to uphold the norm, and dictatorship was not itself a form of government, but limited to

six months during which parts of or the whole constitution was suspended for a limited period of time (p. 417). In antiquity, this varied greatly from tyranny in which the tyrant acquired power through force, deceit, and violent overthrow in order to destroy the common interest resulting in the downfall of legality and freedom (Kalyvas, p. 416). The role dictatorship played in the fall of the Roman Empire and its republican institutions led it to be irrevocably associated with tyranny.

Arendt describes the differences and similarities between several types of authoritarian regimes in her seminal work *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951/1968). She declares that totalitarian government is quite different from dictatorships and tyrannies (p. xxvii). However, some commonalities exist. While it is not the purpose of this dissertation to describe the historic political development of authoritarianism in Latvia and the Soviet Union, a basic description is necessary to determine commonalities and differentiations as they pertain to the teaching of history.

During the interwar period, three main forms of authoritarian rule developed – fascism, Nazism and Bolshevism. While most of Eastern Europe experienced authoritarian regimes, the majority did not fall strictly into any of these three categories, but rather created regimes that focused on national concerns adopting some, but not all of the characteristics of authoritarianism. Although Nazism and Bolshevism are immediately identifiable with specific political regimes, fascism continues to be one of the most vague, yet pejorative of the major political terms (Payne, 1995).

Payne offers a typological definition of fascism that includes ideology and goals, negations, and aspects of style and organization (1995, p. 7). Ideology and goals focused around the creation of a nationalist and authoritarian state based on an idealist, vitalist, and voluntaristic philosophy organized through a highly regulated, multi-class integrated national economic structure. A positive evaluation of the use of violence and war, as well as the goal of expansion or a radical change in the nation's relationship with other powers, often was a part of this ideology. Fascist negations were antiliberalism, anticommunism, and anticonservatism. Style and organization included attempted mass mobilization with militarization of political relationships, emphasis on esthetic structures of meetings, symbols, and political language, extreme stress on the masculine, exaltation of youth, and a specific tendency toward authoritarian and charismatically personal style of command. Although fascism is generally considered the most extreme form of European nationalism, it was not necessarily racist or anti-Semitic (Payne, 1995, p. 11), nor was it anti-religious or totalitarian in principle (Arendt, 1951/1968, p. 258).

Arendt describes fascism as a movement that claimed to represent the interests of the nation as a whole, and which identified itself with the highest authority as it seized control of the government in an attempt to make the people part of the state. The army was used as an intensely nationalist instrument of the regime. Fascism did not consider itself above the state and its leaders were not above the nation (Arendt, pp. 258-259). Arendt describes the rise of fascism in Italy as an ordinary nationalist dictatorship, which developed as a result of decades of inefficient multi-party rule. Seizure of power came as great relief because it assured some consistency, permanence and a little less contradiction (pp. 256-257).

The other two predominant forms of authoritarian government, Nazism and Bolshevism have been well documented and discussed. Arendt (1951/1968) describes in great detail the debt both these movements owe the Pan Movements, Pan-Germanism and Pan-Slavism respectively. The hallmark of these movements was that they never tried to achieve national emancipation but transcended the narrow boundaries of national community and proclaimed a folk community that would remain a political factor even if its members lived elsewhere on earth. In addition, they did not consider history, unlike smaller nations that would seek out a historic national past, but projected the basis of the community into a future toward which the movement was supposed to march (Arendt, p. 232). Unlike fascism, the army was subordinated to the political elite (p. 259). Totalitarian movements succeed in organizing masses, not classes (p. 308), and the most successful mass leaders have come from the mob, not the people, such as Stalin, who emerged from the conspiratorial apparatus of the Bolshevik party and its outcasts and revolutionaries (p. 317). Arendt clarifies that the mob, like the people, represent all classes, but unlike the people, they are made up of the "residue" of all classes and clamour for a strong, great leader rather than true representation (p. 107). Arendt claims that although the non-totalitarian dictatorships that spread through most of Europe in the interwar period were preceded by totalitarian movements, totalitarian rule on the scale of Stalin in the USSR was unlikely because these countries did not control enough human population to allow for total domination and the inherent great losses required, and that even Germany only accomplished totalitarian rule after its conquests in East Europe during World War II (pp. 308-311).

Leadership also differs between the totalitarian leader and the ordinary despot or dictator. The nature of totalitarianism causes the leader to develop totalitarian characteristics (Arendt, 1951/1968, p. 365). While total responsibility is the most important organizational principle of authoritarian leaders, complete identification and a

monopoly of responsibility for everything is characteristic of totalitarian leaders, and not dictators who would never identify with subordinates. Ordinary dictators would use subordinates as scapegoats in order to save themselves from the people, but the totalitarian leader cannot tolerate criticism of his subordinates since they always act in his name. If the totalitarian leader wants to correct his own errors, he must blame the mistake on others and ultimately kill those others. The total responsibility of the leader in this system results in a situation where nobody is ever responsible for his or her own actions or can explain those actions, and a mistake within the framework of this organizational system can only be a fraud – an impersonation of the leader by an imposter. Arendt notes that the real mystery lies with the ability of the leader to assume all crimes of the elite and to claim simultaneously to be the honest, innocent respectable fellow traveler within the system (pp. 374-375).

The majority of European countries had adopted some form of dictatorship by the outbreak of World War II, including Latvia. Similar to Italy, Latvia had experienced many years of fractious political in-fighting resulting in political instability and general dissatisfaction. Payne (1995) discusses historian Georg von Rauch's description of the dictatorship in Latvia as an "authoritarian democracy". Payne describes this authoritarian regime as a very moderate one that may have averted more serious political development. Its main achievement was a remarkable rate of economic growth, and it appeared to have the support of a majority of the population. On the scale of authoritarian regimes and dictatorships, the Ulmanis' authoritarian dictatorship was more reminiscent of the ancient Greek dictatorship in that the 1934 coup d'état was non-violent and certainly was considered for the greater good of the Latvian nation, although Ulmanis never did return power to the Parliament or lift the few restrictions that were placed on freedom of the press and assembly. His rule exhibited some traits of fascism in its strong anti-communist leanings and the mass mobilization of society based on his personality cult. While the political rhetoric became more nationalist in tone, it did not become anti-Semitic, nor was it totalitarian in principle. In fact, it might fit more aptly into the category of paternalistic democracy. Ulmanis' regime fits into Altemeyer's (1993) RWA scale as conventionalism through its high degree of adherence to the perceived wishes of society and established authority. Education was influenced as well by these nationalistic tendencies that had begun to develop during the 19th century as nationalism developed and grew throughout most of Europe.

One issue commonly agreed upon in the modern world is the significance of the teaching of history in defining identity. We are who we are because of what happened

in the past. Barr (1926) states that the understanding of the purpose of the historian as a faithful recorder of the past and how the present order of things came into being is the primary concern of the history student, and the understanding of these purposes is the essential equipment of every history teacher. "The history teacher, then, should aim to explain to boys and girls how the present came into being" (p. 8). Henry (1955) describes how Dewey, on the other hand, made a departure from this type of education in his conception of the progressive school, and unlike lessons that children learned through recitation of what was read in a book or heard from a teacher, pupil activity was central. While textbooks were still used, children gleaned information from them not for the mere purpose of reproducing it, but to make it relevant to their own lives (p. 10). However, unlike other pedagogues who grounded their work in theories of children's nature, Dewey focused on a pragmatic theory of knowledge, which was an outcome of action. Here he differentiated from Aristotle who believed in the cultivation of intelligence as an end in itself, but focused on the process of cultivating intelligence as a tool to solve problems (Henry, p. 12). This struggle between the significance of the process of acquiring knowledge and erudition as a product continues to be the focus of both teachers of history and pedagogues in general.

1.2. History Didactics

Barton and Levstik (2004) state, "Despite differing political perspectives or varied disciplinary backgrounds, many people consider the nature and purpose of history – or more to the point, of history teaching – to be entirely self-evident" (p. 3). Didactics of history teaching have not always been easy to define. In fact, didactics in general as a concept and term has several definitions. Gundem (2000) states that didactics, as a term, is generally avoided in English as it has a rather negative connotation. It usually refers to practical and methodological problems of mediation and does not claim to be an independent educational discipline. Hudson (2003) adds that discussions on didactics often remain at a relatively theoretical level, and a close connection with research on classroom practice does not occur. This assertion does not just apply to current teaching of history, but is also apparent in the previous discussion of the history of teaching of history and will be reasserted again in discussion of history teaching in the various periods of Latvian history.

Nevertheless, the most comprehensive and widest definition, formed by Dolch (1965), specifies didactics as the science and theory about teaching in all its circumstances and in all its forms, and Weniger (1965/1994) also succinctly describes

didactics as the theory of the contents of formation, Bildung, and of its structure and selection (as cited in Gundem, 2000, p. 235). The concept of Bildung is a multifaceted understanding that emerged from the Enlightenment between 1770 and 1830, mostly in the German-speaking part of Europe, and its overreaching aim is to identify the formative elements of the disciplines, as well as cultural values and norms, and ensure their transmission into individual subjects within the school curriculum (Gundem, pp. 242-243). Žogla (2001) elaborates stating that the theory and practice of didactics meet in two distinctly different processes, teaching and learning, where the teacher either initiates or assists learning through an overt, systematic, and goal-oriented process, and the goal of learning reached by the student is self-improvement through goal-oriented and experiential processes (pp. 99-100). In the educational context of German-speaking and Scandinavian countries (Latvia's close historic ties with German pedagogical developments puts it into this category), the study of didactics exists on three levels: a) theory and prescription and, as a result, reflection and action; b) different levels of abstraction (general, special, and subject-specific); and c) as a scientific discipline (Gundem, 2000, p. 236). The abstraction of subject-specific didactics brings me back to the beginning of this discussion on didactics and history teaching.

Taylor (2000) concludes that recent history instruction in schools has moved away from the strict teaching of content to a balance of content and methodology mainly because of the psychological developmental theories of Piaget (1969) that led to three general steps in teaching historic thinking and understanding. The first is the pre-operational state where young students often cannot make sense of historic information. The second is the concrete stage where students can describe historic events, and the last is the formal operational stage when students can make inferences and hypothesize about motivation and causation from the information given. Piaget's model was criticized as being too chronologic in age development leading to a revised model of general categories of historic thinking: understanding the use and value of forms of historic evidence; capacity to establish causal links between events; understanding of change over time; ability to empathize with participants of an historic event; ability to consider evidence and produce conclusions that are open-ended; and finally, the ability to report conclusions and place events in a proper historic context (Taylor, pp. 844-845). Vygotsky also claimed that biological maturation was not the determinant of a student's mental development, but human tool-mediated labour activity – an approach organically tied to the development of mental processes (as cited in Leont'ev, 1997, p. 21). Vygotsky claimed that development of everyday concepts occurs spontaneously,

but mastery of scientific concepts indicates a student's zone of proximal development (as cited in Leont'ev, p. 29), and that different instructional modes such as lectures, questioning, discussion, and independent study represent different levels of teacher control of learning (Smolucha, Smolucha, 1989) which are different ways of providing scaffolding in the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1933/1966). Textbooks can also be used to correctly assess students' capabilities of comprehension.

History textbooks have become the accepted source for knowledge in history lessons, but recently textbooks themselves have come under scrutiny as their purpose as factual transmitters of information is challenged. Preiswerk and Perrot (1978) wonder, in this global village, whether textbook authors intend to falsify history or are just culturally insensitive. The ideologies and values of a society are implicit in all social interactions and these non-conscious internalized social morays are reflected in the textbooks society creates. They raise four key issues surrounding the creation and use of textbooks. The first questions how representative of a particular culture's history are the authors of textbooks and the level of academic freedom when writing textbooks. The second calls into question the ties between the specialist's knowledge of history and the level of what the author's call social knowledge. Does the historian play a role in forming social knowledge, and how, in turn, is the historian influenced by the latter? The third concern surrounds the actual role of texts in actual teaching, and to what extent do teachers modify history presented in textbooks, and how is that received by students. The final question focuses on the impact of textbooks on the formation of ethnocentrism in comparison with other possible influences (pp. xxiii–xxiv). While history textbooks have also come a long way from dense, text-laden tomes to more teacher- and student-friendly illustrated interactive books, they still exhibit the social values accepted by society. They have also not proven to be the most effective form of history instruction.

While psychological research regarding children's development has turned the tide away from the "chalk and talk" form of teaching used for so many decades, and encouraged use of different teaching methods to build understanding, research shows that students are no more historicly aware than they were before (Wineburg, Wilson, 1991). An accepted and widely used method of introducing younger pupils to historic thinking is researching their family history and the history of their local community. In older classes a typical history lesson today may include use of movies and stories about people and events in history in addition to teachers' explanations and textbooks, but older pupils still rarely come into contact with original documents, write term papers

that include analysis of the topic, or work with other students in an effort to develop and use critical thinking skills needed to make conclusions and judgments. Professional development courses are available for teachers to learn and use other methods such as debating, drama, and electronically available sources to enhance historic thinking in students, but all these enhancements to make potentially boring history lessons more engaging require political will and state support and commitment. Even so, history courses are often still just vehicles for passing on the national myths and icons, rather than teaching a mature awareness of history, and even the most modern computer programs have not risen to the occasion using out-moded pedagogical approaches, just in a new format (Paxton, Wineburg, 2000, p. 859).

If one recognizes that Bildung ensures that cultural norms and values are transmitted through curriculum, then one must recognize that history, as a subject, most frequently succumbs to political pressure and ideology. Subject-specific didactics incorporates age and development appropriate material and teaching practices into a standardized, government-approved national curriculum (Žogla, 2001, pp. 249-250) at its best, but at its worst, as shown through the history of history teaching, becomes highly politicized and a means of oppression through political or religious self-justification (Taylor, 2000, p. 843). This discussion indicates that the history of teaching has not had a clearly defined model of teaching, and has been the victim of politicians and bureaucrats. Didactics of history teaching range from the humanistic principles ideally found in democracies to the normative practices characteristic of authoritarian regimes. I will present information for each period stating the goal of history teaching, the content included in the curriculum, teacher status and views on history teaching, and finally, by disucssing the methodology, including resources and teaching practices used to achieve the goals in each period.

2. HISTORIC BACKGROUND OF HISTORY TEACHING IN LATVIA

2.1. Development of Historic Thinking in the Context of Education in Latvia

This section will discuss the different periods of history and the main influences upon the Latvian education system in general and history teaching more specifically. It is not the purpose of this dissertation to give an in-depth analysis of the development of the program or those historians and pedagogues responsible for their creation. Rather, this section highlights the main influences – political, philosophical, cultural, linguistic, and others – that played major roles in the development of the teaching of Latvian history. The general periods of history include the latter half of the 18th and early 19th centuries before the declaration of the independent Latvian state, both parliamentary and authoritarian rule in independent Latvia during the interwar period, Soviet occupation, and post-Soviet independence. Elements discussed will include curriculum, teaching materials, and teaching methodology.

The Enlightenment and its related ideas were instrumental in creating generations of Latvian intellectuals who influenced the development of a Latvian pedagogical movement. The emergence of the Enlightenment coincided with an increased awareness of the individual and nation building in Europe, and education played a key role. The awareness of the importance of education in Latvian territory during the 19th century can be characterized by several major developments. Ķestere (n.d.) notes the incorporation of education issues in national politics, the realization of the importance of education for all social groups and its necessity for professional and social growth, the development of various types of schools, and the implementation of universal education. Educated youth became the intellectual leaders of nationalist movements, and although schools still suffered from teacher shortages, out-dated methods and materials, and high illiteracy rates, the overall level of education among teachers improved, as did teaching methods and materials. Anspaks (2003) describes the development of this intellectual movement in Latvian territory into three distinct categories: (a) the development of Latvian intellectuals during the period 1830-1850; (b) the far-reaching and many branches of the New Latvians during the National Awakening; and (c) developments in Latgale during the latter 19th and early 20th centuries (p. 68). The first two movements were influenced by and responded to Germanic influences, and their struggle was primarily against Germanization of the Latvian people, and to a lesser extent Russification, and the creation of a national system of education to support the general development of nationalism. Latgale, on the

other hand, had long suffered under Polonization and Russification and was also fighting for Latgallian rights. During the 19th century, "National-historic narratives swirled through the public sphere, all over Europe, and in great and relentless density… and …all of society, the entire public sphere was immersed neck-deep in a nonstop multimedia cult of national self-articulation and self-celebration." (Leerssen, 2006, p. 203). History was romanticized, and European historians played an important role as nation builders. This national-historic preoccupation extended into all spheres of public life, including education, in the Latvian territory of the Russian empire. Educators, however, were not a class of intellectuals onto themselves, but were often involved in other cultural spheres, as well as politics. Education of the peasants was the long-term goal, but this could not be completed without the creation of teachers. The political struggle surrounding the creation and maintenance of teacher training institutes mirrors the events of society and issues surrounding language, culture, and politics.

2.2. Teacher Seminars in the Baltic Provinces and Development of History Teaching

The Moravian, or Herrnhut, Brethren had introduced a teacher seminar to Vidzeme in the first half of the 18th century. The combination of their influence along with the revolutionary views on language and culture expressed by the German philosopher Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803) would play a major role in the development of education in general and history teaching specifically.

History teaching in the Baltic provinces reflected the monoperspective of history teaching that ruled in Germany during the 19th century. History was viewed from the perspective of the elite and emphasized *Hochgeschichte* – a unified history creating a unified identity. The purpose of history teaching was to gain knowledge and be knowledgeable in a system in which history teaching was a receptive process (Bergmann, 2000, pp. 15-19). The teacher was the transmitter of information as charged by the ruling order. History teaching was chronological and personality-based, and pupils learned names, dates, and facts from the political-historic world, or as Depaepe calls it "antiquarian and chronologically constructed *acts-and-facts history*" (Depaepe's highlight, 2006, p. 37). History books of the time reflected this classic style and the study of the history of humankind through the accomplishment of great personalities. Books included facts about the Orient, ancient Greece and Rome, the period from the Middle Ages until the French Revolution, and modern history (Peterson, Bach, Inselberg, 1898, p. 82). Church history was also a requirement. In the introduction of

one of the history books used in Kurzeme, the author noted that only the most important names and dates need be memorized (Klein, 1860), and biographies of famous men were couched in terms of friends or enemies of God and used as examples for up-bringing (Vičs, 1926). In 1874, curriculum for Kurzeme schools included history, but it was included in the geography course, and no special classes were devoted to the teaching of history separately (Vičs, 1926).

The course of history teaching recited classical narratives of action and studies of the great deeds of men and had yet to succumb to nationalistic fervour. However, the tide of change, particularly national awakening, was sweeping across Europe, and the Baltic provinces were not immune to these changes. In their efforts to create a group of ethnic Latvians who would support and maintain the existing order, the Baltic German barons ultimately succeeded in introducing Latvians to ideas that would bring drastic changes to the education system and curriculum they had not envisaged. Perhaps the most important and influential of these Latvians was Jānis Cimze (1814-1881) who is considered to be Latvia's first notable pedagogue and one of the founders of the Latvian national education system.

Language as a means of national expression was one of the key elements of the Enlightenment and was often at the heart of education issues, both for Cimze and for the local landed gentry. Although he had been introduced to the most modern and progressive educational ideas of the era as a result of his educational experience in Germany, Cimze was quite pragmatic and a product of his time. He suggested that teaching in Latvian alone at the newly founded Vidzeme Teacher Seminar would be insufficient because Latvian as a language was yet under-developed, and there were insufficient instructional texts. There were clear advantages to learning in German. In fact, he suggested that Latvian, German, and Russian be taught at the Teacher Seminar (Rinkužs, 1938, pp. 40-41). In addition, Cimze had himself been educated in German and spoke in German in public as a matter of course, as was the practice of the Latvian intellectual elite of the time (Kasekamp, 2010, p. 76). Many of the German supporters of the Teacher Seminar believed that the Seminar would serve to educate the local peasants and bring them into the German intellectual circles. The Russian government did not actively protest against this policy, and, in fact, the greatest protest came from conservative German barons who wanted to keep the German intellectual social group free of Latvians (Rinkužs, 1938, p. 44). Cimze did not discourage Latvians entering German intellectual circles, but did criticize Germanization openly in an article written in 1842 about Latvian books containing an "historic" overview of Latvian history and

introduction to the development of Latvian literature that was ultimately unpublished due to resistance from several barons (Rinkužs, p. 42). Cimze's work was instrumental in creating a future generation of Latvian educators who called not only for a more nationalistic curriculum, but also political self-determination.

As the political situation changed over the course of the 19th century, nationalist sentiment grew centering particularly on language. Like the rest of Europe, the Baltic provinces were influenced by the uprisings of 1848 that took place in several areas in Europe. The growth of German nationalism and the Pan-German movement after 1848 included the view that the Baltic lands were also part of Germany, even though of the two million inhabitants of Estonian and Latvian territories, only approximately 120,000 of them were Germans, and of those, many were Germanized Latvians and Estonians (Eliass, 1938, p. 124). During the National Awakening in Vidzeme and Kurzeme in the sphere of education, a struggle, that had previously focused upon a more Latvian curriculum and prevention of Germanization, now took on a more political nature focusing against feudalism and foreign oppression. The leading idealism of the 19th century throughout Europe was nationalism (Leerssen, 2006, p. 126), and this manifested itself for many Latvians, not on Latvian soil, but rather in Tartu and St. Petersburg where Latvian students gathered and published works out of the reach of Baltic German censors (Kasekamp, 2010, p. 78) expressing the enlightened ideas of the time. This group, known as the New, or Young Latvians, became the driving force for change in many spheres of life, including education, and many took a then-revolutionary stand tying democratic self-determination to resolution of educational issues. The main issues for discussion were language, education, and social change, and they looked to the West for examples. Among the most notable of these teachers and activists were Krišjānis Valdemārs (1825-1891), Juris Alunāns (1832-1864), Krišjānis Barons (1835-1924), Atis Kronvalds (1837-1875), Auseklis (1850-1879), and Andrejs Spāģis (1820-1871).

As the Young Latvian movement grew, some of its members became critical of Cimze and his insistence in the use of German as the language of instruction in the Teacher Seminar. Cimze's last years were full of conflict, particularly over nationalistic issues. While the German directorship of the Seminar accused Cimze of overly Latvian nationalist sentiment, Cimze was being vilified in Latvian press as being too pro-German. Indeed, many of the members of the New Latvian movement believed that the Latvian nation's only hope for reforms was to be loyal to the tsar and his government (Švābe, 1958, pp. 502-536). Kronvalds was one of Cimze's detractors and called for

creating teaching seminars with Latvian as the language of instruction and also separating Latvian and Estonian teachers' conferences (Rinkužs, 1938, pp. 66-67) so that each conference could be held in Latvian and Estonian respectively. The conflict between Cimze and Kronvalds centered on Latvian language use and was quite public. After Cimze's death in 1881, the Seminar experienced intensified Germanization.

In an attempt to raise the profile of Latvian culture, Adolfs Alunāns, who was acutely aware of the lack of literature in Latvian promoting Latvian luminaries, published a small book in which he recounted personal memoirs of his meetings with Latvian national activists (Allunans, 1887). In his forward he noted that larger nations are "richly fed" with news and life stories about their patriots, writers, artists, scientists, and politicians (p. 3), and that Latvians have a distinct lack of such literature. This deficiency prompted him to write about notable Latvians he had known. He recounted meetings and relationships with virtually all the Latvian activists of the time focusing prominently on those involved with education.

Juris Alunāns was one of the most active members of the Young Latvians. He railed against German oppression of Latvian peasants and their authoritative teaching methods, and he called on the Russian government to take control of schools hoping that tsarist reform would break the hold the barons had on education.

Krišjānis Valdemārs was another highly influential figure in the history of Latvian education in general and the teaching of history as well. He protested the Germanization of educated Latvians. He used his considerable contacts and diplomatic skills to convince the Russian government to curb the influence on education by the German barons, who, as long they remained loyal to the czarist government (Kasekamp, 2010, p.83), not only ruled unchecked in the Baltic provinces, but had serious influence in the Russian government itself through strong Germanic royal ties and the fact that ethnic Germans made up 13% of government ministers, 25% of members of state ruling bodies, 40% of the senators, 50% of army generals, and 60% of governor generals (Eliass, 1938, p. 125). Despite this seemingly contradictory situation, he, as well as other members of the Latvian nationalist movement realized that Latvians alone could not struggle against the deeply-entrenched rights the Baltic Germans had enjoyed under numerous foreign rules, including tsarist, but that only the Russian government could change this situation (Kasekamp, 2010, p. 80).

In his article *Latviešu skolas* [Latvian Schools], Valdemārs (1884) expressed great support for the development of schools in rural areas because there were too few urban schools, and they were prohibitively expensive. He stated that Latvians and

Estonians, much like the Finns, learned to read without attending school as a result of the Swedish Reformation experience and its influence in those countries. Nevertheless, teacher education was important for the overall development of an educated Latvian population not only on Latvian soil, but also for those Latvians who had migrated to the interior of Russia in search of land. Valdemārs mentioned that the Latvians who lived in the Russian interior would benefit by educated Latvian teachers who could "raise the glory of Latvia and God". The development of literacy would be well served by the creation of libraries, and Valdemārs wrote frequently on this topic. He admired the free library system of North America (Valdemārs, 1880, 1881), and stressed the need for small nations to have many opportunities to read widely so that intellectually bright individuals could be developed to their full potential, thereby counteracting the effect of "dark" members who not only harmed themselves, but tended to drag down others with them (Valdemārs, 1880).

Valdemārs was also quite pragmatic and suggested that Latvians should learn Russian because they were citizens of the Russian state, and that Latvians should know both Russian and German because of the nation's geopolitical position between these two large language groups. He cited the large number of Russian- and German-speaking Latvians who worked in St. Petersburg as liaisons for foreigners as an opportunity for Latvians to improve their material position (1886a). He also emphasized that knowledge of these languages would only serve to make Latvians more appreciative of themselves and their culture, as it had done for the Baltic Germans who had spent time in St. Petersburg. Kronvalds (1870b) also bemoaned the fact that many Latvians who received higher education would switch to German as their language of communication, and compared this with the German situation where educated Germans once used Latin and, up until quite recently, French to communicate. He also considered knowledge of these languages beneficial and suggested they be included in the school curriculum (Kronvalds, 1869a). Yet, he considered a thorough command of the Latvian language and higher education the best weapon against the opinion that Latvian was not an intellectual language and criticized those who claimed that the relative small numbers of books in Latvian indicated its second-rate status (Kronvalds, 1870a, 1870b, 1871).

With regards to the teaching of history, content and its interpretation took on an increasingly important role. Valdemārs (1890) was highly critical of German and Russian historiography stating that their discussions of Latvian history were too short. In his discussion of the current situation in the 19th century, he encouraged Latvians to research and write their own history, supplementing existing information with other

books and materials, and he also encouraged the use of oral history as a legitimate form of historic record. Like other enlightened and nationalist intellectuals of his time, Valdemārs (1886b) defended the glorification of one's history. He discussed a famous battle between the Teutonic Knights, identifying them as Germans, and Latvian and Lithuanian tribes in 1260 in which the Germans were utterly defeated, and how this and other ancient victories should be glorified, and that mention of these events in history textbooks was needed to represent the glory of a nation. At the two-day teachers' conference in Turaida in July 1869, Kronvalds (1869a) also suggested that both Latvian and general history be taught. In fact, Kronvalds (1869b) has a special place in the teaching of history as he created the Latvian word for history – *vēsture* – and wrote many articles about the use of the Latvian language and adoption of foreign words. His devotion to the study of Latvian led him to study Lithuanian and other Latvian dialects, and he also proposed the creation of a unified orthography. This would help unify the nation after so many difficult years of separation into a "Grand Latvia" (Goba, 1937, p. 55). Auseklis, or Mikus Krogzemis, also stated the importance of history as a means of teaching love of the fatherland, but differed from Kronvalds and Valdemārs in his stress on subservience to authority and honouring rulers and rule of law (as cited in Lapiņš, 1922) as an important part of Latvian identity. Auseklis also included cultural elements such as folksongs as an important source not only to teach love of fatherland, but also for Latvian language lessons. While nationalism in Vidzeme and Kurzeme moved away from strict adherence to piety and its lessons stressing subservience to the ruling order, Latgale was undergoing quite a different experience.

Unlike the other Latvian territories, Latgallian clergy tended to lead cultural life through quiet struggle against the landed gentry, a situation that continued well into the 1920s (Latkovskis, 1999, p. 16). The region of Latgale was experiencing a more drastic educational situation, and one of the main activists was Pīters Miglinīks (1850-1883) who trained as a teacher, but never pursued this profession. Instead he became a literacy activist who fought against the tsarist regime, the entrenched rights of the landed gentry, Russification, and Russian Orthodoxy. He is described as a true Latvian patriot because he refused to leave Latgale where he was not allowed to teach because he was a Catholic (Latkovskis, p. 66), but could do so in Russia proper, if he chose. He is also considered one of the first activists to call for a unified independent Latvia (Rupaiņs, 2000, pp. 78-80). Teacher education in Latgale was also hampered as no teacher training institutes or seminars were established in Latgale. Most Latgallians did not speak German, so they were not able to attend the first teacher seminars in Vidzeme or

Kurzeme, or other Latvian cultural centres located in Tartu, Piebalga, Riga, Jelgava, and Liepāja – all German-speaking territories. Latgallians only had St. Petersburg (Žukovs, 1999). In 1890, there were 3525 Latvians residing in St. Petersburg, but by the beginning of the 20th century, the number had risen to 20,000 of whom one-third were from Latgale (Zeile, 1994, pp. 18-19).

The Russian government intensified Russification in the Baltic provinces during the latter half of the 19th century, requiring greater numbers of Russian-speaking teachers. Matīss Kaudzīte (1848-1926), teacher, author, and member of the Young Latvian movement, noted the difficulty of the forced Russian requirements for teachers during his teaching career (1868-1911). He wrote that intially the school boards did not enforce the state language requirement, but gradually teachers were required not only to be able to pass the Russian language exam, but also to teach all classes in Russian, without using translations from or into Latvian for assistance. In fact, Kaudzīte noted that this stress upon Russian language acquisition hampered learning other subjects, but that school inspectors judged a school's success only by the level of Russian learned (Kaudzīte, 1924/1994, pp. 379-381). The Baltic Teacher Seminar was opened in 1870 as a result of Minister of National Enlightenment A. D. Tolstoy's realization that Russian was not being properly taught in the Baltic provinces due to a shortage of qualified teachers. No record of the program for teacher education from 1878 to 1904 has survived, but the history program involved a shortened course on ancient Greece and Rome in the first year, the Middle Ages through to modern times in the second, and the third and final years were devoted to Russian history and history methodology (Tomāss, 1940, pp. 99-101). Ushinsky, in his report on a trip abroad, noted that Swiss and German schools had a strong geography course, but their history program was notably weaker (Ušinskis, 1980, pp. 212-214). He added that teaching local history was the first step in acquiring general historic knowledge, and that the Russian government should develop the materials, similar to Germany, needed to properly teach this subject. Ushinsky stated that the main subjects in school should be the Russian language, Russian geography, and Russian history, and that all other subjects should be grouped around this base (Ušinskis, p. 213).

The Russian government moved the Baltic Teacher Seminar to Chistopol in the interior of Russia in 1915 because of World War I, taking with it all books and other teaching materials. With the creation of the Soviet Union, all teacher seminars were disbanded and renamed People's Education Institutions, and the Baltic Teacher Seminar was renamed Chistopol People's Education Institute. Practice schools, an integral part

of the Teacher Seminars, also closed, and education took on formalist lecture format. In 1920, the last of the Baltic Seminar teachers, who had been evacuated with the school, left Chistopol and returned to Latvia.

The last teacher seminar to open in the Baltic Provinces was the Valka-Valmiera Teacher Seminar in 1894, which prepared teachers until 1919. Like the Baltic Seminar, the Valka-Valmiera Seminar was under the direct supervision of the Ministry of the Enlightenment of the People, and the Russian administration was often in conflict with the local Baltic German landed gentry, who considered this seminar a continuation of the Vidzeme Teacher Seminar (Ozoliņš, 1936). The program included history as a course of study and focused on three main points, which reflected the trend towards the goal of developing nationalism through history teaching. The first stressed the aim of history lessons to immerse the students completely in the history of the fatherland and those facts in general history that applied to Russian history. This would strengthen love of the fatherland and subservience to the throne. Secondly, history was viewed as one the best subjects to influence a student's desire to learn and to gain proper and rational opinions about general national and social relationships and about the Russian nation, in particular. The need to be particularly careful about the choice of history facts was stressed, and students were encouraged to discard everything that did not support patriotism and virtue, and to focus on teaching techniques that would stir not only the mind, but also the soul. The final point specified texts to be used to teach history and also indicated that literature should be used to supplement history teaching (Ozoliņš, 1936, pp. 65-66).

In the description of the Valka-Valmiera Teacher Seminar, it is recorded that history was taught by Latvians starting in 1907, which was noted to have made a significant difference to the students, the majority of whom were Latvian. Previous Russian teachers of history, V. Lafins and A. Sako, were characterized as boring, and Latvian students were not moved by their descriptions of Russian history. With the arrival of Latvian history teachers P. Dreimanis and K. Dreimanis, lessons changed. P. Dreimanis, by all accounts, was an inspired teacher and active in the local teacher community, unusual behaviour for the time. His openness and ethnicity caused Russian colleagues to attack him personally, forcing him to request a change of assignment (Ozoliņš, 1936, p. 94). K. Dreimanis replaced him. Initially the syllabus required instruction in the development of slavism, but as tsarist influence subsided, K. Dreimanis began reading lectures about Latvian history in Latvian, much to the enjoyment of his students (Ozoliņš, p. 93). During World War I, the Valka-Valmiera

Teacher Seminar was evacuated to a Latvian colony in Siberia, Sizrana, in 1917, but was soon forced to close.

Thus, it was no longer solely the history, accomplishments, and language of the ruling elite that determined historic awareness in the Baltic provinces. By the turn of the 20th century, the literacy rate in Vidzeme had reached 95%, in Kurzeme it was 88%, and even Latgale stood out among the regions of Vitebsk province with 50% literacy (Bleiere, et.al., 2005, pp. 82-83) indicating a serious commitment to educating the nation, which was also tied to issues of identity. More specifically, issues of identity centered on Latvian language, culture, and history, all of which came to the forefront as a result of the enlightened ideas that were circulating throughout most of Europe. The German landed gentry, mostly through their own negligence, had lost control over what they had considered to be the accepted social order where Latvians were posited in the lower class. Russian pedagogues were also acquainted with the enlightened humanist ideas that had spread throughout Europe, but had not succeeded in popularizing or implementing them in the Russian education system, which, outside the Baltic provinces, remained in a comparatively poor state for many years. However, both the Germans and Russians had come to realize the potential of history teaching as a means to instill values favourable to advancing the growth of pan-movements. Their textbooks glorified the role of leaders in history and used generally adopted formalist methods of instruction to pass on this knowledge. The Latvian activists were, however, unified in their views of a humanistic pedagogy, which included teaching students not only to read and write, but also other subjects needed to create a well-rounded, educated Latvian patriot. The main source of information continued to be the textbook, but the content of these books was not under the control of Latvian nationalists. However, Latvians made up the majority of the student body in the teacher training institutes on Latvian-speaking soil, and Latvian nationalist sentiment was prevalent in all aspects of student life in these teacher seminars.

Methodological approaches were changing as well. Rote learning was considered harmful to students' intellectual development. Entrenched superstition and narrow biblical teachings were to be replaced with an enlightened and pragmatic curriculum, and peasants were encouraged not only to attend basic schools, but also enter institutions of higher education. Teacher education was also of primary concern in the development of an educated Latvian nation.

This brief overview of the activities of teacher education in the Baltic Provinces indicates the progression and growth of Latvian awareness in the field of education

overall that conflicted with the motivation and purpose of education as determined by the ruling order who viewed history from the perspective of the elite and emphasized *Hochgeschichte* – a unified history creating a unified identity. The purpose of history teaching was to become knowledgeable. Research in curriculum, methods, materials show that history teaching was chronological and personality-based, and pupils learned names, dates, and facts from the political-historic world. History books of the time reflected this classic style and the study of the history of humankind through the accomplishment of great personalities that included members of the Church. In this context, the teacher was the transmitter of information as charged by the ruling order. Members of the National Awakening called for a new type of history teaching that reflected the importance of national identity and language of the indigenous people – basic tenants of humanism. This movement challenged the ruling order and its views on the purpose of general education. The efforts of these Latvians would resonate and be emulated in the 20th century, particularly in the newly founded Latvian state.

3. HISTORY TEACHING IN INDEPENDENT LATVIA (1918-1940)

3.1. History Teaching Under Parliamentary Rule (1918-1934)

The development of a national education system was an exercise in the creation of a completely new entity in which Latvians were, for the first time, the masters of their own fate. The country was in economic ruin as invading armies marched back and forth across the territory removing or destroying the infrastructure and forcing people to flee. Nevertheless, the nationalist government, that came to power on 18 November 1918 when Latvia declared its independence, took steps to establish some semblance of order, despite the hostilities that ceased only in 1921 when the USSR signed a non-aggression treaty with Latvia. Warring armies criss-crossed the nation forcing the newly formed government to retreat, and a Bolshevik-led regime declared the founding of a Soviet state and ruled over the greater part of Latvian territory for five months in 1919. This regime attempted education reform that included free, universal education in a unified socialist work school system, separation of church from education, student-led methodological initiatives, and education in one's mother tongue. While the attempt to supply students with food, clothing, and education materials, as the war situation would allow, was well received by the population, the actual education system itself did not change much. Teachers pretended to tow the Bolshevik party line, but actually continued on in the fashion to which they were accustomed (Anspaks, 2003, p. 180). This short-lived regime would also be the foundation for Soviet claims of renewal of the pre-existing Soviet Latvian state in 1940. When the nationalist government returned to power, not only did the new country have to rebuild its physical infrastructure, it also had to create a social system to unify a people that had for many centuries been divided. The government established in November 1918 addressed this task even as the war raged on.

Anspaks (2003) offers a comprehensive overview of the main educators and pedagogical practices in Latvia during the first period of independence, and also identifies several key influences in the creation of a national education system (pp. 175-179). Latvian educators had many sources from which to draw as they developed a national pedagogy. They drew from the experiences of Latvian history as exhibited during the two National Awakening movements when creative thought, moral esthetics, and an explicit work ethic developed, as well a sense of national identity. The struggle for independence and the resulting establishment of an independent state both engulfed and divided the nation as it struggled between those who wanted to create a sense of

civic responsibility and political and personal freedom, and those who supported more socialist values of equality and rights. This often coincided with the struggle to instill a sense of nationalism in a nation that had been colonized for centuries and whose educated citizens were lost to the Latvian nation as they assimilated into primarily German society. The nationalism that accompanied the creation of the new independent state transcended into all spheres of public life, particularly education.

Both state and municipal resources funded schools, and the main goal of the education system was to foster not only the overall education of the Latvian nation, but to instill a sense of national and civic duty. On the second anniversary of the proclamation of Latvian independence, Prime Minister Kārlis Ulmanis founded the Cultural Foundation, which played a leading role in the support of Latvian culture with particular focus on support of rural schools and libraries and development of cultural centres in rural areas right up to 1940 and the Soviet invasion (Bleiere, et.al., 2005, p. 196). Historians and teachers of history were often one and the same, and some played a multi-faceted role as they created a national history curriculum. Many of these same people would also play a role in government and incorporate the research and methods into a national program. Some of the people who played a significant role in its development, both theoretical and practical, were Kārlis Dēķens (1866-1942), Eduards Pētersons (1882-1958), Pēteris Dreimanis (1879-1971), and Augusts Tentelis (1876-1942). History, along with all the other subjects, took on a distinctly Latvian essence, and discussion surrounding curriculum development reflected this preoccupation. However, the devastation of the war and creation of a new state offered other, more immediate challenges. Elements and aspects of creating a national education system were discussed in the public sphere, particularly in articles in the pedagogical journal *Izglītības Ministrijas Mēnešraksts* (IMM) [Education Ministry Monthly], which began publication in 1920.

The most acute problem facing the new nation in education was a shortage of qualified teachers (Melnalksnis, 1922a) and materials. The Ministry of Education encouraged people to inform the Ministry's 'Reevacuation' Committee of historic materials. This committee was formed as part of the peace treaty with Soviet Russia and charged with compiling information about the location of libraries, archives, and other materials that due to the war had been evacuated primarily to Russia, Germany, Estonia, and elsewhere ("Uzaicinājums", 1920). The mass evacuation of people from Latvian territory during World War I, mostly to the interior of Russia, is estimated between 760,000 – 800,000 (Plakans, 1995, p. 115; Kasekamp, 2010, p. 94), or about one-third

of the total Latvian population. Many teachers returned, but not enough to satisfy the required number of teaching positions, and people from other professions stepped in to alleviate the teacher shortage. The Department of Education in the Faculty of Philology and Philosophy at the University of Latvia and teacher training institutes and teaching courses that were established were charged with supplying the country with needed teachers, and once the required number of teachers was reached, teaching courses would be the first to be discontinued in favour of the more substantial training offered by the Department of Pedagogy and teacher training institutes. By the start of the 1922/1923 academic year, the number of required teachers had been reached, and the teacher courses that had been established in Riga and Daugavpils were discontinued. By then, Latvian schools had 4100 teachers of whom approximately half had received their teacher education since the declaration of Latvian independence (Melnalksnis, 1922b).

The new teachers were educated in an era of 'innovative' curriculum and methodology inquiry, and they searched for the appropriate educational model for the newly independent country. Many pedagogical theories existed in the field of education during the first half of the 20th century, and Latvian educators actively sought what was appropriate to the Latvian situation and adapted them to the needs of the Latvian educational system. They took from those the necessary elements to educate teachers and supply them with the necessary teaching tools. Active cooperation with pedagogues in Estonia and, to a lesser extent Lithuania, expanded to include Germany at first, and then other major European and world education centres. In 1918, when Latvia became an independent state, it discontinued using the Russian unified education model, and the 1919 education reform laws encouraged experimentation in the search for a national education model (Ķestere, n.d., p. 77). However, this was not so easily attained. The newly formed country was based on democratic principles, which also extended to the education system. This led to many views on the education system and its purposes.

Saleniece (2002) discusses party politics in the new republic and its influence in early educational policies. The major parties – *Latvijas Sociāldemokrātiskā strādnieku partija* (LSDSP) [Latvian Social Democratic Workers' Party], *Zemnieku savienība* (ZS) [Farmers' Union], and *Demokratiskais centrs* (DC) [Democratic Centre] – understood the value of educated citizens and considered education a priority. The *LSDSP* wanted to be rid of the elitism of education and wanted universal education, including secondary education and trade schools, with special emphasis on making this possible for poorer families by subsidizing clothing, books, and meals. Their particular focus was on families in financial need. Higher education was to be free only to those unable

to pay, and access to culture and particular attention to those areas of Latvia most devastated by WW I ranked high in their party platform (pp. 18-21). The *ZS*, unsurprisingly, protected the interests of the farmers. Its main focus was development of culture in rural areas, development of nationalism in schools (mainly directed at Russification, still considered a threat), ridding the nation of Russian traditions left over from the tsarist era (Western European traditions were acceptable), connecting education to practical applications through supported development of a professional trade school network, and obligatory universal primary education (Saleniece, pp. 28-32). The last major party, *DC*, could be found somewhere in between. It supported an obligatory, universal unified school system that would prepare children for life and work, and nationalism was important, as was the development of the child as a whole. This party also stressed the improvement of the status of the teacher (pp. 33-41). Saleniece also notes a difference in the concepts of social and national interests within their education platforms. The *LSDSP* never mentioned patriotism in its platform, and the *ZS* did not stress a need to help the poor. The Latvian nation as a concept also varied for each. The *LSDSP* usually stressed the social needs of the citizens, the *ZS* the status of farmers, and only the *DC* spoke of a Latvian nation as a whole (p. 42). The *LSDSP* and *ZS* had a more global vision where the group, not the individual was important, and the *DC* centered on the individual. These differences were popularized not only in the press, but also by the individual parties as they actively sought to push their platforms through to law. This political jockeying was symptomatic of the multi-party parliamentary system, which was frequently ineffective due to the number of coalition governments that would ultimately lead to suspension of democracy in 1934. Nevertheless, initially, members of all parties agreed that a national education system, and history teaching in particular, needed to reflect a Latvian view of the nation's history, and members of the education system became active participants in the formation of new history curriculum and history teaching didactics.

In the autumn of 1919 while war was still raging in Latvia, the National Council, the national ruling body at the time, convened on 19 November to pass legislation regarding education. Although Latvian language issues formed the basis for the nationalist movement, tolerance and support of minorities, characteristic of modern democratic education systems, were an important part of the Latvian education system. Minorities were allowed to convene their own schools, and Latvian as a language was introduced only in Grade 2. Latvian history and geography were introduced into the curriculum in Grade 3, and representatives from the ZS called for the obligatory

teaching of these subjects in Latvian. Minority representatives and other members of the National Council, counseled against such a move as these students had just started learning Latvian the previous year and would find this too difficult. Dēķens warned, "If you want our non-Latvians to learn to despise the Latvian language, Latvian history, and geography, then adopt this pedagogically unsound requirement." (as cited in Saleniece, 2002, p. 49). It was decided to require the teaching of Latvian history and geography in Latvian in minority schools in the upper grades – Grades 7, 8, and 9.

The complex nature of Latvian society was not solely based on language issues. Lapiņš (1922) noted the dualism of the current social situation. He claimed it was difficult to define what was uniquely Latvian, even though a national life style and culture existed, and he noted that both revolutionary and conservative trends were a current Latvian trait. This indicates that although creation of a national curriculum was of great importance, many educators had not forgotten the lessons of Germanization and Russification, as well as political differences of opinion expressed in the revolutions of 1905 and 1917, so recently experienced. This convoluted situation offered the creators of the education system unique challenges, and creating a Latvian version of Latvian history was considered a priority. Latvian historians agreed that creation of textbooks focusing on a Latvian perspective of Latvian history was one of the first tasks to be completed.

Acceptable history textbooks were acutely lacking, and historians wasted little time in preparing texts in Latvian for schools. Most of the previous history textbooks were either in German or Russian and offered an incomplete, and often biased, description of Latvian history, an opinion previously expressed by members of the Young Latvians, but the criticism of the historians and educators of the new nation focused on more recent history. With regards to the teaching of history and the creation of a history curriculum, historians, history textbook authors, and government officials took a relatively pragmatic view, particularly in discussions about history textbooks other than those dealing with Latvian history.

A textbook for ancient history, for example, had not yet been written in Latvian, and Dreimanis (1921d) claimed that materials from existing textbooks could be used. In fact, Dreimanis supported the use of foreign languages textbooks, if they were appropriate. He did, however, criticize the dense and complicated nature of the existing textbooks, which he considered too difficult for students to comprehend. Dreimanis also criticized the supposedly 'scientific' opinions found in some of these books, which he claimed were actually personal observations and comments. The internalization of

historic thinking was of significance, and appropriate books based on a Latvian viewpoint were the most desirable sources, but other books could be used in the interim.

Latvians expressed unabashed patriotism and joy at the opportunity to write their own history. Birkerts wrote the first of many textbooks about the history of Latvia for elementary schools in 1920 while the battles for Latvian independence were still raging. In his forward he exclaimed, "A miracle has occurred: in our schools we can teach our nation's history in our language!" (p. iii). He also admitted that his history textbook had research and pedagogical failings, because "…currently, beyond the ancient Daugava, history is being written with weapons and blood, and the philosophy of history is being preached by cannons." (Birkerts, p. v).

Birkerts was a prolific writer and compiled and updated several history textbooks for various grade levels. The fifth edition of his history textbook for Grades 4, 5, and 6 *Latvijas vēstures pamatskolas kurss* [History of Latvia Primary School Course] was published in 1924. In the introduction Birkerts noted that Latvian history should be viewed from a sociological perspective, because Latvian history is mostly centred on Latvians' social standing as peasants or serfs and as an oppressed people. The starting point for studying Latvian history is in "…the present from which we must find the road back to ancient history and from antiquity, in turn, back to the present" (p. 1). He also noted that each consecutive edition contains new information on Latvian history as published by Latvian, as well as some German and Russian, historians, and he cites these publications. He also acknowledged comments and suggestions made by other historians for the improvement of his textbook in the introduction. This book had a literary companion *Mazā Latvijas vēstures chrestomatija* [Little History of Latvia Chrestomathy] acknowledging the role of literature as a tool to assist history teachers in the classroom.

During the first years of Latvian independence, several authors published history textbooks for various grade levels that were frequently, sometimes annually, reissued with more information based upon historic research that strove to fill in blank spots in Latvian history. In modern terms, one would consider this constant reissuing of textbooks an incredible expense, but this serves to indicate the importance the government of the new nation placed on creation of a Latvian narrative of the history of Latvia as well as the importance of historic thinking and history as a basis for citizenship education. These topics were often discussed within the context of textbook reviews that were frequently published in the Education Ministry Monthly journal. Records of educational discussions pertaining to the school curriculum are also housed

in the Latvian State History Archives (LVVA). It is interesting to note that the same names appear both as authors of history textbooks and reviewers of colleagues' books in archival documents, as well as in articles published in IMM. Despite this small circle, reviews did not tend to strictly glorify or praise each other's work, but often were quite frank in their discussion of positive aspects and detractions found in each textbook.

It was clear to all that Latvia's many years of being part of other countries' empires had not allowed the creation of a national curriculum for national schools. In a record of discussion on the curriculum adopted in 1921, a brief review of Birkerts' textbook is included. The reviewer of the book mentioned several faults in the book, but he also admitted that this is just a beginning to a new subject previously not taught in schools. The reviewer stated that the job of categorizing Latvian history into periods of time did not rest on the shoulders of the authors of history textbooks, but rather on historians who should search the depths of history, and not just skim the surface (LVVA, 6637, 1, 651, p. 3). One of the first reviews of a newly written ancient Latvian history textbook published in IMM describes a situation characteristic of many books. In this review, Zālits (1920) noted that along with the declaration of Latvian independence, a great interest in Latvian history has awakened, requiring the need to teach this subject in Latvian schools, for which Latvian history teachers were poorly prepared. He freely admitted that this was not easily accomplished because a comprehensive Baltic history was not in existence, and much work needed to be done on the part of historians before proper school texts could be produced. In his criticism of the author's work, Zālits gave the author credit for being aware of these shortcomings. Melnalksnis and Zālits (1920) reviewed an elementary school history text in which the author, Krodsneeks, was criticized for overly patriotic sentiment when accusing foreigners for the woes of Latvians. However, the reviewers agreed that history was the cornerstone of the future Latvian education system, and this book, although incorrect and incomplete in some of its reports, was still easily accessible to students and a contribution to the development of Latvian history textbooks. Klaustiņš (1920) expressed a similar sentiment in a review of a history textbook in which he praised the author of the textbook for his efforts in this underdeveloped field. Klaustiņš took a decidedly 'un-whiggish' stand in his discussion of the research of history stating that the ancient cannot be viewed through a modern lens, but needs to be addressed considering the times. He also criticized the use of folk songs to illustrate historic facts as they could not be chronologically dated, but should rather be used to illustrate the mindset of the people.

The developmental stage of learners in history teaching and learning (Dreimanis, 1921e) was a topic often discussed in history textbook reviews. In his review of a short history written by Melnalksnis, Dreimanis noted that history books should be appropriate for the student's intellectual development (Dreimanis, 1921a). Melnalksnis' book was written for Grade 5 students, 12 to 13 year-olds, who still think in figurative, imaginative terms and for whom concrete examples are needed. Dreimanis did not consider this book suitable for this age group because it was too concise and had no illustrations requiring the teacher to significantly supplement the text by orally creating visual images for the students.

Dreimanis, both a historian and author of several textbooks, discussed the history curriculum adopted by the Ministry of Education and emphasized the need for teachers to express their opinions on the question. He regularly interchanged the terms homeland education with history education and described its teaching as a methodological issue (Dreimanis, 1921b, 1921c). History teaching should begin with homeland education from a societal and cultural perspective. He based his argument on the latest pedagogical theories that stated that all subjects should arise from homeland education. However, he emphasized that using only examples from our homeland was not sufficient, and pupils should study other examples offering a broader worldview. Dreimanis continued by stating that Grade 3 students were not yet developmentally ready to study the cultural development of ancient history, and that a more pedagogically sound practice would be to teach homeland studies as it applied to the local environment and family. Grade 4 would be the more appropriate level for Latvian history and should include observation of local rural and urban life as a basis for understanding the concepts of family groups, nations, and the state. Local history and a cultural perspective of nomads and the first steps in agriculture were also considered appropriate topics for this age level. 'Progressive' education encouraged such hands-on history education, but no one doubted that acceptable history textbooks were not only needed, but an integral part of history teaching.

Yet another example of history textbook critiques can be seen in Teodors' (1921) review of a book by Blanks on the Latvian National Awakening. In his discussion of the New Latvians, Blanks had not considered Valdemārs the equal of Kronvalds as a valuable member of the movement because of Valdemārs' views on nationality. Blanks criticized Valdemārs' opinion that birth place was inconsequential in terms of determining nationality, and that members of one national group could become members of a different national group through service to that group. Valdemārs had

cited the example of German officers who, by serving the Russian army, should be looked upon as Russians, and not Germans, and that belonging was not to be determined by birthplace or religion, but by political persuasion. Teodors objected to this view, but clarified it by stating that this view was typical of the era. Teodors stressed that the most important weapon of propaganda was the memory of a glorious past, and that the glory of accomplishments of past heroes can be transferred to real attributes of the present. Teodors deferred to Garlieb Merkel's explanation of the lack of political figures and tradition in Latvian history as the result of the invasion of Latvian territory by the Crusaders during the 11th and 12th centuries that interrupted the natural development of Baltic and Liv political heroes, scientists, and artists. Šmidts (1920a, 1920b) reviewed two history textbooks noting in both that the lack of a political historic tradition had resulted in Latvians looking for a cultural tradition upon which to build history. Others also noted this lack of a political tradition and focused on stressing the rich Latvian cultural tradition to make up for this deficiency.

This focus on cultural history expanded within the teaching community as well as society in general. Teachers were invited to help enrich the knowledge of Latvia by participating in information gathering activities. They were encouraged, along with their students and other members of society, to gather oral recollections about events and visit places, such as old historic cemeteries, ancient castle mounds, and cult activity locations. Old household items and any other items that would enrich the historic knowledge of Latvia were to be noted and recorded with the Ministry of Education ("Uzaicinājums skolotājiem", 1920). All these initial discussions indicated the awareness by Latvian educators and historians of the need for researching and creating an authentic Latvian historiography before a truly authoritative textbook could be written. They understood the weaknesses and failures of the books that were being written and also acknowledged the writing process as one of discovery and renewal.

These discussions about history textbooks are common during this period, and they offer good perspective on the issues that concerned both historians and teachers of history, as well as the political mindset of the day. The development of history textbooks, as well a history curriculum, clearly follows the categories of creation and use of textbooks as developed by Preiswerk and Perrot (1978). The authors represent the generally accepted views on history teaching and had academic freedom in writing these texts. They were influenced by both social and historic circumstances and, in turn, continued to develop social awareness through textbooks. I found no concrete evidence of teacher modification of text. Textbooks were a significant component in the

development of a Latvian interpretation of Latvian history, but did not become overly ethnocentric to the detriment of other groups. This continued to be the case throughout the interwar period.

The school curriculum was reworked again in 1925 and finally in 1935, each time reflecting the development of the needs of the nation as viewed in part by society, as well as the political and ideological forces of the time. In 1925, a nationalist, yet democratic approach focusing on inclusion, as well as active participation by teaching staff and pupils was created, but the 1935 curriculum reflected the authoritarian nature of government and its stress on nationalism, the leader, and conformity. The authors of history textbooks continued to reflect history as deemed acceptable, but academic freedom was curbed by a focus on the leadership cult and an increasing sense of ethnocentrism. The elements of each type of philosophy are reflected in journal articles and archival documents as will be discussed further on in this dissertation.

History teaching didactics were also addressed early on. The teacher was encouraged to experiment and the teacher-experimenter movement, influenced by the Progressive Education movement and initiated by Jānis Greste (1876-1951), was fully supported by the Ministry of Education during the early 1920s, headed by Social Democrat and one of Latvia's best-known poets Rainis (1865-1929). Many teachers embraced new methods that strived to encourage creativity in classroom practices and were active in action-research resulting in new assessment methods and diagnostic practices. Standardized tests, exercises, and practices to correct and encourage student performance were created by these teacher-experimenters. Lapiņš (1922), however, was critical of Latvian educators' rush to follow the latest trends in pedagogy claiming that this was leading to confusion in teacher practice and inconsistencies in student achievement. Nevertheless, the development of Latvian pedagogical thought reflected the trends throughout the world for Progressive Education, and was the combination of research of current pedagogical ideas, mostly German due to similar educational traditions and knowledge of the language (Ķestere, n.d.), and focused on analyses of teacher practice as opposed to policy developed by bureaucrats (Žukovs, 1999). John Dewey and his philosophy on experiential, or progressive, learning were highly regarded and the many progressive and democratic educational movements that sprang from this philosophy came to be known in Latvia as *Reformpedagoģija*, from the German *Reformpädagogik* (Ķestere, n.d., p. 76).

'New education' or progressive schooling was very popular and incorporated multifaceted learning in which the students were encouraged to look at the intellectual

nature of work, thereby discouraging alienation from the creative process. This concept did not focus strictly on applied learning, but also to subjects such as history.

In a speech given at the Riga Teacher Institute on 2 December 1923 illustrating the perceived benefits of the 'progressive' education process in the teaching of history, Bērziņš (1924) noted the special place progressive education had in history lessons. He claimed that history lessons should develop the student's social awareness and give both theoretical and practical knowledge about society and how to live according to these ideals, in short – to raise a loyal citizen. He continued by stating that a school system that adhered to a particular political party platform would succeed only in creating intellectual slaves. Schools should teach political awareness, not ideology, and students' intellectual development should also be taken into account in this teaching process. The development of understanding of concepts, and not the program, was tantamount, but abstract concepts needed appropriate teaching materials. He even mentioned the need for an history 'laboratory' in which students could hold and examine actual historic artifacts. The goal of this process was to internalize conscious awareness.

Dēķens (1920) published an article describing how to introduce history to young students and used the example of the invasion of Latvian territory by Germans in the 12th century. He suggested that students could be taken to Dom Cathedral in Riga and be told the story of Bishop Meinhard. The story should be told as a biographical narrative describing Meinhard's birth in northern German territory, of his childhood there, and his eventual arrival in the territory known as Latvia today. Dēķens stressed the importance of the quality of the narrative –it should be expressive and interesting. Lapiņš (1922) believed that it was the history teacher's responsibility to find the "emotional hook" in the pupil's soul that would connect his or her life with the virtues of the ancient ancestors.

Birkerts (1925), in the introduction to the fourth edition of his *Mazā Latvijas vēsture –Pamatskolas III un IV klases kurss* [Abridged History of Latvia – Course for Primary Grades 3 and 4], noted that vivid descriptions of historic events were necessary and appropriate assignments would help reinforce the memorization of this material. He also stated that methodology was very important, and divergence from historic materials was not pedagogically sound. It was important to help pupils make the leap, in thoughts and imagination, from the present to the past and encourage logical, causal historic thinking. He also acknowledged that illustrations were of great significance in making history textbooks come alive, but that Latvian historic sources were woefully

absent of such material. Athough the textbook lacked illustrations, Birkerts (1923) had written a supplementary literature selection *Mazā vēsturnieka lasāmā grāmata* [Young Historian's Reader] that enhanced the history textbook book with more detailed written descriptions and illustrations by O. Skulme, in attempt to reflect historic events as accurately as possible. This book, however, was published in the old orthography, but the text in both books was written in simple language appropriate for pupils at that level. They also did not contain pejorative language with respect to Germans or Russians, or the role they played in Latvia's history. Birkerts concluded his introduction with a comment that the fourth edition of this book had been approved by the Education Ministry along with the supplementary literature selection (Birkerts, 1925, pp. 3-5).

Jēkabpils State Secondary School teacher Stokmanis (1927) published a methodological book of suggestions for practical exercises for history teachers. In his introduction, Stokmanis discussed the acceptance of practical applications of knowledge by students learning about science, chemistry, or physics, and the abundance of store-bought or student-created materials in such courses. He noted, however, that this was not the case in history where teaching manipulatives were usually just a few maps or pictures tossed in a corner of the staff room, occasionally pulled out to enhance the lesson. He did admit that such practical exercises were required in physics or chemistry lessons, but that practical exercises in history should take place outside the scheduled history lesson at after-school history clubs, similar to those that already existed for natural sciences, literature, and other hobbies (p. 3). He cited the example of the history club at his secondary school that had been active for seven years and whose work was housed in several rooms at the local history museum, as an example of effective methodology (Stokmanis, p. 4). The students had found archeological artifacts, published personal interviews, and created models, drawings, maps, and tables. Stokmanis noted that his school's work combined the primary school tradition of collections of pupil-created materials with that of the secondary school tradition of exhibits of pupil-collected artifacts. By combining these two approaches and including a library of various textbooks, both in Latvian and other languages, a proper history 'laboratory' had been created, much like that proposed by previously-cited experiential educator Bērziņš in 1924.

Education in the parliamentary period was nationally based and research in general education practices, teaching methodology, and curriculum was quite liberal and focused on the most modern educational perspectives of the time. The goal of history teaching was to create a Latvian interpretation of Latvia's history as a means to

instill patriotism and a sense of pride in the Latvian nation. Although Latvians were, for the first time, responsible for writing, as well as teaching of their own history, it did not digress into a national pre-occupation of self-adulation and glorification of everything and anything Latvian. Although the periods of Germanization and Russification were still in the very recent past, historiography did not turn against the Germans and Russians. The previous discussion of the writing of history textbooks and experimental teaching methodology indicates that while Latvian history was celebrated, history writing and teaching encouraged discussion and discovery. Latvians found long-neglected heroes to glorify, but were critical of versions of history that blamed others for the plight of the Latvian nation. Reviewers of history textbooks were critical of blatantly patriotic texts, but did seek out and write about the positive aspects of Latvian history, most notably culture, as opposed to politics. Teachers, students, and society in general were encouraged to participate actively in the process of history education and national historic awareness. Age-appropriate materials and methodology were accented as the most effective means of patriotic up-bringing. Methods of experimentation were encouraged and discussed, although implementing them was not always successful.

Despite the initial democratic euphoria that characterized the foundation of the nation as well as the educational system, the road to more progressive teacher practice was dogged by old-fashioned dogmatic teaching stereotypes among teachers that continued to inhibit student independence and pedagogical developments. In addition, a rise in nationalistic tendencies throughout Europe began to permeate the educational system as more aggressive nationalistic policies were adopted. An example of this is the Directive [*Rīkojums*] *Nr. 815* adopted in February 1933, which stipulated that foreign language history texts could only be used, if no Latvian written texts were available. *Rīkojums Nr. 816*, adopted on the same day, banned three German textbooks published in Germany and one published in Latvia for German schools because of their supposed inappropriate content. During the 1920s and 1930s in the Baltic States, Baltic Germans did establish radical nationalist revivalist organizations, and this trend became marked in Latvia, possibly due to Latvia's proximity to Germany and support from the Third Reich in the fight against Bolshevism, among other reasons (Housden, 2000, p. 441). Although this particular directive did not indicate the reason for banning these three German textbooks, the growth of Nazism in Germany during that period and the inherent associated political ideology may have been unacceptable in a country that,

while also experiencing significant nationalist tendencies, was still comparatively liberal with regard to minority education and rights[1].

Although nationalism was on the rise in Latvia, as well as many other European countries, it was not all encompassing and had its detractors. Lieknis emphasized the need to avoid the nationalistic fervour witnessed in Germany and Italy in an article about history teaching published in the Latvian Teacher Association Pedagogical Periodical (Lieknis, 1933). He offered seven points for history teachers to contemplate in their practice. The first suggested that teachers should avoid the German model of "strong leadership" ideology, which elevated them above other nations. Lieknis also noted Italy as a poor example and suggested that Latvia follow the democratic models in education found in France, England, Denmark, Sweden, and other countries. The following three points focused on the necessity of stressing cultural accomplishments in Latvian history, as well as worldwide. Lieknis noted that previously cultural benefits were usually only afforded to a small minority, but democracy had made culture available to the masses, and teaching the arts was an important part of a democratic school system. The economic crisis was the basis for Lieknis' fifth point on teaching in which he stated that all teachers should understand that Latvian politics are determined by world events and that history teachers need to focus on the future, and not just dwell on the past, in order to create world citizens. His sixth point addressed world conflict as a topic of education. Lieknis stated that the teacher should not stress conflicts in history because that may encourage students to believe that war is inevitable and a natural phenomenon. Cultural achievements should be stressed instead. The final point of concern for Lieknis was the boring nature of history lessons. He suggested that literature be used to bring life to history and bemoaned the lack of Latvian translations of ancient classic literature. Lieknis' main focus was on developing an interest of history in pupils and the need for a positive, cultural focus on the topic, but his democratic focus began to be undermined by nationalism that was on the rise throughout Europe.

The egalitarian school system that had previously been recognized for its inclusive minority school system began to falter in 1932 when Ķeniņš, the current Minister of Education, required that Latvian history and geography be taught in Latvian (Saleniece, 2002, p. 111). Historian and Minister of Education Tentelis adopted a more conservative stance in questions of education as well, most notably by opposing

[1] Minorities enjoyed a great degree of autonomy in the field of education and both Latvia and Estonia were hailed as forerunners in the field of minority education at the Geneva Minority Congress in 1927 (Šilde, 1982/1993, p. 257)

innovative and more liberal teaching methods and practices (Krūze, 2009, p. 103). This would become even more pronounced as the country entered a period of authoritarian rule.

The founding of the new Latvian state necessitated the creation of a Latvian education and history teaching program, which was nationalistic in orientation and hearkened back to the call by the New Latvians for a Latvian interpretation of Latvian history. History teaching was an important part of the curriculum, and content of history textbooks was of prime concern to educators and government officials. While history teaching was meant to inspire patriotic and nationalistic sentiment, it did not purposefully denigrate other peoples who played a role in Latvian history. Creative teaching methods were encouraged, and the nation as a whole was encouraged to play a part in the creation of a Latvian interpretation of Latvian history.

3.2 History Teaching Under the Authoritarian Ulmanis Regime (1934-1940)

Prime Minister Kārlis Ulmanis seized power in a bloodless coup d'état in 1934 as a pre-emptive measure against more radical groups, such as the protofascist movement Thunder Cross, subsequently outlawed, and developed state corporative institutions that regulated many aspects of Latvian affairs (Payne, 1995, pp. 324-325). The manifesto published on 16 May 1934 by Ulmanis and the Minister of War General Balodis stressed that the action was not against democracy, but rather a means to stabilize the country, so that Latvians of all classes could realize their full potential and thus, create a strong and united Latvian Latvia (Šilde, 1982/1993, pp. 315-317). Ulmanis did not create a one-party system, and politicians from other parties continued to serve under him, nor did he introduce a new constitution. He did not appear to be impressed by Hitler or Mussolini and disliked totalitarian methods of government (Hiden, Salmon, 1994, p. 53). However, education was one of the first things to be directly affected by the coup. The next several years saw changes and additions to the education system that reinforced nationalistic principles. Authoritarian decrees disbanded the Student Council at the University of Latvia, the Teachers' Association, and many other organizations, both political and non-political. The arts, literature, and the press began to suffer under forced and exaggerated glorification of everything Latvian and, particularly, Ulmanis as the nation's father and hero figure. Nevertheless, strong economic growth provided education, and culture in general, with tremendous financial support developing aspects of culture and education that had not existed when the nation was created 16 years earlier.

Education under the Ulmanis regime continued to be strongly nationally based, but democratic principles were eroded. The goal of history teaching continued to be the creation of a Latvian interpretation of Latvia's history as a means to instill patriotism and a sense of pride in the Latvian nation. The purpose of history teaching was to gain knowledge of Latvian history from a Latvian perspective, but now interpretations of Latvian history were the domain of a new generation of historians of whom only a few were selected to write history textbooks that focused on the accomplishments of great personalities in Latvian history. The teacher-experimenter movement was abandoned, and teachers adopted a more traditional role of transmitter of information.

A law was passed in July 1934 strenthened educational politics that declared a unified nation's will for cultural self-determination. The law projected that schools should develop physical, intellectual, esthetic, and moral education among the young, and that education must instill in youth a sense of personal and social responsibility, the work ethic, and love for their homeland in the spirit and understanding of nationality and class. Subsequent regulations on determining children's nationality and where they were to attend school super-ceded the previous parliamentary system's goal of an egalitarian and equalizing education system. Kronlīns (1935) extensive report on the education system indicated how truly egalitarian the system actually was, but he used these data to support the state's argument for increased vigilance in creating a 'national' school system. Kronlīns reported that the school system had not yet been completely organized. Some schools had to close because of a lack of students or because they were housed in inappropriate buildings. "Exaggerated" democracy allowed for the creation of minority schools at a much faster rate than schools for Latvian children. In the fifteen years since the declaration of Latvian independence, the number of Latvian schools had grown by 43% while the number of minority schools grew by 162% (p. 454), although minority school independence in curriculum matters had already been reduced in 1932. Schools, numbers of students, class size, and other statistics were continuously compared to those of minority schools. Because minority schools were supported by the state, Kronlīns stated that children of minorities were better off than Latvian children. As a result of these reforms passed in 1934, minority children were encouraged to enroll in Latvian schools. The shift from minority schools to Latvian schools occurred mostly from Russian and Byelorussian schools, and to a lesser extent from Jewish schools. Ethnic status was once determined by the father, but as of 1934, children in families where one parent, regardless of sex, was Latvian, were automatically considered Latvian. Thus, the number of foreign students who could

attend various minority schools also dropped, as more foreigners were considered Latvian citizens (Kronlīns, p. 465).

An anonymous review of the first year of the Ulmanis regime published in the Education Ministry Monthly ("15. maijs", 1935) reflects the authoritarian nature of the regime and the hero worship associated with such political systems. It stated that for the first time, in a very long time, the Latvian nation felt that it was truly the master of its own territory, and that this was personified in Ulmanis along with Minister of War General Balodis. The reviewer claimed that while Latvians were individualists by nature, who did not willingly succumb to societal 'chains' and who may have an unclear understanding of the greater good, they had always honoured the personality and greatness in accomplishments and spirit. This sense of honour had been slightly devalued during the period of parliamentary democracy with the declaration of the equality of all people, but the ancient values had now returned in the persona of a strong leader. Under parliamentary democracy, abstract ideas about equality and general goodness within society had super-ceded the ideal of actions by individuals and their potential greatness even though great individuals were responsible for the creation of philosophical ideas, great works of art, and other significant accomplishments. These values had now returned embodied in a concrete person, and his concrete ideas would, without a doubt, be able to create wondrous achievements to raise the nation in all aspects of life (pp. 528-529).

Many of Latvia's pedagogues quickly adapted to the new regime, and towed the authoritarian line with regard to pedagogical practices. Pētersons, one of Latvia's foremost pedagogues and faculty member at both the University of Latvia and the Jelgava Teacher Institute, was no exception. Petersons (1936) summarized the values and expectations of the education system of the new regime. He championed the ideas that accompanied the new era and claimed that it would ensure a better and brighter future, and lead to an improved cultural and economic situation which would, in turn, stabilize the nation so that it would remain solid for time eternal. He stated that teachers and homeroom advisors had been given a new task appropriate for the times as reflected in the new law on education. Their primary tasks now required them to raise the nation's sense of national civic responsibility [*nacionālā valstiskā garā*]. The purpose of educational institutions was to develop the physical, intellectual, esthetic, and moral education of youth, as well as develop awareness of personal and social responsibility and love of work and the fatherland in the context of the nation and classes. He stressed the necessity for teachers to understand the essence of these words because such

understanding would liberate teachers from the confusion of the era of political fractiousness. This confusion would be replaced by the main principles for up-bringing – authority and freedom (Pētersons, 1936, p. 125). Pētersons supported the leadership cult as he reflected upon ancient warriors Viesturs, Lamekins, and Tālivaldis, whose strong personalities had risen to unify the nation. These traits were personified in a leader who could realize the soul of the nation through ideas inspired by a genius-type will, which called for a new order in the persona or the head of the household, leader, and authority (Pētersons, p. 128). He compared the ineffectuality of democracy in the newer nations that formed after WW I with established nations, who also struggled with democracy, and described the bureaucratic machine and its slow process as sometimes hampering the erecting of buildings or bridges – clearly a negative trait. The only way to get out of this parliamentary crisis was *authoritarian rule* (Pētersons' highlight, p. 129). He continued by suggesting that schools and teachers had previously struggled half-heartedly to teach parliamentary values (p. 130), but now the high value of authoritarianism, as expressed under the new order, would instill in students the values of education, and that those who truly wished to reach the highest levels of education must succumb to the school system and the wishes of the advisor (homeroom teacher). The honour of the school was equated with the honour of the student. Students must respect their parents and the leaders of the nation who, like parents, were responsible for the well being of the nation. And most of all, students should follow the laws of God. Children must be gradually taught to understand the hierarchy of the concepts of social order – family, school, nation, state, government, leaders and their wishes and aspirations, as well as civic duties for the good of government and moral duties to God. Pētersons' use of the term 'new order' reflected similar political tendencies throughout Europe at the time, which resulted in a turn away from liberalized, democratic education policies towards a more dogmatic style reflecting authoritarian rule.

Pētersons stated that education, too, had suffered under the excesses of democracy, and the science of pedagogy had discovered this to be true. In general, teachers had realized this and had kept to the principles that support nationalism and cultural growth. He criticized the liberal ideas of both Rousseau and Tolstoy and their followers, as well as the liberal pedagogic concepts of Montessori and Key and the principles of student freedom they proposed in schools. He saw this tendency in schools in Latvia as well, and declared that freedom was not something to be taken for granted, but a lesson to be learned. The freedom of the parliamentary system had been a license to do anything and everything, but real freedom had boundaries, which allowed

individuals to have personal freedom, and authoritarian rule guaranteed this type of civic freedom for all citizens. Consistency in education would help internalize the order that children experience externally, such as the value placed on proper behaviour. Students were also encouraged to turn to current leaders in government and the freedom fighters who fought for Latvian independence for moral examples of desirable behaviour. Submission to external authority would gradually strengthen internalization of traditions and self-confidence.

Pētersons stipulated and differentiated between three main expressions of authoritarianism in education. The first was order, frequently used in upbringing. The second was honour and respect for parents, teachers, and other authority figures. The third was instilling an understanding of one's place in society, by limiting praise and occasionally expressing statements to lower the pupil's sense of self-worth, but he cautioned that this should be used in up-bringing very sparingly, and mostly in religious up-bringing where one understands that God is the highest authority and that the student should defer to God's laws, even though they are not always comprehendible by people (Pētersons, 1936, p. 135). While expressions of piety, deference to authority, and praise for hero-like qualities were not new concepts to the Latvian education system, they took on a new place of importance and became the main focus of nationalistic education, not just a by-product.

One of the aspects of the education system to come under intense scrutiny was the study of history, of which Ulmanis declared himself patron (Šilde, 1993, p. 324). The teaching of history no longer needed to justify and glorify the foreign ruling class while ignoring generations of Latvian work and achievements. However, there was a lack of Latvian-educated historians and ten years passed before a Latvian history department was established at the University of Latvia. Nevertheless, the knowledge of history was considered a cornerstone for the nation's strength.

The first Latvian history teachers' congress took place on 29 July 1934, and the Minister of Education opened the proceedings with a comprehensive overview of what the government believed was the aim of history research and teaching (Adamovičs, 1938). His opening speech discussed former Latvian historic research citing the tendency by foreign researchers to dismiss important facts and the lack of Latvian historians prior to gaining independence in 1918. Previously, Latvians could not even access foreign archives, but now new opportunities had opened for research. Adamovičs noted that there was so much material, that it was difficult to fathom the amount of work to be done. Foreigners could not write Latvian history because they had not fully

immersed themselves in Latvian life and, therefore, could not be objective about discussing events. Latvian history needed to be told by Latvians who had experienced these historic events, and it needed to avoid foreign influences that could lead historians astray. In fact, The Cabinet of Ministers founded the Institute of Latvian History on 14 January 1936 expressly to support and encourage the study of Latvian history. At its 11 May 1936 conference, members of the Institute of Latvian History discussed the need for all archival materials to be studied and reviewed by Latvians. They claimed Germans wrote from a German perspective and Russians wrote from theirs, and they would certainly not describe themselves in unflattering terms as they wrote history ("Latvijas vēstures instituta konference", 1936, p. 596).

Balodis and Tentelis (1938) also discussed this lack of history from a Latvian perspective in the first volume of the planned three volume *Latviešu vēsture* [History of Latvians], a book not written specifically for use in schools, but rather for the enlightenment of the general public about Latvian history (p. 3). Tentelis was a great supporter of history textbooks and was critical of teachers who did not read history, and particularly critical of teachers who over-loaded their lessons with facts. While facts were important to gain clarity, Tentelis stressed the need for teachers to stop and discuss the meaning and importance of the information (Krūze, 2009, pp. 110-112). In their introduction to the first volume of the history of Latvians, which discussed ancient history, Balodis and Tentelis reminded the reader that presenting a synthesis of Latvian history based on research by Latvians was not a simple task, as many aspects of Latvian history had not yet been researched. Even the use of foreign sources as a basis for discussion of Latvian history was not available because, as the authors noted, the history written by others, most notably Germans, was not complete, but rather a narrow description of activities by the ruling order only. Individual research on topics that pertained to Latvians also usually attacked Latvians or extolled the role of Germans in bringing Christianity and culture to Latvians in defense of their actions (Balodis, Tentelis, 1938, pp. 3-4). They proceeded to give examples of this type of faulty research to support this statement. Balodis and Tentelis concluded their introduction by stating the importance of history teaching in the national up-bringing, or in modern terms, citizenship education of youth. History served as an example to youth of values for up-bringing which not only include the acquisition of facts that enable young people to later make informed decisions about politics and social events, but also showed how the lack of leaders with vision allowed the enemy to divided and conquer Latvian forefathers (pp. 8-9). They also praised Ulmanis for establishing the Institute of Latvian

History, which encouraged historic research including organized searches for original materials (pp. 6-7).

Adamovičs (1938) recalled the philosophy of the New Latvians when he cited Kronvalds who called for Latvians to write their own history stressing historic facts and study of past events as important for citizenship education (p. 8). He declared the role of the history teacher was to teach children how to view the past, instill in them a wholehearted historic view of the nation's culture, and to combine this awareness of national life with national heroes. Although Latvians had long ago lost their royalty and did not have any world famous church leaders, Adamovičs reminded the participants of the first history teacher congress in 1934 about ancient leaders, as well as those peasants who stood against the ruling order and the Riflemen who fought for independence. These hero prototypes fought for the people. The teacher's role as a participant in the writing of Latvian history, stressed in the initial years of independence, was reduced to that of the promoter of the ideals the new order considered most important – the worth of the nation as a whole and its leaders in particular.

History teachers needed to internalize the events of Latvian history, and to realize that the true hero in the Latvian nation was the nation itself that had suffered in many ways and for many years, but had now risen, not as a group comprised of classes among whom one is class is considered better than the others, but as a nation. The nation had no place for class conflict or a "separate class cult" (Adamovičs, 1938, p. 10). The nation was a whole organism, and each young individual, a member of this organism. A great responsibility had been placed in front of the history teacher, because, not only did history teach us about the past, but it was also the place from which we received insight into the present and future, including values to live by. Adamovičs stressed the role played by history teachers in instilling in young students a love for the nation through concrete descriptions of our history. The teacher could help develop national awareness by showing that enlightened people can rule their own destiny. The strengths of a unified nation were stressed. These major tasks were assigned to the history teacher. It is interesting to note the postscript to the opening speech in this edition, which explains that these comments were the first public expression of the nature of history teaching since "The Leader" came to power on 15 May 1934 and the new order came into being (Adamovičs, p. 11). By studying these facts, education focused on the intelligence of the nation. A definite stress was placed on focusing on the positive. Historic events that focused on the enslavement of the Latvian people by others served only to poison traditional Latvian virtues, as well as the

view of historic figures from other nations, and this was deemed not appropriate for citizenship education that expressly focused on the positive aspects of the Latvian prototype. This exaggerated duty assigned to history teachers to support glorification of the nation and the regime foreshadowed a similar situation under Stalin. However, it was Latvian in focus and not underpinned by a totalitarian regime. Adamovičs believed that the 15 years that had passed since the declaration of Latvian independence had allowed certain historic truths to surface, and many blank pages in Latvian history had been filled. But the question he posed was how history teachers could incorporate recent history research results into their curriculum. This involved discussion of both history textbooks and methodology.

Regulations about determining which history textbooks were appropriate for use in Latvian schools were discussed. Members of the commission were chosen, and required the participation of the textbook author in discussions that reviewed each textbook for pedagogical value and methodological approaches, as well as commenting on the book's outer appearance and price. Regulation contents did not make specific reference to ideology, but the minutes of meetings in which history textbook content was discussed (LVVA, 6637, 1, 651, p. 8) indicates that these reviews were quite detailed and regularly attempted to correct what was considered to be incorrect, not only in historic details, but also sentence structure and grammar. The text of the books was also assessed for age-appropriate language.

Another example of this can be found in the minutes of the elementary history book evaluation committee meeting held on 28 August 1937 at which three history books were being evaluated (LVVA, 6637, 1, 651, pp. 10-11). The first book up for review by Reinholds Miķelsons was an elementary history reader that included both primary and secondary sources, as well as non-scientific popular sources. The book was criticized primarily because of the combination of several different types of sources, which the panel thought would be too confusing for the Grade 4 students for whom it was intended. The level of difficulty of some of the included literature was also deemed too high for this age level. It was suggested that this might be better suited as a reference tool for teachers. The committee ultimately determined that the book should be split into three parts, according to type of source. The second point of discussion was a translation of Jewish history to be inserted into F. Zālītis' general history book for elementary schools. The committee noted only a few "oddities" including the system of counting years since the beginning of time, as opposed to the accepted point of reference – the birth of Christ. This section, with the minor changes, was to be included

at the end of the history book. The last point of discussion was a Polish translation of Zālītis' general history for elementary schools, which was deemed acceptable for use in Polish schools. Other books in German and Russian were also discussed as these meetings indicating that history teaching still took place in languages other than Latvian. However, these books were carefully reviewed for content.

The history book for German pupils in Latvia *Bilder aus der Weltgeschichte Für deutsche Grundschuler in Lettland* was criticized for inconsistencies, particularly about inclusion and exclusion of specific historic events, and the inaccurate chapter titles which bore little resemblance to the content. These points were part of the general criticism of the book, which was found to idealize Germanic life and accomplishments, not just in the Baltic, but also throughout history in general. The general admission by the committee was that the book was pedagogically acceptable for Grade 6 students, but needed to address the many changes noted by the committee before the book would be accepted for use in German schools in Latvia (LVVA, 6637, 1, 651, pp. 12-14). At the next meeting of the committee, which took place six weeks later on 3 October 1938, many of the changes to the German book had been made, but the committee was still not satisfied with the description of Latvian history since gaining independence and required the author expand this section by including accomplishments of Latvia in several branches of life and society (p. 14). These meetings were attended by the Education Minister Tentelis indicating the importance of the role of history in Ulmanis' regime in general, and, more specifically, the appropriate interpretation of history as related to Latvia. This also supports previous statements indicating that Ulmanis was not a blind supporter of the current German historiography, even as it applied to German history.

Another common point for discussion in the meetings was that the history books did not adhere to the new education standards, but rather to those of 1928. They were lacking in sufficient discussion of notable Latvian figures and certain events in Latvian history. Zālītis' history book for elementary schools was deemed acceptable but went through some changes, which were not substantial in nature, but rather sanitized the language to make Latvians sound less like victims. Examples of such changes were – "Kurši oppression by the Germans" became "Kurši struggle with the Germans"; "Kurši surrender to the Germans" became "Kurši treaty with the Germans"; and "defeated Latvia's German lords" became "defeated Māra's Land's lords" or "Livonian German lords". Grīns' Latvian history textbook (1935) for elementary schools began with a forward that stressed the importance of knowledge of one's past as a bridge to the future

(pp. 3-6). He described Ulmanis as the founder and unifier of the nation and the synthesizer of the ideas of Valdemārs and Kronvalds. The section of the textbook that described the parliamentary era concluded that the system was unsuccessful, and that Ulmanis stepped in, along with general Balodis who had proved his worth during the battles for freedom in 1919, to save the country (Grīns, p. 276). While this new beginning of the Latvian nation was the work of Ulmanis, it was clear that the future of the country rested on the shoulders of the youth.

This focus on youth and the importance of education is also apparent in a book published in 1936 by the Minstry of Education *Mana tēvu zeme* [My Fatherland] that was presented to pupils upon their graduation from elementary school. The first several pages consist of likenesses of Ulmanis, General Balodis, and the Minister of Education Tentelis followed by a dedication page with the pupil's name to whom this book was presented and a photograph of Ulmanis flanked by two young girls tossing daisies in his path entitled *Youth and Leader*. The contents focused heavily on literary works describing historic periods and reproductions of paintings of glorious ancient Latvian leaders, poems extolling love of the country and the virtue of work, and photographs of Latvian vistas, as well as Ulmanis and his supporters. Literature clearly played a role in supporting the nationalistic agenda.

Metuzāle-Kangere (2004) describes how literature reflected a return to the spirit of national romanticism of the previous century through people's attachment to the land. The word *zeme* denotes both earth and country/land and becomes indivisible. Descriptions of rural and urban life were decidedly nationalistic and devoted to the work ethic and the moral and righteous nature of the person in contrast to the literature, particularly prose, of the 1920s that described liberal cosmopolitanism, as well as disbelief in Latvia as a full-fledged nation. The historic novel gained importance and one-third of prose published during the Ulmanis regime was historic novels that identified Latvian national identity through aspirtations of nationhood within a designated territory and with a unique culture and history (pp. 143-146). This literary movement reflected the style of text books adopted for use in history lessons.

The Ministry of Education published a decree in 1936 noting that the history books published in 1935 by two authors, P. Dreimanis and Fr. Zālītis, were the only ones approved for use in schools (Untitled, 1936). In a later edition, Zālītis (1937) prefaced his history textbook by stating that new history material and research indicated that previous foreign historians had written Latvia's history from their ethnic perspective. Therefore, many facts important to Latvians had been either ignored or

interpreted incorrectly. He couched these discoveries in terms of correcting mistakes and the single-sided interpretation made by previous historians, and thus, giving a more precise picture of the Latvian nation's history. Zālītis praised the "people's leader" Dr. Ulmanis for suggesting and supporting the foundation of the Institute of Latvian History whose main goal was to research Latvian history in the spirit of truth and nationalism. Zālītis also described the period of Ulmanis' rule as the brightest historic period – a renewed Latvian Latvia.

While much attention was paid to the sanitization of history textbooks, Zālītis' 1937 secondary school textbook was not overly politicized or sanitized. Chapter and sub-chapter titles are short and non-descriptive, lacking language to presuppose positive or negative attributes of historic eras. Descriptions of relationships between Latvians and foreigners are quite mundane and not couched in overly-patriotic terms. A conspicuous addition was the description of the Ulmanis regime in terms of renewal – 'Renewed Latvia' is the title of the last subsection of the book. Ulmanis' dictatorship is described not as one based on foreign example, but as a return to ancient Latvian ways, where he is the head of household who is responsible for the welfare of his home. The idea that Latvia was finally ruled by Latvians, and not foreigners, is stressed. The book is also rich in illustrations and depictions of notable personalities in Latvian history, both foreign and Latvian. The book also contains pictures of newly-erected municipal buildings and several photographs of Ulmanis meeting with the people.

The political standing of the Latvian language in itself is an interesting element. While many celebrated the ability to teach and write in Latvian, Vanags (2004) notes that until 1932, Latvia had no official national language. After Cabinet adopted Latvian as the official state language, use of Latvian became obligatory in the armed forces, government, local government agencies, and commercial enterprises. However, other languages could be used in local governments where minorities made up more than half the population. This exception was removed under Ulmanis who strove to strethen Latvian at the expense of minority languages.

Not only did books experience some change, but also the presentation of history in class appeared to revert to a more formal approach as stated by Vīksniņš (1936), who described a typical introductory history class for gymnasia students. The lesson was teacher-directed with questions about the meaning of history, culture, politics, and philosophy. Students answered these questions and then received some explanation about the topic from the teacher. The lesson took place as a question and answer session

between the teacher and students, and ended with some reflective practice as the teacher had students contemplate the discussion and apply this to themselves.

Lapsiņš (1934) claimed that teachers would be especially happy about the changes, as they had always been at the forefront of national awakening and change. He noted that a break had taken place, and the nation had replaced social class and political party infighting with a wave of nationalism. He stressed the teachers' desire for national unity, unification, and humanity principles, and in the field of education of youth, everything national and religious had become top priority. Lapsiņš repeated the refrain that the Latvian nation had suffered enough at the hands of foreigners and now must focus on a sense of national responsibility and citizenship education. The September 1934 issue of IMM contains a series of decrees changing the curriculum for minority schools declaring previous curricula null and void. The changes made were not drastic in nature but did include the requirement that Latvian history and geography be taught in Latvian in minority schools (V.V.Nr. 201).

Ulmanis assumed the presidency of Latvia on 11 April 1936, solidifying his power over the governmental structure. Anspaks (2003) claims that the political coup d'état by Ulmanis on 15 May 1934 put an end to enlightened teaching practices, stifled any teacher creativity, and entrenched centralization and control. A law adopted on 12 July 1934 criticized any experimentation in pedagogical methods, plans, or projects. The law also disbanded the Latvian Teachers' Association and included textbook censorship and restrictions on teachers as researchers. However, schools continued to be built during Ulmanis' regime, and the general population supported the call for development of both schools and culture in general through an event created by Ulmanis (1935), Draudzīgais aicinājums – literally, Friendly Invitation – that encouraged people to donate books, artwork, and money to the schools they once attended. He also invited cash donations that could be earmarked for specific purposes and to be administered by the Cultural Foundation (Ķestere, 2009, p. 186).

Several of the teachers interviewed as part of this dissertation remembered their early school days during the Ulmanis era. Many recalled a sense of Latvian patriotism in school and many pictures of Ulmanis and other leaders exhibited in their schools. I also interviewed several people who had attended school during the Ulmanis era who fled Latvia after World War II and now reside abroad in the United States, Canada, and Australia.

Both Jānis Mežaks (personal communication, May 2004) and Juris Valainis (personal communication, 25 July 2008) completed their elementary school education

during the Ulmanis era. Both described liking history, as it was patriotic in nature, with tales of ancient Latvian warriors and freedom fighters during the struggle for independence, but also described the defeats and losses suffered by the Latvian nation. They described it as most decidedly nationalistic and patriotic, but when questioned about instances of negating other nationalities, they could not recall specific comments that would have purposefully described other nations in negative terms. They did note that Russification and Germanization were specifically mentioned, but within the course of history, not as an on-going historic sore point. Other published interviews with pupils of the Ulmanis era also describe memories of an inate sense of civic duty and pride towards the nation rather than formal instruction on political expectations or love for the fatherland (Medveckis, 2004, p. 48). Uldis Siliņš (personal communication, 23 July 2008) began his primary school career during the Ulmanis era and completed it during the German occupation. He noted the prevalence of pictures of Ulmanis and other leaders in school. However, Valainis pointed out that pictures of leaders in schools is not necessarily a trait of authoritarianism, and cited the example of the United States where the portrait of the president is prominently displayed in all public schools. Mežaks also noted that not only the Prime Minister, but also the Queen is visible in all Canadian schools, and Siliņš also agreed that portraits of Australia's Prime Minister and the Queen are prominently displayed in Australian schools.

Nikolajs Kalniņš (1911-2001) was a Latvian writer and educator who graduated from the Cēsis Teacher Institute during the Ulmanis era whom I had an opportunity to interview while completing research for my B.A. thesis on Latvian history at the State University of New York, College at Purchase in 1978. He noted that as a teacher and homeroom advisor, he was required to encourage students to read stories about young people who were 'doers', not 'dreamers', and emulate behaviour that would support the glory of the Latvian nation and state. Although he agreed that patriotism was, in essence a positive thing, there were too many requirements placed on teachers forcing them to include works of literature that idolized the leader as the saviour of the nation. He also noted that not all teachers were supporters of this leadership cult, but they had to be careful not to express this opinion too vocally in public (personal communication, March 1978).

Although specific textbooks were approved for use in history lessons, I was not able to ascertain how carefully these books were adhered to during history lessons and whether teachers used other non state-sanctioned teaching aids. Ulmanis' leadership cult was not universally admired, but the onset of World War II and ultimate Soviet

occupation and/or exile may have caused the less favourable aspects of his regime to be dismissed or forgotten in favour of more positive remembrances in those who were part of the education system during the Ulmanis era.

Patriotism and nationalism, as a goal of history teaching, was heightened during this era, and some control upon teachers and methodology was initiated. History textbook authors continued to be culturally representative of the system and continued to enjoy a relatively high degree of academic freedom, though reduced from the previous era. Their work continued to add to the social knowledge of the nation and although nationalistic in spirit, it was not ethnocentric in form. Specific history textbooks were reviewed and the work of only two authors deemed acceptable for use in schools. The egalitarian and culturally diverse education system that had existed during the 1920s began to be eroded by nationalistic and authoritarian policies. The main thrust of the Latvianization of the education system, introduced by Education Minister Ķeniņš in 1931, was directed primarily against the Baltic German school system, and a 1934 education act downgraded the head of the autonomous German school board to advisor to the Minister of Education. This growing manifestation of increasing intolerance of national diversity echoed the Russification of the pre-World War I czarist era and anticipated the Russification and xenophobia of the Stalinist regime following World War II (Hiden & Salmon, 1994, p. 56).

Ulmanis' authoritarian regime resembled the classic form of dictatorship rather than tyranny, even though he made no effort to return the power to the people. His rule was fascistic in the sense that it was a nationalist dictatorship that assumed rule in order to assure consistency and permanence, something that had been lacking in the multi-party parliamentary system. He claimed to represent the nation as a whole and have the people be made a part of the state through him; the general welfare of the population increased. Ulmanis' dictatorship did not follow the definition of fascism in that Ulmanis never publicly espoused extreme racist or anti-Semitic rhetoric. He did create a state that was nationalist and authoritarian based on idealist, vitalist, and volunteerism principles and philosophy through a highly-regulated national economic structure. Education was the basis for this philosophy and was placed in high regard and extensively supported by the state.

History teaching continued to be considered an integral part of developing patriotism and nationalism and took on a decidedly hero-oriented slant. History textbooks were more carefully viewed for appropriately nationalistic content, and focused on the accomplishments of individuals and Latvian history, but continued to

remain relatively un-biased in their descriptions of relations with other nations and nationalities. The progressive teaching techniques were abandoned in favour of more traditional teaching methods, but this was not due only to the nature of the authoritarian regime, but rather reflected a general retreat from this school of pedogical thought throughout Europe. Ulmanis' rule used authoritarianism and the hero cult to continue the development of nationalism that had already begun during the parliamentary period. He rid the education system of the 'messy-ness' of democracy and solidified a streamlined institution for the education of the youth who, in turn, would build the glory of the nation. Ulmanis may have been the appointed leader and father-figure, but it is not entirely clear that his leadership cult was the ultimate goal, but rather a means to an end.

4. HISTORY TEACHING UNDER THE SOVIET TOTALITARIAN REGIME (1940-1941; 1945-1991)

The occupation of Latvia by the Soviet Union radically changed the entire social structure of the country, including education. While Latvian territory was part of the Russian empire for almost 200 years, the education system in Vidzeme and Kurzeme was run by the local Baltic German landed gentry and embodied traditions of the Enlightenment and humanism filtered through Western European, particularly German traditions. Russian and Soviet historiography has been extensively researched, but a brief view of its development in relation to the Latvian experience and later developments in Soviet historiography is needed for purposes of clarification.

4.1. History Teaching in the Soviet Union

Latvian national identity began to consolidate during the 19th century National Awakening and was the driving force behind Latvian educational reform throughout the interwar period. Brandenberger (2002) notes the irony in the name of the Russian Revolution as it was non-Russians who strove for self-determination, while many Russians themselves were indifferent or even feared the revolution. Enlightened Russian educators, such as Konstantin Ushinsky (1824-1871) supported the creation of a nationalist system of education, but supported the Occidentalists' view of reform based on a humanistic European model, while trying to reconcile the Slavophiles' wish to maintain old traditions. He stressed the importance of the mother tongue in the development on thinking and learning and work-based education to prepare people for a happy life. Ushinsky also stressed the need to acknowledge national origin, since it was a common factor for peoples, and it evoked a response of cooperation that could be more effective than habits formed through reason or fear of punishment alone (Ušinskis, 1861/1980, pp. 65-75). Creation of a nationalistic educational system was problematic as Russians lacked a sense of mass identity and had little more in common than the tendency to identify themselves in opposition to non-Russians (Cipro, 1984/1994, pp. 15-16). Arendt (1951/1968) notes that in the development of Pan Movements, tribal nationalism was based on the oppression of other nationalities. In Russia, oppression was the exclusive monopoly of the bureaucracy, which also oppressed the Russian people, resulting in a Pan-Slav movement comprising strictly of Russian intelligentsia (p. 236). This differs from the Latvian experience not only due to differences in

numbers of population, but also in that Latvians as a group were the oppressed nationality, and the leading intelligentsia worked to raise the state of the nation as a whole.

The early Soviet regime's commitment to proletarian internationalism forced the adoption of an educational system that turned the existing tsarist educational system immediately on its head. The Soviet system was based upon the work of Marx, who overturned the traditional philosophy based on the essence of man and created a theory of history and politics based on radically new concepts of the relationship between social formation and productive forces and a radical critique of philosophical humanism. Earlier (bourgeois) philosophy was based on a problematic assumption of the essence of man (human nature), which Marx replaced with not only a new history of societies, but also a new philosophy – historic materialism (Althusser, 2000, p. 30). Marx and Engels developed 'theoretical anti-humanism' in which consciousness did not determine a person's social life, rather it was social life that determined consciousness (Badmington, 2000, p. 5). This shift from classic theories of humanism influenced changes in the education system. Private schools were closed and classical languages and religious instruction were dropped from the curriculum.

Early Soviet pedagogues were at the forefront of addressing educational problems similar to their colleagues in Europe and North America, particularly illiteracy, which reached 77% in rural areas and 50% in the cities (Ķestere, n.d., p. 90). Universal education, mixed-sex classes, and pre-schools were founded, and the progressive schooling philosophy, which was gaining popularity in Europe, was deemed acceptable in Soviet schools. Soviet pedagogical thought between 1920 and 1930 was characterized by active experimentation, and was also based not only on social ideas, but political motives, which actively destroyed all that was associated with the old, bourgeois schools. The early Soviet regime's commitment to proletarian internationalism actually discouraged a mass sense of Russian national identity, and such positive appraisals were officially condemned as indications of czarist chauvinism (Brandenberger, 2002, p. 17). Initially, free and open discussion and experimentation took place, but soon the authoritarian nature of the highly centralized Soviet system grew more oppressive, and many Soviet educators were forced to discontinue their work.

Stalin killed progressive reform in 1928 and supported an anti-intellectual movement that moved away from a broad cultural approach to a narrow technical one. This was termed an attack on "bourgeois learning" (Prawat, 2000, p. 689). Educational

psychologists, including Vygotsky who was accused of smuggling in Western ideas, were denounced and their work ignored during the Stalinist regime. Stalin attacked what he considered an over-emphasis on theory at the expense of practice. Stalin thought he could control what people thought by controlling what they said (Prawat, pp. 689-691), and therefore, focused on not only the creation of history, but of language use as well. Stalin did his utmost to rid the party program of specific and concrete content inherited from earlier, non-totalitarian stages of development. He constantly reinterpreted Marxism ultimately voiding it of all its content, because it was no longer possible to predict what course of action it would inspire. The most perfect Marxist-Leninist education was no guide for political behaviour, but on the contrary, one could only follow the party line if one repeated each morning what Stalin had said the night before (Arendt, 1951/1968, p. 324). The progressive education policy, once thought to embody the true nature of education of the masses and counter the effect of bourgeois education, soon fell victim to the totalitarian nature of the system.

Language also took on a role in Stalin's vision that had not previously existed. Lenin called for full equality in language use, and Russian was not even mentioned in early Communist Party manifestos. The victory of the October Revolution was associated with the Latin, not Cyrillic alphabet, and Lenin assumed that Russian would adopt the Latin alphabet (Kreindler, 1993, p. 259). Lenin's language policy did not fit the growing totalitarian nature of the Soviet regime (Kreindler, p. 261), and like other non-totalitarian elements, language became a victim of the creation of the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist myth. Russian became the official language of the revolution under Stalin.

Halfin (2000) describes in great detail the dilemma of making the Marxist myth and how its incessant self-contradiction produce the morally pure proletariat – the only class capable of universal cognition and reality. History, for the eschatologically-driven Russian revolutionary, was a matter of the future, not of the present or past. Marxist thinking was preoccupied with history and the relationship between historicly-given man and ideal man (p. 6). Because the Marxist myth had no clear historic referent – mature capitalism – a myth was gradually created around the 1917 revolution, which resulted in the creation of a historic drama that became true in the sense that it shaped Russian history in its own image (Halfin, pp. 87-88). The relationship between the worker and the intelligentsia was key to this drama and affected the education system in real terms. Halfin relates the education politics adopted in the early 1920s and the emergence of class-based admissions (pp. 236-246). Bolsheviks believed that liberal

enrollment policies in higher education would only prolong the upper-class monopoly on education and enrollment quotas were created. The political struggle for power between Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, described by Halfin as a struggle between pluralistic European Marxism adopted by the former and Asiatic tyranny adopted by the latter (p. 172), encouraged the reporting of dissention, and students were intimidated by expulsion (p. 343). The core assumption was that industrial workers were especially good at reading the souls of students, and thus, the government placed them above professors and students in matters of class diagnostics – proletarians in general were better judges of class identity than administrators, and Communist organizations were best of all (p. 292). This way of thinking created a new elite that lacked the erudition or thought processes previously accepted to be the foundation for education in general, and history specifically. This aspect of revolutionary Russian thought continued under Stalin and directly affected teachers, as will be discussed later in this dissertation.

Brandenberger (2002) describes how Mikhail Pokrovsky (1868-1932), the father of Marxist historiography in the Soviet Union and author of *Brief Sketch of Russian History* (1922), dismissed traditional narrative form charting history in terms of great reigns by great rulers, focusing instead on broad models of stages of economic development, and even painted Russian history darkly as the story of chauvinistic, colonizing, and oppressive czarist regimes. The teaching of history was no longer to be a recitation of naked facts but an interdisciplinary study that would supposedly instill in students a Marxist worldview through subjects like labour, economy, and class conflict. Textbooks were to be replaced with use of journals, revolutionary songs and holiday celebrations, important speeches and decrees, and interviews with workers and peasants. This type of material seemed to be more relevant to Soviet students' lives rather than dry, historic facts (Brandenberger, pp. 18-19). But myth building posed a special problem for the historians in a state born of revolution, and Stalin had to reincorporate the same tsarist society the revolution had overturned in 1917 and bring back Russian tradition into Soviet history (Heer, 1971, pp. 13-14). At the 10th Communist Party Congress in March 1921, Stalin had already proposed the creation of a single Soviet Russia to eliminate the supposed economic, political, and cultural backwardness of nationalities inherited from the past, in order to give them an opportunity to 'catch-up' with Russia in relation to statehood, culture, and economy (Service, 2005, p. 201). Following a war scare in 1927, Stalin began to move away from the Marx/Engels' line that the working class could not have a fatherland. Capitalism

had been overthrown and power rested with the working class, and they now had a fatherland that could be defended (Brandenberger, 2002, p. 28).

This about-face was the result of the failure of the party line to rally the poorly-educated Soviet people and the search for a more populist line to replace a dubious Marxist notion of a 'socialist' fatherland. The absence of populist practices necessary for the development of a sense of national identity among Russians resulted in the lack of a common heritage and awareness of a glorious history with semi-mythical patriot heroes that other European countries, including Latvia, had developed during the 19th and early 20th centuries. Stalin realized that the backward, unsophisticated Russian peasantry was not a positive element and began to dredge the past for things associated with state power, strong rulers, terror, industrialization, towns and cities, secularism, and organizational gigantism resulting in a version of Marxism/Leninism that glorified dictatorship, militarism, urban life, gigantism, and distrust of the West, while degrading peasantry, rural life, and Christianity (Service, 2005, pp. 329-330).

Russian national identity only began to solidify during the 1930s in the Soviet Union, and by the mid-1930s, Pravda was openly promoting Soviet patriotism focusing on shock workers, Stakhanovites, in industry and agriculture, as well lavishing attention on old Bolshevik revolutionaries, Red Army heroes, party leaders, and even famous members of the secret police in a "search for usable past" (Brandenberger, 2002, p. 29).

Three categories of imagery from Russia's usable past included concrete pre-Revolutionary dates, events, and heroes which supported the Russian school of historiography; Russians as 'first among equals' acknowledging their superior cultural standing and inherent 'big brother' status; and, finally, 'Stalinist Orientalism' which claimed that Russians were state builders, innovators, and cultural luminaries, while non-Russians were depicted as traditionalists, thus justifying Russian paternalism (Brandenberger, pp. 93-94). In August 1932, the Central Committee openly criticized the 1920s style of teaching and asked for reintroduction of the textbook. Stalin openly rejected the "multi-ethnic" history of the region in favour of a historic narrative that would focus on Russian nation-building through the ages, and in May 1934, a Central Committee resolution disparaged the teaching methods favoured during the 1920s by calling on brigades to write heroic new narratives for mass consumption and renewing the teaching of facts emphasizing important social historic phenomenon, figures, and chronological dates (pp. 31-36). In addition, Communist Party history became the most powerful educational tool, providing illustrative facts to prove the political doctrine. Party history was the union of theory with practice, the acting out of the official concept

of the party, and Party history was understood by the public to be more authoritative than other branches of history, since it recounted the exploits and policies of an infallible institution (Heer, 1971, p. 31). This search for a usable past was an echo of the Pan-Slav movement in the 19th century and provides the background of understanding for the shift from revolutionary proletarian internationalism to more conventional Soviet patriotism based on Russian history and the fundamental role history instruction would play.

Stalin took a leading role in determining the content of history textbooks and these evolved dramatically during the years leading up to World War II. A. Shestakov edited a new school text, *Short Course of the History of the USSR*, complete with illustrations, mainly of leaders from Prince Oleg from the 10th century to Stalin, with the implicit message that Soviet Russia was an organic extension of historic Russia (Tucker, 1990, p. 481), which was published in 1937 at the height of the 1937 terror. This text was an extension of the Stalin cult manifestation of hero-nation. Stalin rewrote history clearly for self-adulatory purposes as the political stage in *Short Course* is devoid of actors other than the gigantic figure of a single hero, and the absent players had not only been pushed off the stage, but identified as traitors unworthy of their historic roles (Heer, 1971, p. 30). The multinational people of the Soviet Union was the hero-people, but Russia, the hero-nation, was first among equals as shown in the text that made Russia's national past the past of all Soviet children. Soviet minorities with languages written in Latin letters were forced to replace them with Cyrillic (Tucker, 1990, p. 490). Along with the glory of pre-revolutionary Russian nationalism came the anti-Semitism of that period (Tucker, p. 491), and xenophobia became an integral part of Russian national self-glorification (p. 571). This focus would increase as Stalin embraced World War II as a defining moment in the history of the Soviet Union with resulting effects on the history taught to the nations occupied by and incorporated into the USSR after the war. Thus, Soviet historiography had again made an about-face in its views on the purpose of teaching history. 'Bourgeois' history and its focus on humanism was replaced by socially-determined consciousness. The attempts at a nationalist focus of the 19th and early 20th centuries was replaced by internationalism. However, the USSR was not immune to the wave of nationalism and various forms of authoritarianism that was sweeping across Europe, and proceeded to adopt an even more virulent form of nationalism through totalitarianism and terror in society and glorification of everything Russian in history teaching.

If one views this period of Soviet history through the previously discussed framework offered by Preiswerk and Perrot (1978), the authors of the new Soviet history textbooks were cultural representations of the system, yet they had no academic freedom in their work, as only the Marxist/Leninist/Stalinist interpretation of history was acceptable. Their work was clearly meant to create social knowledge. Teacher experimentation ceased ending creative approaches to history teaching. The terror of the 1930s left no doubt as to the repercussions that awaited those who attempted to modify or even discuss alternate interpretations of content, and the purpose of history textbooks was clearly to form ethnocentrism.

4.2. Theoretical Aspects of History Teaching in Soviet Latvia

The Red Army marched into Latvia in June 1940, and rigged elections in July 1940 brought about the creation of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic (LSSR or Latvian SSR). Over 500 teachers experienced repressions, another 1500 were fired or resigned voluntarily, and approximately 6000 teachers were moved to different schools, affecting two-thirds of the total number of teachers in Latvia (Pavlovičs, 2004, p. 99). Not only did the mass transfer of teachers affect the education system, but the sudden shift from a Latvian nationalist education system to a Soviet system explicitly sociocentric in its bias towards the proletariat and ethnocentric in its glorification of Russian culture, while simultaneously devaluating other cultures, rendered useless many of the materials, particularly many textbooks used in independent Latvia. Mass deportation of Latvian citizens to Siberia, including teachers, took place on 14 June 1941, and shortly after this, on 1 July, the German army invaded Latvia, forcing the Soviet forces and government to flee. The German invasion of Soviet occupied territories throughout Eastern Europe was short-lived and ultimately served as another source of glorification of the Soviet government and Russian people over Latvians. Although the German occupation of Latvia is not within the scope of this dissertation, a short description of the German occupation must be included as this period influenced some of the future content of teaching materials and methods.

Many local Latvians greeted the Germans with joy thinking they would be liberated, but the German occupation would prove differently. People hoped education would return to the pre-war system, but almost immediately changes were made reflecting the new occupation (Pavlovičs, 2004, pp. 99-113). Initially, some teachers who were able, returned to their former teaching positions, but a witch-hunt soon ensued, affecting many teachers who had organized even one single pro-communist

event in school. At least 500 teachers suffered during this period. German censors reviewed, adapted, and re-released the pre-war books that had not been ruined or destroyed by the Soviets, but paper was scarce, and many students did not have books. The only completely new course was a general history course with a new history book.

A Latvian history textbook, *Latvijas vēsture V pamatskolas klasei*, for Grade 5 was published in September 1942 and did not indicate an author. It covered the period of Latvian history from the Ice Age to the beginning of Russian rule in various parts of Latvian territory in a short 120 pages. This abbreviated version of Latvian history did not contain phrases or descriptors of Germans in negative terms, such as occupiers, but rather as missionaries and traders (pp. 40-41), and portrayed the actions of the local Baltic tribes in relatively passive terms.

A new curriculum was issued including German lessons and intensified physical education. German rhetoric entered the public and educational spheres, and the historic role of Germany in the creation of intellectual Latvians was stressed. Nazification of the Latvian school program increased, and education suffered as the school year was drastically shortened due to war-time activities. Changes in the school structure affected not only minorities, but in 1942, the use of Latvian dialects in schools was outlawed. The education system soon incorporated work requirements, and young males were offered diplomas or the opportunity to skip a grade if they enlisted in the German army in 1943. The German occupation of Latvia lasted three years, and Latvians were expected to be thankful to the Germans for reestablishing Latvian schools, but this occupation was the basis for many recriminations by the Soviet Union after the re-occupation of Latvia by the Red Army in 1944, and a rich source of materials used condemn Nazism and its Latvian 'collaborators' and once again glorify the victorious Russian nation.

These historic events would result in, as Readings (2000) describes, a clash between the metanarrative of a unitary state claiming to embody universal values and local communities of minority groups that appeared either reactionary or progressive. The central state imposed a notion of abstract citizenship in the name of a narrative of the progressive realization of national destiny, erasing the specificity of local practices (p. 113). In addition, not only did official Communist Party rhetoric claim that he who commands the present also controls the past, but also, Soviet historiography suggested that he who controls the record of the past legitimates his authority to command the present and to define the future (Heer, 1971, p. vii). This is part of what Heer describes as the informal function of Soviet historiography, which was not openly described in

published articles and books, but remained as the core of the Soviet system. This assumption did not bode well for any of the national minorities within the USSR as Stalin pursued a narrow and distinctly Russian interpretation of Soviet history.

Education under Soviet occupation was based on strict political and ideological principles. Research in general education practices as well as the teaching and content of history lessons were based solely on Stalin's interpretations and directions. The goal of history teaching was to create a Soviet interpretation of Latvia's history as a means to instill Soviet patriotism. The purpose of history teaching was to gain knowledge of Soviet history from a Marsixt/Leninist perspective. This process excluded the participation of teachers, students, and the public at large who were discouraged from participating actively in the process of history education and national historic awareness.

The period immediately following World War II was a period of Russian self-adulation and reduction of all other nationalities. Discussion of local history was dangerous as charges of bourgeois nationalism were indiscriminately leveled at anyone working on local history in 1946 and 1947 (Brandenberger, 2002, p. 190), and a conspicuous break with previous acknowledgements that Russia was a culturally backward and illiterate country took place with the new line stressing that Russians had always been innovators and failures were only due to the tsarist regimes' obscurantism (Brandenberger, p. 203). And, similar to the 1930s, teachers resorted to populism and russocentric explanations of a national Bolshevik line diluting the political theories of Marxism/Leninism and dialectic materialism that were just too hard to grasp and exacerbated by teacher and curriculum deficiencies (p. 212).

The gaps created by this sudden change in narrative were filled by the publication of an educational journal *Padomju Latvijas Skola* (*PLS*) [Soviet Latvian School] that would aid in the transition from a 'reactionary' Latvian historic narrative to a 'progressive' Soviet one. This journal also had to fill the vacuum created by the complete banishment of foreign, non-Soviet pedagogical literature. The creation of a history curriculum and methodology was problematic, and a special ban was placed on work by Latvian pedagogues who had fled into exile. Latvians who had been living in Soviet Russia during the interwar period were actively repatriated to the Latvian SSR and they wrote on the subject of history teaching. Their strict adherence to Marxist/Leninist ideology directly influenced the future teachers of Soviet Latvia (Zīds, 1998, p. 8), but their work was insufficient to fill the void, and a large part of the literature was translated from Russian into Latvian and published in the new

educational journal. This was to be the basis for the new Soviet Latvian educational system. While the introduction of a Soviet interpretation of history teaching for teachers in Latvia could be found in *PLS*, the ultimate arbiter of history teaching didactics was finally translated into Latvian in 1946 in the publication *Kā jāmāca vēsture* [How One Must Teach History].

This short booklet consists of articles and directives dating from the 1930s; specifically two articles by Stalin, another two by Stalin, Kirov, and Zhdanov, as well as excerpts from the 1934 directive on how to teach history and the results from a state commission competition for the best history textbook for third and fourth year secondary school students. The articles are reprints of letters to the editorial board of several Soviet publications. These letters are exclusively responses to publicly published articles that discuss historic events in which Stalin finds fault with the interpretation. The textbook reviews are equally scathing in their criticism of incorrectly interpreted events. The book offers little instruction on methodology, but rather gives voice to Stalin's interpretation of history, which, at the time, was the only acceptable one, and in which he reduces all other interpretations to traitorous actions against the state.

Concrete didactic instructions were condensed into a short, one-page description indicating a retreat from a socially intertwined interpretations of history as proposed by Pokrovsky, and adopting a formalist, chronological study of personalities and events leading to a Marxist world view in the widely published *Excerpt from the Council of Peoples' Commissars and the Central Committee of the Communist Party's Decision On the Teaching of Civil History in the Schools of the USSR* adopted on 16 May 1934 (Balode, 1946, p. 20).

> …The USSR People's Commissariat and the Central Committee of the Communist Party have found that history teaching in USSR schools is unsatisfactory. Textbooks and teaching methods themselves are abstract and schematic in nature. Instead of teaching history in a vital and interesting way by analyzing principal events and facts in chronological order including the role of leaders, we present pupils abstract definitions of social or economic systems, thus replacing rational analysis of civil history with abstract sociological schema…

In order that pupils properly learn the history curriculum, the most important requirement was that pupils, when retelling historic events, observe the chronological order of historic events, and it required that pupils recall important historic

phenomenon, leading figures, and important dates. Only this type of history course could ensure students attain the required understanding of the material by making the content accessible and concrete. It was possible to come to a correct analysis of historic events and a correct overview only upon this type of basis, and would guide the pupil towards a Marxist understanding of history. This narrow and limited description is more fully developed in other works included in the book, which offer Stalin's view of 'axioms' of history, which, in turn, are even more significant as a source of information as to the consequences facing those whose interpretations differed.

The book has no introduction by the editor but begins with a reprint of a letter by Stalin, *On several historic questions about Bolshevism* written in 1931 to the editorial board of the magazine *Proletarskaya Revolucia*, a historic magazine devoted to the study of the history of the October Revolution. This letter criticized an article published by Slutzki in 1930 in which, among other things, Lenin's relationship to German Social Democrats and his adherence to Bolshevism were questioned. Stalin noted that the magazine printed a retraction, but only after a significant period of time had elapsed. This retraction, however, committed yet another serious mistake by declaring that events surrounding the relationship between the Bolsheviks and others during the pre-WWI period as a problem that should be researched further. Stalin reprimanded the magazine for publishing this piece as an article for discussion as this topic could not be debated. Lenin's role as a Bolshevik was an "axiom", according to Stalin, and the magazine was only dragging "us" back by attempting to transform an axiom into a problem for future study. Stalin implied a lack of true understanding of Bolshevik history or a misguided notion due to "rotten liberalism" as the basis of this false interpretation (Stalin, 1931/1946, p. 4).

Stalin highlighted three specific points that the editors of the magazine considered worthy of attention. These points indicate not only Stalin's view of the correct interpretation of history, but also the self-proffessed infallibility of his argument, and Stalin's declaration of the insidious nature of differing opinions. The first was Slutzki's assertion that Lenin and the Bolsheviks' relationship with other revolutionary factions before World War I was unstable and tenuous. Stalin declared this view a manifestation of Trotskyism, which he declared a punishable lie. Stalin continued by correcting this fallacy and declaring that among all the competing factions, only the Russian Bolsheviks at the time were experienced in organization and ideologically mature enough to lead the movement, and they were not responsible for the fact the Western leftists were not ready to follow in the footsteps of the Russian Bolsheviks.

The second point by Slutzki was that Lenin and the Bolsheviks did not assert themselves enough and support the leftists in Germany. Stalin described this reproach as "charlatanistic" and an utter lie. Again, Stalin criticized Slutzki's assertions as a faulty interpretation of history but also asserted the infallibility of the historic events as interpreted by Stalin, and clearly indicated what should be done with such falsifiers: "The maneuvers of liars should be punished, and not turned into a subject of discussion." (Stalin, 1931/1946, p. 6). Stalin questioned the allegiance of Slutzki and declared that Slutzki had revealed himself as a "semi-Menshevik" and masked Trotskyite (Stalin, p. 11). Slutzki also asserted that the fractious nature of the movement resulted in the Russian Bolsheviks abandoning the ideal of an international revolution. Stalin called this the most base and obscene assertion not worthy of substantiation. He continued by explaining the true nature of the movement citing Lenin's 1902 work *What is to be Done?* as proof of the opposite basing this on the accuracy of Lenin's statement, and ultimately his own. Those who considered these questions as fractious in nature revealed themselves to be dishonest and "degenerates" (p. 13).

Stalin concluded by stating that the editors of the magazine had erred in allowing discussion of history by a falsifier of history. Stalin questioned the reason the editors went down such a road. He claimed it was the same rotten liberalism, which had spread among a group of Bolsheviks. This faction believed that Trotskyites were a faction of communism, but in reality, Trotskyites were the advancers of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie (Stalin, 1931/1946, p. 17). The "historians" and literary figures, such as Slutzki, who fell into this category and attempted to claim that Lenin had not truly assessed the danger of centrism and only became true revolutionary through his contact with Trotsky were "smugglers" who, instead of being given a public forum to discuss their false ideas, should be unmasked (Stalin, p. 18).

In Stalin's opinion, the editorial board should have raised questions of Bolshevist history to appropriate heights by encouraging the study of history and sharpening the struggle against Trotskyites by systematically unmasking them as falsifiers of history. Stalin concluded by stressing the importance of this task because other historians were following the lead of Slutzki and incorporating basic mistakes in their works of history.

The final argument by Slutzki stated a lack of official documents to support a claim of a definite and unswerving view by Lenin and the Bolsheviks with regard to this period. Stalin called this view bureaucratic and stated that even Lenin claimed that the resolve of revolutionaries and their leaders should be judged not by their declarations

and resolutions, but by their deeds and actions. Proof through action was provided by the Bolsheviks who, through their actions, had proven to be the *only* (Stalin's highlight) revolutionary organization that had destroyed and expelled all centrists and opportunists from the Party (Stalin, 1931/1946, p. 15). This subversive assertion, according to Stalin, made Slutzki a distorter of history.

This article clearly served as a warning to anyone who wished to challenge the leading role of Russian Bolshevism in events leading up to the October Revolution. For teachers of history in the Latvian SSR, it was a clear statement that they must quickly learn the correct – Stalinist – interpretation of historic events. Although this article dealt specifically with events surrounding the October Revolution and made no reference to Latvian participation in these events, the language used by Stalin to argue against the author's suggested interpretation of events is a clear and unmistakable indication of the authoritative nature of history teaching in the USSR. His description of the author and others who have even attepmpted to offer an alternate view of these events as liars, traitors, and even degenerates, is an unmistakable warning to those whose opinions and interpretations differed from his own. Stalin positioned himself as the voice of the Bolsheviks whose role in history was undeniable fact and not available for interpretation. In fact, truth no longer resided in the words, but rather in the actions of people. This 'truth' also rang true for teachers of history, as will be discussed later in the section on teachers' lived experience.

Reprints of the article published in Pravda on 27 January 1936 and the June 1935 decision related information about the content of new history textbooks (Balode, 1946). History was divided into five periods: ancient history, Middle Ages, modern history, history of the USSR, and modern history of dependencies and colonized countries. The Council of Peoples Commissars and the Central Committee of the Communist Party organized five groups who were charged with the responsibility of creating the new textbooks. Stalin, Kirov, and Zhdanov (1934/1946) submitted critiques of the entries, which were subjected to detailed examination and severe criticism. The remarks of Stalin, Kirov, and Zhdanov clearly indicated that the sociologically-based Pokrovsky school of historiography was no longer acceptable, and that the Communist Party was the final arbiter of historic truth and accuracy.

Stalin, Zhdanov, and Kirov (1934/1946) wrote scathing reviews indicating incorrect interpretations of historic facts, as well as incorrect understanding of the point of the exercise of textbook writing. These authors were criticized on several points, including style, language, and facts. Language and style issues criticized imprecise

language in descriptions of historic events such as naming the French Revolution as only “great”, as opposed to the more correct “bourgeois”, or the incomplete title given to the October Revolution which should have been designated consistently as Socialist and Soviet as well. Stalin’s obsession with ‘proper’ language use created standard phrases and language forms that permeated language structure and use in general throughout the Soviet Union long after he died. Stalin also wrote a critique on the history of Communist Party in which he stated that the text lacked sufficient Marxist interpretations of events and was incorrect in its classification of periods of events, which he proceeded to correct.

Xenophobia is apparent in Stalin’s note that there was insufficient stress upon the fact that the Russian empire had been punished by other countries for its backwardness and was dependent upon foreigners for economic and political leadership, as well as the role of Bolshevism in freeing the country from foreign oppression. Increased stress upon the role of the worker as the liberator of the peasant was also needed, because the peasantry was not capable of being sufficiently organized to liberate themselves. It was also decided that there was insufficient information about the Civil War (1917-1920), and more emphasis needed to be placed on the nature of describing the development of the USSR in terms of political slogans and the Soviet peoples constant struggle against the enemies of the state. Positive elements in the book were discussion of Soviet, not just Russian state development. Yet, Stalin, Kirov, and Zhdanov (1934/1946) criticized the idealization of pre-Christian paganism, stressing the importance of Russian Orthodox cloisters in contrast to pagan barbarism, the importance of the church in developing literacy, and the importance of monasteries as bases for colonization. The authors were also criticized for not stressing the positive alternative that Ukraine experienced by coming under Russian rule as opposed to Persian or Turkish rule in the 18th century. Also, all authors were criticized for not following Marx’s interpretation of the battle in 1242 on Lake Peipus when Nevsky expelled Germans out of Russian territory forever. Despite Stalin’s protests that Soviet, not Russian history needed to be the focus, Russian pre-eminence was clear.

This booklet clearly indicates the role of the Communist Party as the ultimate arbiter of interpretations of history, as well as the static structure of history teaching, the Marxist/Leninist/Stalinist ideological basis of the curriculum, and the lasting influence of Stalin on Soviet historiography. Although Stalin professed the importance of including discussion of other ethnic groups in history, Russian superiority is clear in his historic interpretations, but the full extent of Stalin’s glorification of the Russian nation

and Russia was yet to come during World War II and after, with the expansion of the Soviet Union and its sphere of influence.

The nature of totalitarian rule is clear in Stalin's statements on the consequences of diversion from his interpretation of history, particularly if those reflected Menshevik or Trotskyite ideas, which virtually guaranteed a death sentence during the 1930s. The seminal nature of these articles is apparent in that the book published in 1946, more than ten years after the initial appearance of these articles in Soviet press, contains only these articles and nothing more recent. The methodological principles followed in Soviet schools were obvious – all subjects were taught following Marxist/Leninist dogma and for the express purpose of instilling Soviet nationalism. This sent a clear message to teachers and historians in the Latvian SSR that no other form would be acceptable, and strict adherence to the chronological teaching of history focusing on facts and personalities was the safest course of action. Latvian historians and history teachers faced an unprecedented dilemma. They had no acceptable teaching materials and thus, were resigned to adopting and using the safest and only materials available – those supporting Stalin's view of history. These were initially available through translation only, as Russian historians were considered reliable, and Latvian historians and teachers were suspect because of their bourgeois past. These translations, along with the works of repatriated Latvian historians and pedagogues, were published in *PLS* and were the sole acceptable source of teaching material.

The first issue of *PLS* was published in August 1940 and included discussion of all the elements of the new education system. *PLS* encompassed everything any teacher in Latvia needed to know about teaching in the 'newly liberated and rejoined to the Soviet Fatherland' Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic. The majority of the articles in the journal were methodological in nature and included conference overviews as well as a literature review. The journal did not digress from this format much, but over the years it added sections that dealt specifically with school life, teaching practices, book reviews, and official notices. Each of these sections contained articles focusing not only on the practicalities of education, but also the formality of pedagogical practice and theory as dictated by Soviet Stalinist principles.

Strazdiņš (1945a) defined the main tasks for educationalists in the "liberated" Soviet Latvia, published while the war was still being fought on Latvian soil. They included renewal of school buildings destroyed during the war, giving new substance to the curriculum, books, and the educational system itself, up-bringing in the Soviet spirit, developing national culture, and finally, the political education and up-bringing

of the masses (p. 12). The Soviet regime also wasted no time in its criticism of independent Latvia's education system and textbooks.

Schoolbooks were an essential component for communist education and Soviet patriotism as determined by Stalin in the changes in history teaching during the 1930s. Latvian books were highly criticized, and several authors pointed out the negative features of 'bourgeois' Latvian textbooks. Niedra (1941), in his lecture to teachers in Rīga in April 1941, noted that the main deficiency of the bourgeois history of literature was that it was insufficient in its reflection of the basis of the author's social position, historic development of economic conditions, and the connection between the soul and material goods. Nāburgs (1941) was highly critical of pre-war children's readers because they lacked sufficient translations of "European" literature. He claimed this indefensible chauvinism did not serve the Latvian nation, but succeeded in quite the opposite in that it forced disassociation from the rest of Europe and encouraged regression in the children. Part of communist education should include negative examples of behaviour, of which there were many in Latvian literature and life. Hundreds of these negative portraits could be found in Latvia during the German occupation of Latvia, and teachers were encouraged to instill disgust in the youth towards these "traitors" (Dušina, 1946). Strazdiņš (1945b) stated that the nationalist, capitalist culture of the previous regime did not allow the masses to develop their own culture, and this type of development could only occur through internationalism. This sentiment also extended to former history books, and a correct Marxist interpretation of Latvian history would instill in the students Soviet patriotism, and proper explanations by teachers would help wipe out completely the harmful and anti-scientific views taught during the bourgeois regime (Dubins, 1948).

In an article on Soviet school textbooks ("Padomju Savienības skolas", 1940), the author noted:

> USSR schoolbooks differ from bourgeois schoolbooks in their methodological construct. The lesson of Soviet schools and books is to give students the most important information about the basis of knowledge, and, simultaneously, teach the student, the future active builder of socialism, how to employ the knowledge gained in school in the practicalities of everyday life. This principle is used to create textbooks… And with this we will instill love for our native land (p. 56).

The previously cited regulations about Soviet schoolbooks adopted on 9 August 1940 stated that books would be published in the mother tongue of all the Soviet peoples, no matter how few speakers there may have been, but this was clearly not a

priority. Several entries stressed the importance and necessity of learning Russian not just to be able to access great works of literature, but also because history textbooks would not be translated into other languages for the non-Russian speaking population. In his critique of *Monumental World History*, Pētersons (1941) noted that this work, being prepared by the Academy of Sciences (in Moscow), encompassed 28 volumes. He further declared that in order for Latvians to also be able to access this research, they must unceasingly learn Russian because translating and publishing the whole work in Latvian would not be possible in the near future.

The article on history curriculum explained that Latvian schools would not have to search for new textbooks, but would be able to adopt ready-made educational textbooks and methodology which the great fatherland, the USSR, had spent 20 years developing ("Mācību metodes", 1940). The author continued by citing the USSR Central Committee's 16 May 1934 decision to change the history curriculum, because Stalin had decided that the current methods of teaching history using abstract sociological themes were unsatisfactory, and that a chronological format, stressing the most important events, historic personalities, and dates should be employed. This contradiction passed unnoticed by the editor and censors, possibly intentionally because of the recent purges, which had instilled great fear among the upper echelon. It is, however, unlikely that the readers of *PLS* knew the politics surrounding the development of Soviet history textbooks during the 1930s, and even if they did, they were not likely to highlight the discrepancy. The author continued by stating that the books used in independent "bourgeois" Latvia not only did not reflect a true vision of historic events, but also were remiss in teaching proper patriotism, because they failed to teach students practical lessons for everyday life. Soviet books would do so.

In a translated article by Jakovļevs (1948), he stated that schoolbooks are not just a compilation of systemized facts. They also defined methodology and were a definitive ideological and theoretical tool for a large army of teachers and the most important tool for the education of Soviet youth. Nevertheless, discussion of Latvian history was virtually absent in the history books translated from Russian for use in schools, and *PLS* served as a forum for Latvian history lessons as they should be taught.

Education of Soviet youth required proper history education, and an article discussing history teaching ("Piezīmes", 1940) gave a clear overview of the eschatologically-driven methodology of the new order. This article stressed the need to "…raise the new nation's citizens not only for the transition period – socialist society – but rather for the final developmental stage – communism" (p. 37). The article restated

the decision on 16 May 1934 requiring history be taught in chronological order, reinforcing through memorization the most important events, historic figures, and dates. Rational civic history should not be presented in abstract sociological terms that mirror abstract definitions of economic systems. The author noted that changing the history curriculum would be a relatively simple task, because Latvians no longer had to continuously search for historic truths as a complete curriculum and methodological approach to the teaching of history could be taken from the 20-year development experience of the "great fatherland". Much of this truth included reinterpretations of Latvian history, particularly relations with Russia.

In 1944, the Russian SSR history program was translated for use in Latvia (Aņisimova, 1983, p. 39). All history teaching in the Latvian SSR from 1944 to 1949 was based on the USSR law passed on 16 May 1934 *On the teaching of civic history in USSR schools* (Aņisimova, p. 39). The journal *PLS* was the main source of information for history teachers between 1946 and 1949. Articles continued to offer information on methodological approaches, including the chronological teaching of history, how teachers should present information and use existing materials, ways to ensure pupil retention and recitation of information, incorporation of Latvian SSR history within the context of USSR history, teaching the history of the fatherland, and other educational issues pertaining to the teaching of history.

This gave teachers of history a clear picture of the elements of history teaching that would no longer be considered acceptable, as well as those elements that would receive particular focus. The 'didactic' text published in 1934, later reproduced for other nationalities, formalized the nature of teaching to the point of petrifaction as will be demonstrated later. History teaching revolved around Marxist/Leninist/Stalinist worldviews, nationality issues, and language, which influenced both curriculum content and methodology. The formalization of history teaching in the USSR in general consisted of teaching events in order, but for Latvia, focus was more specific – to prove and have Latvians acknowledge Russian superiority. History as a topic of education and propaganda tool figured prominently in the discourse of *PLS* and focused on three generally dominant themes. The first was not only a change in description of historic events, but also a change in content focusing on the sociocentric proletarian world view; the second was the USSR's criticism of Latvia's years of independence and previous historic periods; and finally, the explicit bias toward Russian culture and language.

Within the discussion of history, communistic up-bringing was the primary goal, as indicated by the many articles devoted to the subject. Communistic up-bringing

encompassed several aspects including the formation of a truly scientific world view strengthening friendship between the Soviet nations, Soviet patriotism, and international proletarian friendship (Plaude, 1970, p. 5).

The importance of couching everything in terms of class struggle was particularly visible in the history curriculum as described in the *PLS* article that outlined the history curriculum ("Piezīmes", 1940). This article described the teaching of history as a means to bring the new nation's students to a Marxist interpretation of history. Modern history was divided into three distinct categories - the first spanned the period from the French revolution in 1789 to the Prussian War of 1870. The second began with the Paris Commune of 1871 and ended with the October 1917 revolution. The last, from the October revolution on, was described by the author as "…a new era in human history…the USSR revolution broke all chains and freed all nations from all forms of exploitation…" (p. 39). However, this class struggle in the Latvian context was consistently tied to relations with outside forces – German (negatively) and Russian (positively) – as visible in the curriculum adopted for history teaching.

The projected Latvian history curriculum for Grade 7 encompassed all periods of Latvian history and was divided into ten units ("Projekts – Latvijas PSR", 1945). Many of the units were titled in terms of class struggle, reactions to feudalism, and the growth of capitalism, but more prevalent was the focus on Russia and Russians. Each unit, including the first about ancient Latvian history listed subsections that focused specifically on initial positive relations with Slavic tribes in general, and then with Russians more specifically in later historic periods. The relationship with Germanic Teutonic knights is couched in virulent terms as illustrated by the title of a subsection on the Middle Ages, *German Teutonic rule – worse than Tatar rule*. Russian conquests of the area were described in terms of reestablishing supposed pre-existing rights to the territory and stressed the positive significance for Latvia when it joined the Russian empire. In the final sections on modern history, the declaration of an independent Latvia on 18 November 1918 is not mentioned – only the USSR's recognition of the short-lived Soviet Latvia in 1919. While this omission is only one of many, it should be noted that by neglecting to mention the date of the declaration of 'bourgeois' Latvia's independence, the significance of this historic event is blatantly negated. In addition, no textbooks existed to be able to teach the Soviet version of Latvian history, and teachers were forced to create their own materials and also offer alternative versions of what they once considered facts. The detrimental effects of the negative connection with Germany were used frequently, and articles about specific historic events often omitted

or distorted facts and frequently used inflammatory language, particularly when discussing the role of Germany in Latvian history.

Dubins (1948) examined the peasant revolts of 1804 and described the bourgeois interpretation as a nationalistic moment in Latvian history. Dubins did not deny the validity of this expression of nationalism, because it was clear that Latvian peasants were revolting against German landowners, but added that this should be viewed as part of a greater social struggle of peasants revolting against landowners, which was taking place in other parts of the Russian empire. Interestingly, he chose an example of uprisings in an Estonian hamlet, not a Russian location, to make this point. He continued to stress the Latvian nation's voluntary struggle together with the Russian army against the German landowners, and how the tsar was negatively inclined toward the Baltic German landed gentry. He also compared the landed gentry with capitalists. Dubins concluded by stating that unlike the bourgeois definition of nation building on the basis of 'similar blood' and a 'national awareness', the Marxist view defined nation building as the incorporation of a stable territory, and joint development of economy and language the basis of cultural ties as the defining factors. The implication of the Soviet claim to Latvian territory is clear through its historic connection with the Russian empire.

Miške (1946) wrote an article that described the preparations for the 1917 October Revolution in Latvia adding that this article could not be published in the bourgeois Latvia of the day. He wrote this article to show Latvian youth how deep Bolshevism's roots were in Latvia, as well as the similarities between the German 'black' barons and the Latvian bourgeoisie, or 'grey barons', in their oppression of the landless peasants and workers (p. 15). He continued by stating that Latvia's historic course was clear - it was an incontrovertible fact that true freedom for Latvians had come from the East. The workers and peasants and Latvia's progressive intellectuals, over many decades of bloody struggle, had gone hand-in-hand with the revolutionary Russian proletariat and the great Soviet nation to fight under the leadership of the great Lenin and Stalin (Miške, p. 25).

In his article on the founding of the Latvian SSR in January 1919, Kauliņš (1949) ignored the declaration of independence in November 1918 and other facts relating to the founding of the Latvian state in 1918. In this article he used highly inflammatory language to describe the battles for Latvian freedom: "German thieves, imperialist-funded armed soldiers together with Latvian counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, and rural barons began once again to murder and lock the Latvian nation in

chains" (p. 45). Draudiņš (1949) made several errors of omission by neglecting to mention the difference between Red and White Riflemen, the date of the declaration of Latvia's independence, as well as the peace treaty signed by the Soviet Union in which it forever renounced any claim on Latvian territory. He also blamed the Germans, of course not Russians, for removing most of the industrial infrastructure out of Latvia during World War I and claimed the Entente ordered the Germans to drown the socialist revolution in blood. The incorporation of Latvia into the USSR in 1940 was viewed as a return to the Soviet state that had lasted only five months in 1919, and the activity of Red Riflemen during the Russian civil war was proof of solidarity between Russian and Latvian proletariat.

K. Strazdiņš was appointed the Latvian SSR People's Commissar for Education in 1945, and he wrote several articles on the duties of Soviet citizens reflecting Soviet self-aggrandizement as the winners of the war and the relationship of the previous government of Latvia and Latvians with Germany. Soviet criticism of independent Latvia and the Ulmanis' regime, in particular, was not restricted to educational matters. In his discussion of the duties of a Soviet teacher, Strazdiņš (1945d) identified the true purpose of the Germans – to wipe out the Latvian nation and its culture. Latvia had been prepared to play a significant role in the development of the Ostland provinces. Strazdiņš named bourgeois Latvia and Ulmanis' dictatorship in particular as the …"twin brother of Hitlerite racism, Hitlerite extermination ideology…" (p. 23). Latvians were generally portrayed as bourgeois reactionary nationalists who actively tried to separate Latvians from their easterly neighbours and deny the influence Russia had over Latvia's cultural and economic achievements (Šacs-Aniņš, 1952). One of many articles discussed the poor level of education in independent Latvia and glorified the Soviet Union's education policy. He noted that three-quarters of the Russian population had not been literate under czarist rule, but that literacy rates had improved dramatically under Soviet rule ("Mācību metodes", 1940), implying that Latvia's literacy rate could only improve, now that it was a part of the Soviet Union. When the Red Army occupied Latvia, the illiteracy rate was 11%, making it one of the most literate nations in Europe, and illiteracy was highest in Latgale (Ķestere, 2009, p. 187).

The final period, and perhaps the most important period for evaluation of influences on current Latvian identity, is the founding of Soviet Latvia. The Soviet textbook showed images of Latvians greeting Soviet soldiers as liberators showering them with hugs and flowers. This is key as it quite problematic for Latvian identity. There is an expression – My enemy's enemy is my friend. Unfortunately for most

Latvians, the enemy of the occupying Soviet force was an equally horrific force, and thus, any sympathy towards the Germans as potential liberators was turned by the Soviets into support for the Nazi regime and ideals. Partisans fighting against the Soviet regime were called "bandits", and opponents were generally classified as fascists. It was clear that Latvians needed to be reeducated to be able to fit in to the Marxist/Leninist/Stalinist educational paradigm. The post World War II period also needed to fit Soviet historiography. With regard to this time period, the Soviet text omited any evidence of mass deportations of the Latvian population, claimed mass support for all political and economic policies, declared all non-Soviet support as evidence of support for fascism, called those who fled to the West 'deserters', and, once again, placed Russians as saviours of the Latvian nation.

Not only was Russia's role in Latvian history written to stress the positive influences, the Soviet Union's glory was founded on the glory of Russian history. The historic war theme against Germany extended to World War II as Russians were portrayed in the role of liberators and communists as the defenders of justice. This role permeated all aspects of society, including the arts. Literary works and paintings were commissioned in which the leading victorious role of the USSR was highlighted and raised to a level of glorification. This also transcended into articles about history for the benefit of Latvian history teachers.

The 'Great Patriotic War' is a defining moment in Soviet history and was couched in terms of patriotic defense of freedom and those who were either for or against this freedom. In an article translated from Russian, Baltijskis (1945) noted that Communists were patriots because they fought against Hitlerites, and Communists were not prepared to become involved in all wars, but only just, liberating wars (p. 62). Thus, the Latvians who fled overseas or to other zones after World War II were branded as traitors, not exiles or refugees (Upītis, 1947). Baltijskis (1945) implicitly defended the USSR's actions in Latvia stating that history had not experienced a single patriotic movement whose goal was to attack a foreign nation's freedom and equality (p. 63) reinforcing, yet again, the presumption that Latvia was not an independent nation and a separate people. He added that the international proletarian movement could not be considered a cosmopolitan movement because cosmopolitanism was a foreign ideology to workers who were united against fascism and supported peace, freedom, and guaranteed a nation's freedom (Baltijskis, pp. 64-65). Stalin had described cosmopolitanism as rootlessness associated with the bourgeois and intellectuals, but the workers' revolution had found its home in first in Russia, and then in the USSR. By

definition, the USSR's actions could also not be imperialistic. Thus, explicit descriptions of the glory and righteousness of the Soviet struggle against Hitler, and accusations and declarations of Latvian refugees and those who fought against the Soviet Union as traitors placed the entire Latvian nation in an unenviable defensive position in the new order.

Miķelsons (1945) discussed the significance of Soviet schools during the 'Great Patriotic War'. History lessons, as well as geography, language, literature, and all other lessons, were devoted to studying the past and present of the Fatherland. "The students were familiarized with the ancient battles fought for the homeland, learned the language and literature of this people, thereby instilling and developing a love for the nation, its values, language, and traditions… all in honour of the courageous battles being fought by the homeland's army" (p. 24). But, here too, the Latvian nation as a whole could not participate in such glorification, as the homeland mentioned refered to the USSR, and many Latvians fought against the Soviet Union. Teaching history was no longer restricted to history lessons, but permeated every aspect of the school curriculum. Many of the methodological articles would also incorporate discussion of proper interpretation of historic events and ways that history could be used to teach other values.

Love for the homeland was a requisite part of Soviet education and would be strengthened by applying methods used in Soviet schools ("Mācību metodes", 1940). In this article, translated from the Russian, the author related the teaching methods used by a history teacher, M.V. Kropocheva, whereby she described the death of the French revolutionary, Marat, at the hands of the Girondist, Charlotte Corday. The article described how the teacher noticed that:

> … hatred towards [Marat's] murderer and love for the leader of the people glowed in the children's eyes. The message about the Girondists and their intent – for the children it relates to the present. And with this message the children's hatred extends to all the enemies of the Soviet peoples (p. 44).

Political events following World War II, particularly the onset of the Cold War, added a new dimension to the discussion of history teaching in *PLS*. History was not just a discussion of the political will of the USSR, but also proof positive of the cultural superiority of Soviet culture in a global context. The history lesson must raise conscientious Soviet citizens, particularly:

> …today, when new global overlords – English and American imperialists – have adopted German fascistic thinking and now preach Anglo-American dominance in the world, the correct analysis of cultural questions is the key to the battle

> against this 'racist' misconception… today our great socialist country is at the forefront of the world. It was this way, as well, in ancient history when Central European and Northern European peoples still lived in primitive groups, while the southern regions of the USSR already had highly developed cultural states" (Graudonis, 1951, p. 83).

Graudonis continued by stating that cultural questions should be described in highly visual, and factual language, so that everything that was said was convincing. The outcome of this lesson should be the complete understanding of many of the facts on class struggle and the "role of the Russian people in the development of culture of the peoples of the USSR" (pp. 83-84).

The intertwining of politics and culture was discussed at many teacher conferences. *PLS* published several synopses on educational conferences held both in Riga and in Moscow. The conferences held in Moscow stressed the value of history as a tool for instilling Soviet patriotism by teaching about the glorious Russian past. Conflation of Soviet and Russian identity is a consistent element as authors refer to the 1934 Soviet directive on the teaching of history. Latvian conferences, on the other hand, stress the positive influence of association with Russia and Russians in comparison to the negativity associated with the Germans.

In the overview of the first scientific session of the State University of Latvia, Kadeks (1945) reviewed a lecture on the Russian influence on Latvian art given by Pelše who stressed the fact that Latvians were educated outside Latvia, primarily in Russia, and that this influence needed to be researched more thoroughly in order to end false rumours circulated by Germans about pre-eminent German cultural influence. In another article by Kadeks (1946) about the Latvian Academy of Sciences, he stressed the positive influence of Russia on Latvian culture. Kadeks noted that under German domination, educated Latvians became Germanized and were lost to the Latvian nation. With the abolition of serfdom, the Russian doors to higher education were opened to the active members of the National Awakening. He continued by claiming that the leaders of this movement exhibited no ill will towards Russians and that some, in fact, stressed the linguistic ties between the Latvian and Lithuanian languages and Russian. Upītis (1947) also claimed that the Latvian nation had never felt dislike towards the Russian language during tsarist times, but rather that everyone understood that Russian was necessary not only in everyday usage, but also for access to scientific materials and literature in general. Upītis stressed that cultural and trade relations had existed between

these two nations for centuries, and the 'barbaric' methods used by the tsars to russify Latvians had not created animosity between Latvians and Russians.

The politically expedient views of the most prominent Young Latvians were adopted to fit the Soviet argument and served two purposes – the first was to show Russian superiority, and the other to tie Latvians and their entire cultural and political experience to Russia and Russians. Miške (1946) took this one step further in his description of the preparations for the October revolution. He claimed true freedom for Latvians came from the east, and that through many decades of bloody battles, the Latvian worker and farmer, along with the progressive intelligentsia had gone hand in hand with the revolutionary Russian proletariat and Soviet nation. This view continued on throughout the Soviet era as indicated in the entry entitled *Soviet Nation* in Volume 3 of the Latvian SSR Little Encyclopedia refers the reader to the article *Friendship Among Nations* in which the general primacy of the Russian nation is not blatantly stated, but without the benefits of friendship of other nations, Latvia …"would not have been able to protect its independence and sovereignty against Western imperialist desires…" (Zeile, 1970, p. 508) The conflation of nationalism with sociocentrism is apparent not only in individual articles on specific events in Latvian history but also in the overview of the history curriculum.

The most popular topics in the curriculum, by far, are Russians, the Russian language, and Russian culture. Stalin was responsible for the new policy, 'national in form – socialist in content', which focused on Russian language, culture, and patriotism (Kreindler, 1993, p. 260), and this phrase is repeated regularly in articles about the Soviet education system. First and foremost was the importance of the Russian nation, particularly the Russian proletariat, in the building of the Soviet Union and the role of Russia and the Russian proletariat in the development of Latvia and Latvian culture. Even the Soviet Latvian anthem glorified ties with Russia – "…only in comradeship with the glorious Russian nation, we became a force that defeated our enemy…" ("Padomju Latvijas himna", 1945).

The importance of learning the Russian language was also stressed, and the reader was constantly reminded that it was the only language in which Russian culture, history, and the principles of Marxism/Leninism could be fully appreciated. According to several authors, this in turn would improve Latvian culture. The new Soviet Latvia had few Russian-speaking teachers. To assist in administering this new curriculum, the Ministry of Education issued a directive ("Noteikumi pamatskolu", 1940) on 9 August 1940, which allowed any person who had received any type of teacher training during

the era of the Russian empire to teach Russian without proving their ability to do so. Because previous literature was largely no longer acceptable or available, the government encouraged the population to learn Russian. Skultans (1998) notes that the older generation growing up during the first period of independence had a link to national identity through the content of Latvian literature and history teaching. These meanings were lost along with the literature. Some of the literature of the previous era reappeared during the Stalin era, but it no longer carried the same weight as previously, because of editorial prefaces that gave instructions on acceptable views on how the books should be read, thus, curtailing the influence of those books.

Strazdiņš (1945a) stressed five main tasks for educators, the most important being learning Russian. Only by learning from other cultures would Latvians be able to improve their own culture and learn about socialist culture. This culture was available to Latvians in Russian, and he added, "…nowadays it is hard to view one as cultural if one does not speak Russian… (p. 12)." Language was also used to show the similarities between Russian and Latvian culture. Funks (1948) described one aspect of language usage as an indication of cultural similarity in his article entitled *On Beauty*. Funks stated that the Russian people had formulated a truly objective view on what was beautiful, and Latvians had reached a similar conclusion – things of beauty are compared to the sun or are 'sunny'. Proof of this was in the expression used by both Russians and Latvians – "Stalin – our sun". This type of article stressing the similarities between Latvian and Russian culture was not unique, and *PLS* published many articles describing the cultural and historic ties between Latvians and Russians emphasizing the mentoring role played by Russia. Despite these frequent lessons on the proper interpretation of history, student success was lacking. This was also a frequent topic of discussion in *PLS*.

Strazdiņš published several articles reprimanding teachers on their poor performance. He observed that the biggest problem was "formalism" whereby students were taught basic facts, but not a deeper understanding of the meaning. Teachers were at fault as they were not yet fully convinced of the undeniable socialist victory and did not have the required burning desire to become defenders of the socialist system (Strazdiņš, 1945c). This also indicated that teachers had not embraced socialist thought, the communist education system, and Soviet patriotism. Teachers needed to be motivated, because the lesson was the heart of the education system, and every lesson was required to develop in every student a Marxist way of thinking and Marxist world view (Strazdiņš, 1948b).

It was also the fault of the teacher that so many students were retained. He blamed teachers, over 2000 of them, who were poorly trained for their jobs. Yurchak (2006) describes this discussion of the failings of the system as 'rhetorical circularity' in that the same system that created the lack of success should be used to guarantee success – the Soviet citizen should develop new approaches and methods of work by using old approaches and methods and should continue doing the things that had proved futile in the past (pp. 71-72). In an effort to improve this situation, the Ministry of Education issued a general directive on 23 December 1948, which focused specifically on the inadequacies of the teaching of history ("Latvijas PSR izglītības", 1949). All members of the education system including the editorial boards of *PLS* and *Skolotāju avīze* [Teachers' Newspaper] were given specific instructions and timelines how to improve the teaching of history. *PLS* was instructed to include more articles on Latvian history. Despite this directive, *PLS* published only one article about Latvian history in the next issue and none again until May 1950. The Minister of Education Strazdiņš made it clear that the educational program was failing due to inferior teachers and the poor education they received under the previous regime.

Student performance was discussed often, and teachers were usually to blame. The Daugavpils teacher conference reported a 40% failure rate in history, and pupils would often misbehave in class, for which teachers were again at fault (LVA, 700, 5, 45, pp. 39 – 40). Teachers in Cēsis blamed the lack of history textbooks (LVA, p. 26), and teachers from Madona complained that knowledge of history and Russian language skills were lacking, just to name a few (p. 106). Lack of Russian language skills and lack of knowledge of the Marxist worldview, Marxist dialectic methodology, and insufficient development of extra-curricular activities, particularly Young Communist and Pioneer organization activities, were frequently criticized. Liepāja conference minutes went as far as publishing the names of individual teachers in schools with high failure rates (pp. 84-85). In Viļaka, one resolution suggested that teachers refrain from teaching any lessons that did not have an ideological goal as an outcome for the lesson (p. 146). The resolutions adopted at the Rēzekne conference placed the blame squarely on the previous regime stating that remnants of bourgeois nationalist theory and foreign cultural influences still existed (pp. 104-105). This was evident because teachers had not reached the political understanding needed to teach Marxism/Leninism, and were not well enough acquainted with the biographies of Lenin and Stalin. This failure was only one of many by the previous regime, according to the Soviet government.

Instructions on student organizations located in the Latvian State Archives also indicated the close nature of teacher and director involvement (LVA, 700, 5, 31, pp. 10-13). These instructions stressed the need for directors and homeroom teachers to direct the creation of truly organic student councils, which were not to be confused with external Communist Youth or Pioneer organizations, but needed to work closely together with them, nevertheless. Teachers were required to actively participate in extra-curricular activities, but their work load was also quite heavy and closely monitored as witenssed in regulations on the marking of final exams (LVA, 700, 5, 31, p. 17).

Points 8, 9, and 10 of this directive described the assessment process. Point 8 required that immediately after the exam, the teacher and an assistant must correct each pupil's work, write a review about the results, and submit the corrected test and comments to the school director for review and acceptance. Point 9 required the director of the school then send the work on to the regional Education Ministry office for further analysis. Finally, in Point 10, the work was again thoroughly reviewed, and the results were to be discussed at teacher conferences to give direction for even greater improvement. Student work deemed exceptional would be forwarded to the Riga Education Workers Professional Development Institution as exemplars.

While there were no spring final exams on history in the 1948/1949 school year, the themes for the final composition in literature are indicative of the interrelated role history and ideology played in all subjects in education and their importance in creating identity. In Grades 10, 11, and 12, the literature topics included *Pavil Korchagin – Soviet patriot and fighter for Bolshevism*, *Soviet land – land of heroes*, *The struggle for land by peasant workers in A. Upītis novel Zaļā Zeme*, *Indulis' struggle against the Germans in Rainis' tragedy Indulis un Ārija*, *The character Pavil Vlasov in Gorky's novel Mother*, and others. The topics were written out on sheets of paper indicating the date and time of the final exam and kept secret until time for the final exam. Apparently, this was not always such a secret, and cheating was rampant. Attempts to reduce cheating were initiated with the introduction of television, and in the 1970s, pupils would sit final exams in the school auditorium where the topics would be disclosed to all students simultaneously throughout the country in a television transmission (personal communication with Elita Stikute, 30 October 2008).

The pressure on the teacher as a person of trust and responsibility was high, and the role of the history teacher as a builder of the Soviet ideals made him or her even more responsible for building the Soviet state. A series of teacher conference minutes

from 1947, located in the Latvian State Archives (LVA, 700, 5, 45), indicates the main issues addressed in these conferences as well as the role of the teacher in building the new socialist order. Most teacher conferences took place at the end of August, shortly before the beginning of the school year on 1 September. All recount discussions on the significance of history lessons as the foundation for Soviet patriotism and instilling a sense of duty to the state. At the Alūksne teacher conference, the second secretary of the Communist Party of Alūksne Tomins described the teacher as

> …a person of trust to whom the state and the Party have entrusted their most treasured – the youth. The teacher must raise the future Soviet citizen, who will be masculine and fight against all that is hostile to the Soviet system. In addition, the teacher is a social activist in Soviet Latvia, where not everyone has been re-educated in the Soviet spirit – this is a field for improvement… (LVA, 700, 5, 45, p. 4)

At that same conference, Reisners, a teacher from Gaujiena Secondary School, read a lecture indicating the three main factors needed to be incorporated in history lessons to serve as tools to raise Soviet patriotism in students. The first was descriptions of the compelling struggle to build communism, followed by teaching love of the homeland and honouring and protecting its values, and, finally, internationalism and the friendship and cooperation between peoples. He also suggested that lessons on the battles at Stalingrad and the reign of Peter the Great would be good material for this kind of up-bringing. In Jelgava, the teaching of history was divided into discussion not only of historic periods, but included separate lessons on the Soviet constitution and ideological goals (LVA, 700, 5, 45, p. 14). In Daugavpils, teachers were charged with becoming more active in social life outside of school by paying more attention to the education of parents in the role of communistic up-bringing (LVA, pp. 54-55). A similar sentiment was expressed in Liepāja where both teachers and directors of schools were encouraged to participate in extra-curricular life such the Communist Youth, Pioneers, and other student activities (pp. 89-91).

In addition to deficiencies in knowledge of Marxist/Leninist ideology, a lack of Russian language skills was often noted in pedagogical literature and reviews. Lack of knowledge of Russian as an indictor of cultural deficiency is a recurring theme in *PLS*. Egle (1945), in her article about teaching Russian in Latvian schools, stressed this point. Under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, the USSR had developed a culture that was socialistic in content and nationalistic in form. Egle stated that the ruling elite taught Russian for the purpose of exploitation of the masses during the czarist era, but the

Russian language played a different role in the USSR. It had become a language of liberation in that by teaching Russian, the smaller nations now had the opportunity to become acquainted with the significant works created in Russian, thereby, raising the overall worth of their national culture. It was also clear to Egle that, although not everyone spoke Russian, non-speakers wished to learn the language because they want to be closer to the Russian nation and utilize its cultural and primary sources in Russian. Nevertheless, the mother tongue received some attention as an important aspect in education.

Fluent knowledge of both Russian and the mother tongue was an important base for education (Miķelsons, 1945, p. 23). Vilks (1945), in his article on pedagogical education, stressed the importance of language and literature instruction in both Latvian and Russian. The dire teacher situation immediately following the war is reflected in his comments that the teacher shortage in these subjects was most severe, and the educational value of these languages and their literature was "more significant than learning a foreign language". This is an important indicator in that, even though the war had not yet been won, Russian was no longer considered a foreign language.

Several articles on correct Russian language usage also indicated this. Several directives issued by the language commission described proper language use including an official notice on the proper writing of people's names in the Russian tradition, which included patronymics, in both Latvian and Russian, using Cyrillic for Russian translations ("Vārdu, tēvvārdu un uzvārdu", 1945), and a directive indicating the proper writing of Latvian place names in both Latvian and Russian ("Latvijas vietvārdu pareizrakstība", 1945). The Russian list was again published using Cyrillic lettering, indicating the importance of acquisition of Russian language skills and the assumption that this would occur immediately. Learning Russian also became increasingly important, if readers of *PLS* wanted to read all the articles.

An article written in Cyrillic Russian appeared in 1953 and by 1954, a total of nine entries were published in Russian. Mastering uniform Russian language by non-Russians was given great prominence throughout the Soviet Union, and special ethno-linguistic methods were developed to socialize students to Russian esthetics, values, and even humour (Kreindler, 1993, p. 263). Although a great number of articles stressed the importance of learning Russian as a means of access to world, e.g. Russian literature, it was apparent that learning Russian did not occur as smoothly or as thoroughly as hoped, and the textbooks that were considered superior in their discussion of the nature of history appeared to encourage lack of success in Soviet Latvia.

The school inspector for the Jēkabpils region Ūsiņš (1948) lamented the deficiencies of Russian language education. Ūsiņš began by repeating the standard refrain that, because Russian was the language of the October revolution, Lenin, and Stalin, it opened a path to the entire Soviet people by, first and foremost, facilitating the acquisition of the culture of Russia. He noted that although Russian language instruction had improved over the past two years, there were several areas in which improvement was still required. The three areas he highlighted were proper Russian pronunciation, improving Russian language teacher qualifications in the Russian language department, and the inability of students to formulate simple sentences in Russian. He suggested the creation of special language exercises, which were appropriate for the current, maybe even unique situation in Latvia. Ūsiņš did not, however, clarify this unique situation.

Strazdiņš (1948b) stated that although teaching the curriculum in Russian might be difficult, teachers were not making an effort to improve their Russian language skills. He stated that Soviet literature was important, and even though there was little of it in the libraries, teachers did not read enough. Therefore, teachers did not know the value of this literature or how to apply it according to communist pedagogical methods. Without Soviet literature, there could be no Soviet education, and a radical change was needed. While a lack of books complicated the matter, Strazdiņš noted that it was apparent that teachers were not involved in professional development. Many also did not understand the importance of the program. Others had poor knowledge of Russian and did not know how to teach Russian. Straževs (1947) wrote that history could not be taught by one who did not have the deepest world view of communism, but the teachers had not internalized this world view as was apparent in their lessons, which consisted of isolated examples of the Russian people's battle for freedom against several invaders during the last century. Strazdiņš (1948a) stated that it was each individual school's responsibility to take steps to correct such problems and fulfill the educational plan. He did not elaborate as to how this should be done.

PLS was the Latvian teacher's first immediate introduction to Soviet historiography, but, eventually, several books on proper Soviet education and history teaching didactics were published in Latvian during the Soviet era. It is interesting to note that much of the original philosophical work on pedagogy is translated from Russian, while original works in Latvian focus more on Latvia's role within the Soviet Union. With regard to history teaching, the titles indicate quite clearly the importance of

the history lesson in the proper up-bringing of the Soviet citizen, and this importance did not change after Stalin's death.

The system of teaching history developed during the 1930s in the USSR continued without significant change throughout the 1950s in all Soviet republics and used translated books from the Russian SSR (Aņisimova, 1983). Aņisimova noted that some changes took place in the content of the history curriculum as a result of the Communist Party 19th Congress in 1952 and the 20th Congress in 1956 focusing on improvements in the communistic up-bringing of the new generation. Conspicuously absent in this description of the change was an overt attack on the Stalin cult by Khrushchev, but a departure from overt hero-worship was apparent in textbooks published after this event. New textbooks were introduced to reflect changes in the curriculum. These changes were introduced to improve the level of theoretical foundations of the teaching materials and rid the program of material that was not scientifically grounded – clear references to the Stalin cult. The previous program was also considered too dense, and the volume and centralized nature of the program was reduced.

The Latvian SSR Institute of Sciences published the first volume of Latvian SSR history in 1953, which covered the period of Latvian history until 1860, and was followed by a second volume covering the period between 1861 and March 1917, but both these textbooks were incredibly dense, and clearly not meant for younger learners of Latvian history. Another book was published in 1956 (Strazdiņš, 1956), which was meant for secondary schools students, but was still quite verbose and heavily biased against Germans and Latvians, as reflected in the chapter and sub-chapter headings, and within the text itself. A condensed version of Latvian history for secondary schools was published shortly after in 1958 (Plaude, Kripēns, Lielā, 1958). Although not as wordy, the table of contents indicates a continued bias against Germans and bias towards the positive influence of Russia and Russians. Another point worth noting is that Latvian history was consistently written by Latvians during this time, but they never deviated from the party line.

Ties with Russia began with negative descriptions of Latvian relations with the Teutonic Knights. Soviet texts stressed that Latvian victories occurred only with Russian assistance and rarely mentioned the participation of others. Russian leaders were mentioned by name; Latvian and Liv leaders were not. Ties to Russians were always described as 'progressive' and 'positive', and the tithes paid to various Slavic princes claimed to have benefited the cultural, linguistic, and political development of

Latvia. The Soviet text also regularly conflated Eastern Slavs with Russians. The first Latvian republic was depicted as being in a perpetual state of economic crises with focus on the oppression of those opposed to Ulmanis' regime. Ulmanis was described as a supporter of the capitalist bourgeoisie with no mention that he, too, was once considered a revolutionary in czarist Russia. Picturesque Latvian vistas were also absent from this text. Images of independent Latvia were often negative by default when compared to accomplishments of Soviet Latvia. Discussion of the lives of Latvians in exile in the West and east was non-existent.

As in Ulmanis' era textbooks, focus was placed upon great leaders, but predominantly Russian ones, to the complete exclusion of Latvian and other leaders as Table 1 indicates. Latvian history was described in global terms only as it related to occupying forces, and Latvian SSR history focused exclusively on relations with Russians and the Soviet Union.

Table 1

Pictorial Representations of State Officials in Latvian History Textbooks

	Zālītis, 1937	**Strazdiņš, 1956**
Ancient Latvian	5	0
Crusaders	3	0
Russian	4	0
Polish	5	0
Swedish	6	0
Dukes of Courland	6	0
Baltic Germans	6	0
Latvian (pre-1940)	31	0
Soviet Latvian	0	0
Soviet Union	0	7
Other foreign	6	0

A Latvian SSR history chrestomathy for secondary schools (Cimermanis, Kripēns, Plaude, Ziemelis, 1960) offered selections from primary sources and literature, as well as excerpts from works of historians, as a compliment to existing history textbooks. Many of the primary sources describing the Middle Ages and German baron relationships with Latvian peasantry are cited from translations published in inter-war

Latvia, but secondary sources from that period do not appear. Other periods of history, particularly revolutionary periods, are often described by Soviet historians or by primary sources that mainly consisted of Bolshevik publications and newspapers. Another such chrestomathy was published much later (Aņisimova, Strods, Kanāle, 1977), and the forward by the editors indicated that the included documents support and give depth to the study of Latvian history. This book also assigns questions after each section. All the questions required repetition of opinions and facts supporting the Marxist/Leninist interpretation of history quoted in the text. Prior to the publishing of the 1977 chrestomathy, another Latvian SSR history textbook was published (Kanāle, Stepermanis, 1967) that also included questions to be answered after each section. This book is unique in that it includes two two-sided colour inserts of paintings depicting battles – two from ancient Latvian history and two depicting uprisings in 1905. The other chrestomathies do not include illustrations, but the history textbooks have many illustrations, tables, and detailed map inserts supplementing the written text.

The Latvian history textbooks first published in Latvia during the interwar period focused primarily on the cultural achievements of the Latvian nation, rather than the political accomplishments of great leaders, because, as Latvian historians and authors themselves admitted, such leaders were in short supply. Under Soviet rule, these cultural achievements were no longer associated with the abilities of the Latvian people, but rather with ties to Russians and Russian culture. This turned the Latvian nation into passive observers, not only of their political history, but recipients, not initiators of their cultural development as well. The death of Stalin and the retreat from the personality cult did not diminish Russian superiority as the cornerstone of the Soviet education system. That, along with the eschatological nature of Marxism/Leninsim, and the social development of the Soviet citizen became the focus of a new generation of Soviet didacticians.

Skatkin was one of the foremost didacticians in post-Stalin Soviet education. While references to Stalin and the personality cult had disappeared, the essential elements of Soviet education had not changed. Skatkin's (1984) definition of the point of education continued to stress the past in its focus on the formation of the student's personality and worldview. The purpose of general education in the Soviet system was to facilitate participation in the creation of a new society and its leadership, increase work productivity by learning to use and improve new technology, and to develop science and culture. The liquidation of the differences between physical and intellectual work was the basis for harmonious development of society. The goals and assignments

of school were determined by society's needs and ideals, and the same teaching principles could not be used in the communist, materially dialectic, and scientific world as in the bourgeois, anti-scientific worldview system of education.

The results of studies in Marxism/Leninism, work of party functionaries, and the creation of Soviet government documents, defined the work of teachers. The main goal was to become a communist, and to do so, one was required to learn the basics of science, because the communistic worldview was the only scientific one. Skatkin claimed that the nation's most illustrious scientists, who studied education issues, gave hope that the science of education and understanding would merge to forge new roads, but to do so, teachers were to refrain from using the logics of the inductive process by introducing abstractions that supposedly helped the student to understand the concrete. Schools should avoid any type of abstraction that was not completely scientifically defensible. Information was to be critically analyzed and internalized so that students' conclusions fit with the modern educational viewpoint. In order to internalize a communist worldview, students were required to take active part in its building. In addition, the basic principles of the communist worldview were reflected in teaching principles and were qualitatively different than those of bourgeois school systems. Skatkin stressed that long-term retention and understanding, as well as other technical procedures of teaching and learning, were used in both socialist and bourgeois schools, but these procedures adopt an ideology when adapted to subjects that have direct relation to the ideology and purpose of building a communist worldview. In discussion of these ideas, correct and specific identifying language should always be used so that foreign teachers would not confuse Soviet ideology with bourgeois ideology, e.g. "Communistic up-bringing principals in the education process" and not simply "educational up-bringing principals" (Skatkins, 1984, p. 48). This stress of proper language use indicate the lasting effect Stalin had on language formulation as previously discussed.

An important aspect of communism was the correlation between learning about life and the practical job of up-bringing. Learning takes place systematically in theory, but it also takes place when put into practice. Both product and process were influenced by Communist ideology and morals, but student organization and use of the collective were considered the most effective way to teach the characteristics of the true socialist.

A unique aspect in Soviet education, according to Skatkin (1984), was the use of the collective. He believed that children should learn to work together in a friendly manner, to understand the assignment and goals of the collective, learn to work in a

group, and subjugate their personal interests and actions on behalf of the good of the collective. Group work needed to avoid the mistakes of the 1920s when, according to Skatkin, this organizational system was undeveloped and contrary to the established classroom and lesson system resulting in individuals shirking their duty and being irresponsible towards others. A well-run collective was beneficial to all members, and organization of collective group work was the teacher's main assignment. Then, individual attention from the teacher would also be fruitful.

The main relationship between teaching and learning in bourgeois education had been achieved through falsely created teaching/learning situations. Soviet didactics had moved away from compartmentalized teaching, learning, process, cognition, etc., and had encompassed the learning process as a whole. The core of the lesson plan used a scientific and systematic approach, and the unit approach was criticized. The unit approach had been used during the 1920s in the USSR, but did not lead to good results, and actually lowered the education level (Skatkins, 1984, p. 100). However, up-bringing and raising awareness in the Soviet system was specifically focused on the social level. These social education norms were required to be incorporated into the curriculum, particularly the history curriculum. Ethics was not taught as a stand-alone subject, but rather incorporated in history, civics, literature, and even music classes (Skatkins, p. 103).

It appears that not much had changed with regards to student performance from the 1920s. It is interesting to note that Skatkin, who wrote his Secondary School Didactics in 1984, sixty-five years after the founding of the USSR, found it necessary to comment on the poor state of student awareness of societal relationships. He noted that students found it difficult to understand the development of these relationships. Research on older students indicated that they had poor understanding of the laws that governed the development of society, a cornerstone of Marxist/Leninist ideology. He noted that the poor explanation of these relationships during history lessons was often to blame. He went on to cite Soviet historian N. Dairijs who stated that the understanding of the development of the relationship of society was based solely on the quality of history teaching. If history was taught thoroughly and carefully year after year and from a true, scientific, Marxist/Leninist approach that encouraged students to think independently, then the foundations for the comprehension of this correlation would be solid (Skatkins, 1984, p. 54). However, how a student comes to independent thinking in system based on a teleologically-driven worldview, which stresses the collective, is not clear. Lessons appear to have continued to be static, teacher-driven and teacher-

directed, which encouraged performative work that discouraged independent thinking. The difficulty of the structure of performative language, as well as choice of language, also influenced learning.

Language use did not lose its importance after Stalin's demise. Skatkin (1984) noted that in the USSR, one could freely choose which language to use. He stated that Russian was not an obligatory language, but had gained respect among all groups as a modern and progressive language of science and technology, and it was the language used to express and proselytize peace and harmony among nations. This is why it was taught in all national schools. Native languages were used as an important communications aspect as a weapon of expression and considered a uniquely important development tool.

Children learned about their surroundings, family and society, and aspects of cultural in their native language. All up-bringing education was based in the native language (Skatkins, 1984, p. 103-104). While this may have appeared to be very egalitarian on the surface, it hid a more refined Russification attempt. Minority schools – Jewish, Polish, Estonian, Lithuania, and others – had continued to exist for a short period of time immediately after the war, but were soon closed leaving only Russian or Latvian as options for language of instruction in Soviet Latvia. In 1945, 78-79% of students learned in Latvian, but by 1963, the number of students learning in Latvian had fallen to 55%, lower than the percentage of Latvians in the country. By 1988, that number dropped to an all-time low of 52% (Bleiere, et.al., 2005, p. 358). Not only did the number of pupils learning in Latvian drop, but Livs who spoke their language and enganed in Liv cultural activities were under the watch of state security forces, and books in Latgallian, available during the 1940s and 1950s, could no longer be published as of the 1960s (Bleiere, et.al., p. 360).

The late 1950s saw a rise in 'national communism' in many of the Soviet republics, and its demise was caused, in large part, by events surrounding the education reform initiated by Khrushchev in 1958-1959. The education system was criticized for being behind the times and not preparing youth for practical life. The first major change involved increasing obligatory education to eight years instead of seven and incorporating an intensified work-study program. The other major change involved choice of language of education.

The education reform acknowledged that students were overworked, and in an attempt to alleviate this situation, parents could choose the language in which they wanted their children to be educated. They could choose either the national language or

Russian. It was also allowed that those pupils being educated in the national language need not learn Russian, and those being educated in Russian could choose not to learn the national language. While this was officially touted as a democratic choice, many years of acknowledgment of the cultural superiority of the Russian language, not to mention the status of Russian as the language of revolution, would make this situation farcical. It was clear that any school that chose to teach in Latvian and not offer Russian would be branded 'bourgeois nationalist', and parents who chose this option would be questioned as to why they wished to distance their children from Soviet citizens in other republics and the vast opportunities available only in Russian in the other republics. In addition, this offered the opportunity for Russian speakers to avoid learning Latvian. It was a common pattern throughout the republics of the Soviet Union that Russians could remain mono-lingual at almost no cost, but minorities would be virtually bi-lingual, if not tri-lingual (Laitin, 2001, p. 847). This one sided bi-lingualism (only 3.5% of Russians reported knowledge of a non-Russian language in 1979) supposedly had nothing to do with the socio-linguistic dominance associated with mono-lingualism and subordination associated with bi-lingualism, but rather showed a universal love and respect for Russians and their language (Kreindler, 1993, p. 264). The language-of-learning issue was the basis for school reform.

Several of the Soviet republics wished to extend the seven-year school system by adding another year stating that this was necessary so that students could learn three languages as dictated by local law – Russian, the national language of the republic, and a foreign language. Latvian law also required the separate teaching of Latvian history, not only in elementary, but also in secondary schools, contrary to Moscow's wishes that a unified Soviet history program be implemented in schools. Higher education administrators were also required to to travel to Moscow to receive approval for curriculum documents. Some report the frustration they experienced trying to create programs and courses that did not adhere to the Russian model. Approval for programs designed with individual nationality considerations in mind was consistently denied forcing administrators to rewrite programs to fit the Russian mold (Medveckis, 2004, p. 67). This nationalistic move did not survive, and Latvian law was forced to comply with Soviet law that was modeled on Russian SSR requirements. Nationalist-oriented leaders were removed from their posts in the government, and Russification of the education system intensified (Bleiere, 2004, p. 126-130). Educators, such as Milda Vernere who was the director of Riga Nr. 49 Secondary School, were also removed from their posts

for expressing nationalist sentiment (personal communication with Milda Vernere, 14 February 2007).

The Soviet system of education, while couched in egalitarian and even democratic terms, is a clear example of the previous discussion of teaching under totalitarian regimes. The history curriculum was carefully reviewed and sanitized before being approved by the government. The results of this process can be seen in the history texts that glorified the Soviet regime, which had, over the years, turned away from an international proletarian construct to embrace a nationalistic Russian focus. This is particularly visible in the rewriting of Latvian history in which Latvian ancient military victories and more recent cultural accomplishments were always associated with assistance from Russians, and Latvian misfortunes were conveniently blamed upon others, most notably Germans. While didactic discussions suggested that the development of students' critical thinking skills was encouraged, the teleological theory of the development of history, the strict adherence to this theory, and the stress on the collective suggest that this was not possible.

This continued to be the case in Soviet didactics, even after the public indictment of the Stalin cult and associated hero worship. Plaude describes the development of history teaching in Soviet Latvia by beginning with the October Revolution and he echoes much of the sentiment expressed in Stalin's earlier works in his descriptions of the role of Lenin and the Russian people in the success of the revolution as the key to the beginning of a new era in humanity. The short months of Soviet rule in part of Latvia in 1919 are described in detail with mention of specific teachers and the courses they prepared. Independent Latvia is discussed in one paragraph as the interruption of Soviet rule by Western powers, and the efforts of the underground Communist party and progressive teachers to teach youth the correct nature of the course of history, introduce them to Soviet history, and instill in them friendliness towards the Soviet nation. More detailed information about the harmful nature of history teaching during the 'bourgeois nationalistic era' focuses on the unscientific nature of history teaching, the lack of information about Russia and the accomplishments of the USSR, which caused hatred towards Russians (Plaude, 1969, pp. 150-151).

Plaude criticizes the first history texts used in the Soviet-occupied Latvia immediately following the end of World War II, because they were too dense with facts. Plaude admits they may have been too complicated for both students and teachers, but continued by stating that the fault lay with the previous bourgeois regime, which

used bourgeois methods and did not teach the students about the history of the "world's first socialist nation". Plaude stresses the scientific nature of history found in Marxism/Leninism as the basis for the correct interpretation of the past and the present, as well discussion of the future. Teachers needed to be fully versed in dialectic and historic materialism (Plaude, 1969, p. 152). Despite Plaude's admission of some of the ineffectual teaching materials, the missionic nature of the system is clear and reflects many aspects of colonial education systems.

Depaepe (1995) discusses the nature of colonial education in the Belgian Congo and its explicit intention to "educate" and "civilize" the native inhabitants, and that the essential element of their mission and moral obligation was the improvement of the lot of the native people (p. 16). Like the natives in the Congo, the Latvians needed to be enlightened and reeducated in order to fit into and benefit from the ruling order. This process focused on the increased use and expansion of the education process or the "pedagogization" of society that included increasing the number and range of educational bodies and processes. The consequences of "more" training and education paradoxically resulted in increased dependence and subjugation (Depaepe, Herman, Surmont, Van Gorp, Simon, 2008, pp. 2-3) as described by teachers in the following section of this dissertation.

The overreaching element of power in the totalitarian regime could not help but influence both teaching materials and methods of teaching. The clear Russian bias exhibited by the ruling order towards Latvian history negated Latvian accomplishments and awareness achieved during the previous era of independence – both parliamentary and authoritarian periods. The purpose and goal of history teaching was to write a unified history creating a unified identity. Curriculum once again presented history in chronological and personality-based format, and students learned names, dates, and facts using appropriate descriptors in order to be able to recite these facts in the same manner. Teachers were transmitters of information and textbooks for Latvian history were non-existent, adding an additional burden on teachers to create materials or avoid the subject altogether. The analyzed sources indicate that the teaching of history had become alienated through politicized curriculum and teaching materials resulting in formalist teaching methods that adversely affected teachers and students alike. The effect of this power on the nature of history teaching can only truly be determined by examining the practice of teaching history during the Soviet regime, as experienced by former teachers and pupils.

4.3. Practice of History Teaching In Soviet Latvia

Life stories, as previously mentioned, are an important source in the interpretation of historic facts, but cannot be soley attributed to modern research methods. This view was taken by Valdemārs, previously discussed, in the latter half of the 19th century as he encouraged Latvians to write down the memories of those who had witnessed historic events in order to create a Latvian interpretation of Latvian history. This continued in the early period of Latvian independence as teachers were called upon to engage their students and other members of society in the collection of historic narratives from eyewitnesses. This method was also not lost on Soviet educators in Latvia as they actively promoted the collection of life stories from men who had served as Red Riflemen during the Russian civil war and heroes of the 'Great Patriotic War' in order to create a Soviet narrative for Latvian history. The use of oral evidence to research Soviet history has recently been used as a source to offer insight to significant phenomenon that could also be overlooked if one used official written sources only (Markwick, 2001). I used a combination of structured and semi-structured interviews to glean information about the effects of authoritarianism on the teaching of history in Latvia.

As previously mentioned, a severe shortage of teachers, particularly history teachers, plagued the nation after World War II. The teachers who had received their training in the 'bourgeois period' were considered inferior because of a lack of knowledge of Soviet history, and courses to rectify this situation were already initiated in the 1944/1945 academic year. Recorded oral histories by some teachers of the era describe how they came to teach in 1945, despite an inadequate education, by taking a preparatory course lasting two months after which they were certified to teach (Medveckis, 2006, p. 44).

During the first year of Soviet occupation, authorities concentrated on the rewriting of history resulting in complications in the teacher education system – teacher candidates had not managed to learn the appropriately correct interpretations of history. However, the leading role of history in Soviet education is clearly seen in the changes that took place in the University of Latvia, which was renamed Latvia State University (LSU) and the primary preparer of history teachers. The Faculty of Philology and Philosophy was reorganized into the Faculty of History and Philology, and evening and distance education departments were created to facilitate the education of the young. The Faculty was renamed the Faculty of History in 1944 (LVA, 1340, pp. 3-4), and unlike the University in general, which continued to employ a majority of pre-war

teaching staff, the majority of the faculty was made up of politically acceptable non-Latvians as well as Latvians who had come to Latvia from Soviet Russia, many of whom spoke little or no Latvian (Keruss, 2010, pp. 89-90; "Pētera Stučkas Latvijas valsts universitāte", pp. 71-77).

Statutes adopted in 1940 called for the creation of a History Department that would teach history and history associated courses – art history, dialectical and historical materialism, pedagogy and psychology, USSR history, and Latvian history. The separate Faculty of History created in 1944 had five departments: USSR History, Latvian SSR History, Ancient History, Medieval History, and Modern History. In 1947, the USSR Ministry of Education decreed that the Ancient, Medieval, and Modern history departments be combined to form a general History chair, that was in turn divided, in 1949, again into two – Ancient and Medieval History. Latvian SSR and USSR History were combined in 1949 creating the USSR History department. In 1954, the History aculty of the Latvian Pedagogical Institute was incorporated into the LSU Faculty of History, which in turn, was united with the LSU Faculty of Philology creating the LSU Faculty of History and Philology (LVA, 1340, pp. 34-35).

An accelerated course for history teachers was organized, and methodological seminars offered lectures on Marxism/Leninism theory, international teaching issues, didactics of history teaching, and practical experience using examples from other 'brotherly' Soviet republics. However, these types of activities were not considered sufficient to raise the level of the theoretical ideology required to be a proper history teacher. This was addressed in the Teachers' Qualification Improvement Institute's History and Constitution section where teachers would be properly taught how to arrange history according to Marxist/Leninist principles and gave scientifically-based explanations for historic facts, which, ultimately, was the goal in rearing the youth in the proper communist ideology. Lecturers from Moscow and Leningrad assisted local staff, which supposedly guaranteed the highest level of theoretical and scientific knowledge and resulted in excellently-prepared history teachers (Plaude, 1969, pp. 152-153).

Structured interview questions were put to teachers who had taught during the Soviet regime with preference given to older teachers so that they could give insight into the Stalin regime, in particular, and included as many teachers as possible outside of Riga. Ten teachers volunteered to participate in a semi-structured interview. I also incorporated structured interviews of individuals who were pupils of history during the Soviet era in order to compare their perceptions with those of teachers of history. All

the respondents, both teachers and former pupils of history are of Latvian ethnicity. The tables included in this section are divided into two parts – the first indicates the teachers' assessment of individual aspects of the Soviet system overall; the second refers to the teachers' lived experience in schools. These two assessments are not always identical indicating that while some teachers may have agreed with the theory, practice was something different.

4.3.1. Analysis of teacher interviews and responses

In total, 20 teachers were interviewed. Fifteen of the respondents were female and five were male. Six worked in larger cities, ten in towns, and four in rural areas, and all taught in Latvian. Of the teachers who participated, eight were born before 1935. One of these teachers, Arnolds, who also participated in a more in-depth interview, did not pursue teaching as a career until much later in life, and his data and responses are included in that of the younger teachers. The remaining seven born before 1935 have an average of over 40 years experience teaching. The 13 younger teachers began their pedagogical education in the post-Stalinist era and have an average of approximately 12 years teaching experience.

I also conducted ten semi-structured interviews of which nine were face-to-face and one was on-line. One of these teachers did not participate in the structured interview resulting in a total of 19 responses. Of those interviewed, three were male – Roberts, Jānis, and Arnolds – and seven were female – Anna, Ilze, Zane, Gita, Dace, Milda, and Karla. Of those interviewed in greater detail, four were born before 1930 – Roberts, Anna, Ilze, and Milda; three between 1930 and 1945 – Jānis, Arnolds, and Dace; and the remainder after 1945. Five worked in city schools, three in town schools, and two in rural areas. Most of the teachers were very willing to discuss their educational experiences, and these comments gave insight to the Soviet education system in general as they related anecdotal experiences about things they personally experienced or witnessed. Most of the teachers were ambiguous about remaining anonymous, but several specifically requested anonymity. One respondent, Milda Vernere, is named because she was not only a teacher, but also a deputy in the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, has been previously quoted in the press, and did not object to being named in my research. All other teachers are identified by pseudonyms.

The careers of these teachers span different time periods. All four teachers born before 1930 received their pedagogical education during the Stalin era, and they had at least several years teaching experience during this era, as well. In fact, all but one were not fully certified teachers when they began their teaching careers because of the

shortage of teachers following World War II. Mass deportations of Latvian citizens in 1941 and 1949 targeted many teachers, and many teachers also fled to the West when the Soviets reoccupied Latvia in 1944, reducing the number of qualified teachers in Latvia in the post-WW II period. One teacher born after 1930 reported beginning her teaching career at the age of 18 in 1950, and she completed her education as she worked. These teachers were employed while completing their education, most through distance education. They also had extensive experience with professional development at teacher training institutions and as pedagogical requirements changed and developed during the first two decades of Soviet occupation. Their experience with teacher education was more extensive than their younger counterparts, and consequently they related more detailed experiences about the efficacy of teacher education, as well as intrusions of the authoritarian regime on their education. The teachers worked in schools at some point during the Stalinist period from 1944 until 1956 when Stalin and many of his policies were denounced.

The remaining teachers began their teaching careers in the post-Stalinist period immediately after receiving their education. One of the oldest respondents, however, had the least amount of teaching experience, because he returned to university to receive his teacher education in his forties after many years of working in forestry. The most experienced respondent was a man who had been teaching for 55 years and was still doing so when I interviewed him in 2006.

I analyzed the information obtained from the structured interviews (see original text in Appendix A) qualitatively and compiled the responses into several categories. First is a discussion of the teachers' views on the Soviet system of education in general, including personal pedagogical education experiences and thoughts about the organization of the education system. This is followed by comments about curriculum and teaching materials and methods, including reflections on personal experiences. Next are discussions of the extra-curricular activities in which teachers were required to participate, and the nature of the relationship between teacher and pupil. This section is concluded by a discussion on teaching Latvian history and their experiences. This discussion includes anecdotal references to attitudes towards Latvian history and societal relationships in general, as experienced by the respondents.

While the structured interviews focused on more general aspects of the Soviet educational system, the semi-structured interview questions (see original text in Appendix B) addressed more detailed aspects of their own education, as well as specific questions regarding the teaching of Latvian history and associated issues of power and

fear. The responses to questions are identified, in parenthesis, by question number being answered, and the day, month, and year conducted, e.g. (#3; 14.02.07). Some of the answers may appear to be jumbled and grammatically confusing. Many of the older teachers would begin to relate an incident and then stop to intersperse their telling with an aside, and then return again to the original. I have edited the text only so that the story flows and relates to the topic at hand and have not changed grammatical errors in their stories. I also translated vernacular Latvian into phrases in English that are most similar to the expressions used. Phrases or words inserted for the purpose of clarity are bracketed, e.g. [so].

I should also note the difficulty in finding older teachers to interview. As previously stated, many teachers I contacted refused to participate in an interview stating poor health or the fact they 'had nothing to say'. I contacted several Russian-speaking teachers who refused to even speak to me over the phone. Our conversation would begin with an introduction about my research in Latvian followed by a comment from them in Russian. When I tried to clarify that I did not understand Russian, I was either told that they did not speak Latvian or they just hung up the receiver. A Latvian-speaking teacher also refused to speak to me, but did agree to answer the questions in writing. I was initially puzzled by this negative response to requests for interviews, as teachers are generally not known for their reluctance to speak publicly, but subsequent interviews that related various incidents of self-censoring and negative experiences with the ruling order about Communist ideology and relationships with Russians may indicate that some of the teachers who refused to be interviewed were either too traumatized by their experiences to speak to me, or that they were among the members of the ruling order and are uncomfortable expressing their views, which are generally unpopular and unacceptable in current Latvian society.

When questioned about their career choice, all the teachers noted a love for and fascination with history, and many respondents mentioned inspiring history teachers they had experienced. All noted aspects of culture and a particular fascination with ancient or medieval history as opposed to political history. Roberts noted that Communist Party history was not highly regarded because of its highly politicized nature, and that Communist Party historians were considered at the "bottom of the barrel" (#3; 20.11.06). Roberts' statement illustrates an acute awareness of the Soviet view of the party historian as described by Heer (1971) who notes that the historian who studied the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) was by definition both a party member of considerable standing and an historian, but the party

historian was in a dangerous and difficult position in terms of conflicts of interest and loyalty, because the regime set intangible and ill-defined norms while providing only explosive materials and dangerous tools. The CPSU historian was required to write exclusively on the most politically sensitive topics, yet required to be politically active and set the norm for other historians and lesser members of the teaching and propaganda hierarchies (p. 35). Teachers were the lowest members of the teaching hierarchy, as will be demonstrated by the comments of the teachers, which describe their relationship to the highly centralized system.

The discussion on a centralized and unified education system includes notes on teachers' experiences and reports of their relationship with the system as it applies to their own pedagogic educational experience, job searches, and teaching history, and includes personal anecdotal testimony. The Soviet education system was highly centralized and had a unified curriculum, teaching materials, and methodological requirements, offering egalitarian and free education to all. Most agreed with this as indicated in Tables 2 and 3, but some of the responses to various aspects of this appear to contradict this accepted philosophy. Much of the contradictory evidence, usually negative attitudes towards the system, was expressed by older teachers who had more extensive knowledge of the education system of the interwar period through personal experience or through teachers who had been educated prior to the Soviet occupation. Fear is also a visibly significant factor for many of the older teachers.

Many of the younger teachers admitted to having very limited knowledge about other educational experiences, pre-war Latvian or otherwise. The older teachers were more critical of the education system they experienced under the unified Soviet system. During the early years of the Stalin era, many of the teachers had not learned to read Russian very well, but were forced to study curriculum and methodology from Russian books.

Table 2

Evaluation of General Traits of the Soviet Education System as Indicated by Percentage of Teachers

N=19	**Positive (%)**	**Negative (%)**	**Undecided (%)**
Overall organization of the education system	68	7	25
Ideologized education	2	85	13
Prestige of teaching profession	25	32	43

Table 3

Evaluation of General Traits of Soviet Schools as Indicated by Percentage of Teachers

N=19	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)	Undecided (%)
Overall organization of the schools was good	68	19	13
Education system was overly ideological and biased	90	7	3
Teaching profession was valued	64	18	18

Roberts described his pedagogical education immediately following the war. He attended a pedagogical secondary school that qualified him to teach in elementary schools. He described his struggle with the Russian texts and the final exams that had to be taken in Russian, and he laughed as he reminisced that as soon as he passed the final exam for a period of history, such as the Middle Ages or the history of the Far East, a history book would appear on that topic in Latvian. He was forced to learn to read Russian because studying from elementary school books alone, written in Latvian, would not suffice to pass exams that had to be written in Russian. However, Roberts stated that he was ill-prepared for teaching, as he had not been sufficiently acquainted with the school curriculum. He described didactical lessons as highly theoretical, which explained how to organize a lesson, and he was quite positive in his assessment of the theory in these pedagogical courses. Theory was highly regarded, as mentioned previously in the discussion of teacher education immediately following the war, but much of this did not relate to the teacher's lived experience, and thus, they did not know how to transfer this knowledge to the classroom (Plaude, 1969, p. 154).

Marxism/Leninism was an individual course that all potential teachers had to take and which focused on the nature of history itself. Roberts described a discussion he was part of as a student in this university level course:

> Revolutions are the locomotive of history. That was the view. One society's economic system replaced another. So, the first primitive unified societies were replaced by slavery, slavery by feudalism, and so on, and the ideal future belongs to communism as the final goal. We students goofed around saying, 'So, now we are back at the primitive unified society stage, so to speak, because everything belongs to everyone, yes?' (#1; 20.1.06)

Although resources were scarce, Roberts spoke fondly of the many excellent professors at the school. He explained that many notable pedagogues from around Latvia were gathered in Liepāja and Talsi because they had tried to escape the reoccupation of Latvia by the Soviet Union, but had not managed to do so. He compared this in a favourable light to later pedagogical education in university. Milda noted that the Latvians had somehow maintained their "air of intelligence and order" from the older professors of the previous generation under whom they studied (#1; 14.02.07).

Ilze began her studies while working through distance education at the Cēsis Teacher Institute, which offered a limited amount of courses, including history. She enrolled in Daugavpils University later when teachers were required to upgrade their qualifications and education, and noted a complete lack of cultural history in the history courses she had to take. There was no mention of artists or even music in the history faculty in Daugavpils. Culture was incorporated into the history program during the Khrushchev thaw when the cultural accomplishments of the Soviet Union were taught (#1; 19.06.07). Dace also received her initial teacher training at Teacher Institutes in Cēsis and Valmiera, later followed by studies in the Faculty of History at Daugavpils University (#1; 14.02.07). Anna, who also studied through distance education before entering the State University of Latvia, noted the high standard of her pedagogical education, which she claimed was due to the professors that had remained from the pre-war era:

> They explained things as it should be, and those of us who studied then, learned more precisely. Those new teachers who only had Soviet experience and asked in 1989, what really happened on the 18th of November? We knew that all along, what happened then. (#1; 19.06.07)

Anna's comment indicates that the teaching of actual facts by these older professors was more highly regarded, but also that initially, despite the political changes, some older professors dared to teach material not sanctioned by the ruling order. Positive recollections are partially associated with didactics and accepted pedagogical forms of methodology, but for older teachers, positive reflections are mainly associated with pre-Soviet era instructors who apparently knew their students personally and allowed themselves to teach things that would quickly disappear from the Soviet educational system.

The teachers were also quite cognizant of the politicized nature of their studies, but pragmatic in their reflections about the realities they faced as students. Arnolds

commented: “The knowledge was broad, but not qualitative – it was one-sidedly biased.” (#4; 10.02.07) Politicized courses of study, such as the history of the Communist Party, were not described as being particularly educational, but rather a necessary evil. Dace put it most succinctly: “School was part of the state machine… and …you had to know history as specified in the program if you wanted to get ahead.” (#4: 14.02.07)

The Soviet occupation and resulting deportations, arrests, and executions caused great fear among the local population. Recollections about fear have also been recorded by exiled Latvians who lived through the occupation before fleeing, and who described fear as a factor in examinations, where passing an exam had nothing to do with how well you knew the topic, but rather whether you were friendly to the regime or not (Garda, 2006, p. 77) or because of family and work associations. Fear is a factor in Ilze’s recollections, who did not relate aspects of the quality of the educational experience, but rather described in great detail how the exam process and results were politicized:

> For instance, we were … taking exams. …and we have to take more exams in Latvian and Russian, in history and geography. And we were nervous and suffering through this, and then everything was done, and then it went to the acceptance committee. Only then, when everything was finished, out comes a girl crying. We were all standing by the door. It appeared that there was something about her relatives, and that’s why she wasn’t accepted. Something in her biography, see? I don’t know. Wouldn’t it have been more humane not to let her even take the tests? She passed everything, suffered. I don’t know. She left crying. (#1; 19.06.07)

Ilze’s recollections predominantly describe the fear and uncertainty surrounding her school life because of her own family history. She related that her parents were farmers, but because they owned more than 30 hectares of land, they could be branded kulaks and sent off to Siberia. A local official had encouraged her father to give away ten hectares of land of his own volition, thereby increasing the family’s chances for survival. Even as Ilze described the examination process in the post-Stalin period, this fear remained.

Teachers were required to increase their teaching qualifications, and Ilze described how several functionaries would be present during the oral exams, and after hearing how a fellow instructor had answered a question, she had said:

> And I not thinking… went out … and said 'If I had answered like that, I would have got a 3 or even 2. I wonder what she'll get.'…. Shortly after that, the director called me in. I started thinking, 'What now?' I started thinking about my biography… I sat down in the director's office and the director is sitting there with two men. And then they started questioning me about this instructor – people were afraid of her. She had told on me. She got a 4, the woman of which people were afraid… And they started asking me questions about the other girls… Then, the young man, a lecturer… started asking me exam questions and I got a 4 in the final exam. And if Stalin hadn't, I never say died, if Stalin hadn't croaked, both of us, the examiner and I, would be in prison. (#1; 19.06.07)

This preoccupation with family history as well as incidents of reporting overheard comments, i.e. 'snitching', and associated elements of fear appears in the recollections of the teachers who witnessed the occupation of Latvia, but not in those of younger teachers. Fear as a motivating factor will also appear in discussion of the teaching of Latvian history further on in this section.

Arnolds, who began his teaching career later in life, noted that although he taught history, his formal education was in philology. He recalled getting a three out of five, not a particularly good grade, in his master's final exams because he had quoted foreign pedagogues, such as Komensky, more frequently than Soviet pedagogues. When he passed his state exams in Communism, he was told: "For this answer, comrade [Arnolds], Mr. Reagan would gladly shake your hand." (#1; 10.02.07) By his own admission, Arnolds stated that his age and life experience under the Soviet regime had made him more cynical, and he allowed himself to say and do things other teachers feared. Also, the Stalin era was over, and some teachers allowed themselves freedoms that would have been unthinkable in the post-war period.

One element that is missing from the older teachers' discussion is the difficulty of teaching the new material. Several articles in *PLS* previously mentioned discuss the deficiencies of teaching primarily due to poor Russian skills. The scientific nature of dialectic materialism and Marxism/Leninism was problematic in itself, and, while the teachers I interviewed did not complain about the difficulties of the content, this has been noted in discussion of the Soviet education system, as well as other countries that experienced Communist revolutions.

In her discussion of FRELIMO, the Marxist-oriented Mozambique Liberation Front, Errante (2000) notes that in addition to eliminating all things 'colonial', as well as most cultural practices deemed 'traditionally' African from the curriculum, the early

post-revolutionary curriculum was so loaded with Maoist and Marxist slogans, that teachers complained they could not teach the material because they did not understand it themselves. When discussing history, all the teachers noted that Marxism/Leninism was a required course, but specifically separated that content from other history courses. Milda noted that many of the teachers who were entrusted with this subject were Latvians who had lived in Russia and brought to Latvia for the purpose of inculcating the 'local' Latvians with proper Soviet ideology, because they were more familiar with Marxist-Leninist ideology and undeniably more reliable than the local teachers who were viewed with suspicion.

This view changes between the middle-age group of teachers and the younger teachers whose education is described in different terms. Teachers in the middle age group also expressed some frustration about their pedagogical education, which was driven more by ideology and less by fear. Jānis was educated in philology, but began teaching 'social studies' [*sabiedrības mācība*] when he became the director of a village school. Social studies also included history, among other topics, and he expressed frustration at the requirement that each lesson have specified educational as well as up-bringing outcomes (#7; 23.08.08). He found them difficult to compose and relate to the subject matter. Zane, one of the younger teachers, on the other hand, found history a particularly easy subject with which to fulfill those requirements, and had no troubles creating outcomes for love of the fatherland, patriotism, collectivism, and other ideologically based requirements (#7; 13.06.08).

The younger teachers described their pedagogic experience in terms of methodology. Karla was taught how to write summaries, present and analyze lessons, and other practical skills, such as how to break up the curriculum into individual lessons and fill out school-related documents. Her history methodology courses consisted of lessons on systematization of historic knowledge, which she later used as a history teacher. She also noted that as far as she knew, all her classmates who went on to teach history used the materials from this course. Karla noted: "I don't remember if in general history lessons we were told how or what to present in history lessons." Yet, Karla continued by admitting that some lessons were indeed politicized:

> In some questions that could be interpreted in various ways, Soviet historian perspectives were compared to 'bourgeois' historian positions. The latter, of course, were 'bad', and they were negatively criticized 'point by point', but they did explain their perspectives nevertheless. But there were study courses, where

I don't recall any differentiation between a 'bad' and 'good' position… (#4; 14.08.08)

Karla noted that the only course in which Soviet propaganda was openly taught was the history of the Communist Party, as well as the course on atheism. She recalled that some argument occurred in these courses, particularly in the atheism course. This apparent naiveté about the significance of history as a political tool can be witnessed in her comment about the surprise at the realization during her studies that she and her classmates were studying in an "ideological faculty". Karla continued by recalling that this became a running joke among the students. If one of her classmates criticized some aspect of living in the Soviet Union, the others would jokingly put on serious expressions and say: "Don't forget that you're studying in an ideological faculty!" (#4; 14.08.08)

Another respondent, Gita, noted a similar education experience with regard to methodology, but expressed an unconscious awareness of the highly ideological nature of her studies. She noted that there was a set way to teach history, similar to Karla's description, which was based almost exclusively on history textbooks with some additional materials such as maps and illustrations. Unlike Karla, Gita noted that all her history lessons focused on the role of revolution and importance of class conflict (#7; 21.10.07). She was taught that each lesson needed to stress the importance and significance of societal differences and the struggle between the good and the bad, and in history in particular, class conflict. Gita also noted that the significance of the leader was discussed. Gita studied during the early 1980s and noted that although personality was stressed in a positive light in history lessons, the mistakes of Stalin were also analyzed. She did note that the discussions were not very deep, as they did not have much factual information upon which to base these conversations. In fact, although this took place in university classes, the discussion method was not favoured, as the expression of personal opinions and thinking was not encouraged. Despite this description of her history studies presented in classic Soviet historiography terms, Gita went on to say: "Blatant ideology was not presented in university." (#1; 24.10.07) Gita also related an incident in university when she and her classmates were studying the 26th Communist Party Congress and speeches made by Gorbachev which were, of course, blatantly ideological, and how because of this she laughed aloud, for which she received a reprimand.

The differences between the generations with regard to fear are clear. The older teachers, during the Stalin era in particular, took great pains to protect themselves by

following accepted norms and submerging their own opinions and beliefs, which caused great stress and fear. Teachers in the middle-aged group did not mention fear, but did express feelings of stress about adhering to the many requirements of the system. The youngest group of teachers no longer expressed fear or stress, and 'working the system' had apparently become an internalized process. In some cases, these teachers seemed oblivious to the politicized nature of their own education, as well as the education they were passing on their pupils. This reduction in fear was not only noted in Latvia, but other republics as well, such as Estonia, where cultural activities and books that appeared during the 1970s and 1980s that were not immediately confiscated by the KGB (Bennich-Björkmann, 2007, pp. 326-327).

While several of these teachers, including Gita, stressed that they did not see ideology playing a particular role in their education, they nevertheless related incidents from university lectures that indicates the highly politicized nature of higher education throughout the Soviet era. The younger teachers appeared to have internalized the ideology rendering it invisible. While many of the teachers were ambiguous about the efficacy of the unified Soviet system, they did note some positive attributes as can be seen in Tables 4 and 5.

The centralized Soviet system was not considered a positive one by most, but one of the teachers noted that it was easy to transfer from one school to another because of the unified system – the curriculum was the same throughout Latvia and the rest of the Soviet Union. The unified system also made it possible for teachers to teach in any part of Latvia or the Soviet Union as reflected in the generally positive response to job opportunities for graduating teachers.

Table 4

Evaluation of the Soviet curriculum and didactics as indicated by percentage of teachers

N=19	**Positive (%)**	**Negative (%)**	**Undecided (%)**
Unified, obligatory curriculum and teaching materials funded by state	74	13	13
Curriculum content and quality of materials	10	70	20
Methodology and marking scheme	50	20	30

Table 5

Evaluation of school curriculum and methodology as indicated by percentage of teachers

N=19	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)	Undecided (%)
It was good that everyone had the same obligatory curriculum and teaching materials were free	84	13	3
Curriculum and teaching materials were biased and ideologically slanted, often boring and of poor quality	63	29	8
Methodology was uniform and students were often passive in the educational process.	53	15	32
5-point assessment system in all levels of education was clear and understandable	85	5	10

Of the younger respondents, Gita decided to study and teach history because she wanted to find answers to many questions that she had. She noted that she was required to teach at least three years because her education had been free, but she did not mention how her place of employment was determined (#3; 24.10.07). Karla noted that her parents fully supported her choice of studying history because it would offer several different career opportunities. She specifically requested a teaching position after graduation (#3; 14.08.08). This is in stark contrast to Roberts whose parents bemoaned his career choice noting that he would be forced to say and teach things he knew not to be true, and they were particularly dismayed about the anti-religious stance he would have to profess (#3; 20.11.06). Dace described how she began teaching at the age of 18 in a small town shortly after the end of the war because of the lack of teachers, but was not allowed to teach history as that was the job of the director of the school, who had been versed in the proper ideological methodology (#3; 14.02.07).

Ilze mentioned the stress of applying for positions during the Stalin era, because the first point requiring explanation was one's social background (#3; 19.06.07). Politics played a role in the place of work as well, according to Arnolds, who noted that while work was guaranteed, one's place of employment was not. Riga was the favoured location for work in Latvia:

> Girls could 'arrange' a place through marriage. Many professors dumped their wives and married young girls. Your job depended on your biography – the

> more acceptable it was to the worker nation, the closer [your job was] to Riga. If your [family] history was suspect, the farther away from Riga, and sometimes even outside Latvia. (#3; 10.02.07)

Arnolds' comment about marriage did not just indicate a wish to gain status associated with marrying a professor, but rather a wish to stay in Riga as it was usually only those graduates who were registered Riga residents who would be offered a position in the capital. Residency permits were extremely difficult to obtain, and in addition to marriage, people would often try to arrange residency with relatives.

A placement commission was convened to determined job placement and consisted of members from the faculty, Ministry of Education, and Communist Party functionaries. It was a highly political process, and in the early years family pedigree was extremely important as noted by the older teachers. Karla described the process of this commission, in which students were offered positions based on their success in school, with the most successful students being offered the most desirable jobs and job locations first. Several places of employment would inform the commission of available positions and the students were required to remain in this place for three years as repayment for the free education the state had provided. Karla noted that by the early 1980s, when she graduated from the faculty at the State University of Latvia, this commission was relatively "humane" in its placement of students, as many had already arranged places, but needed official approval. She recalled how in previous years this was not so, and teachers from Riga would often be sent off to rural area schools. "Buckets of tears" would flow at the doors of this commission. Some universities had All Union commissions, which would send Latvians off to Siberia to work and bring Russians to work in Latvia, which, according to Karla, was an offer no Russian would refuse (#3; 14.08.08).

This work structure was characteristic of other republics in the USSR where within the bureaucratic career system, decisions about career paths were based on extraneous factors such as a person's nationality, membership in the Communist Party, or personal connections (Yakushko, 2007, p. 309). Personal choice was not guided by the individual, but rather by the needs of the state (Yakushko, p. 306). Family connections were a main element in job placement, and although this was ideologically condemned by the concept of the egalitarian system, this informal mechanism was common and stable. Those with advanced careers in any occupation were often seen as having achieved this through unfair and ideologically incorrect family means (p. 308). The respondents note family connections with regard to school enrollment as well.

Roberts' comments about biography also support the importance of family history ties in finding work for older teachers, although he made no reference to such a workplace commission. He found work with relative ease because he was well known by the local pedagogues and got a position where he had studied. He was also well liked and trusted. "People knew, one could say, what others thought and what they felt." He did describe the reaction by party functionaries when he announced plans to marry a girl who had been deported to Siberia with her family in 1941. He noted that several of the 'ideology ladies', one of them an old Latvian revolutionary, came to warn him that he would ruin his future career by marrying a girl from such a questionable background. This same old revolutionary would later become the director of a school. Robert explained that initially, school directors were not chosen because of party affiliations or background, but this soon changed and leftist-oriented directors were placed in schools. Roberts added that this fearful attitude toward background clearly explained why, to protect them, many older women who had lost husbands in the war, married Russians.

The Soviet education system clamed to be egalitarian, but many of the respondents pointed out other subtleties that indicated that this equality was superficial. The respondents were divided on the statement that wealth was not discernable, particularly in the dress of the pupils even though they were required to wear uniforms to school. Arnolds noted: "Even with school uniforms, one could see differences in wealth among the pupils. The color of the uniforms was the same, but the cut and the quality of the cloth unveiled material differences."

Some also disagreed that education was free. Ilze noted an inaccuracy in the question regarding free education by clarifying that immediately after World War II, secondary education was not obligatory, and that in 1947, 1948, and 1949 she had to pay 150 rubles annually to attend school. She could not do this after 1949 because she was from the countryside, and her family was forced to join the collective farm in 1949. Her mother was sick and unable to work, leaving her father alone to earn money to support several children and her grandmother, so she was forced to finish her education at night school.

Another teacher indicated, with some irony, nuances in the concept of free education. Although schooling was free, good grades could be bought, implying a degree of corruption among educators. Favouritism was also shown to Communist Party members as described by Ilze who related a story about taking oral exams at a teacher institute in the Stalinist period. She described a teacher who had enrolled at the teacher seminar "…who spoke Latvian very poorly, and also could not answer a

question properly without stumbling and hesitating, but she always got the best marks. And they could not understand how this could be, and then someone told them that she was a Party member. That was in the beginning when there were not many party members yet." (#1; 19.06.07) Party membership was required for all history teachers, as history was considered an ideological subject.

All the older teachers noted that they had become members of the Communist Party because it was a requirement for all teachers of history. Jānis was educated as a philologist and was not required to join, and initially had no intentions of doing so because, as he mentioned, he grew up in an intensely nationalistic family who cheered in 1939 when the Finns managed to keep the invading Red Army at bay during the Winter War. However, one of his teachers, who he also described as being nationalistically-oriented, called him into her office and sincerely suggested he join the Communist Youth, as that was the ticket to success. Not joining would only cause him future difficulties. Jānis did join and continued his discussion about how challenging accepted Party ideology cost him his first chance at becoming the director of a school, despite his exemplary record in the Communist Youth:

> I had to go for director approval at the Party office… It was known that Party members were not allowed to wear wedding rings… I go to this approval meeting. They notice on my finger my wedding band. How they attacked me! How they attacked me!... 'What kind of bourgeois remnants…?' But I said that I bought the rings in a Soviet store. But they did not approve me [for the position of director]… I have not yet shown ideological growth. What kind of a leader would I be? And now they attach… a Party ideological educator [up-bringer], who is now going to 'raise' me… And now she has spent one month educating me…and my wife jokingly said, 'The smart one retreats'… and so the next time [I went to the approval meeting] I took off my ring, and I was approved… and then guess what happened? The educator was a woman … and miraculously, she gives birth out-of-wedlock… such was my 'up-bringer'. (#3, 23.08.08)

The younger teachers related that membership in the Communist Youth was required, but several of them managed not to join the Communist Party itself. By the mid-1980s, Gita noted, teachers were no longer afraid of being sent to Siberia or facing other serious repressions, but she mentioned that sometimes teachers were fired for conducting classes in a manner not deemed appropriate by observers. Arnolds described being let go in the late 1980s for a lesson that was deemed inappropriately taught. He noted how teachers were required to teach according to the designated program and

were not allowed to digress. When he first started to teach, he was told several times that he was not following proper methodological principles and such a divergent teaching style was not "according to the plan". Arnolds recalled how he did not get along with the director of his school and had his final 'run-in' with him about methodology. "The director asked me, 'Must I write a decree, or will you write a letter requesting you be allowed to resign?'" (#10; 10.02.07)

The importance of form over content was essential to this unified system. Several of the teachers noted that rote learning was common, and students would often memorize standard phrases to include in written compositions or repeat upon request. Roberts described how teachers on opposite sides of the Soviet Union could assign a topic about a historic event in USSR history to their students, and the results would be virtually identical (#7; 20.11.06).

Soviet language was hegemonic and constituted the only true representation of reality that was shared by all Soviet people, and from an audience perspective, language had only one function – to describe reality and state facts about the world. Some of the teachers related stories how these misquotes sometimes became comical in content, but this was not so if the lesson was being observed by functionaries. Anna told of her secondary students who repeated her description of events in Latvia in 1940. The text noted that the Latvian nation experienced a socialist revolution and then the Red Army tanks came in. However, some of her secondary students would switch these two sentences around, which, of course, resulted in a completely different interpretation of history. Anna noted that the students were messing about in class this way, but she warned them not to do so in public (#10; 19.06.07). While Anna's secondary school students were purposefully confusing sentence order, students in younger grades were not so politically aware.

Ilze described how results of rote learning of facts and memorization of text and were not always as hoped and led to disaster in an observed lesson. She related an incident when a student memorized text and combined two sentences that ended badly:

> I was sick then… and a teacher had to lead the lesson [in my place]. They were only Grade 4 students, little children. How much understanding do they have in Grade 4? Grade 4 had Homeland History Stories. There were some from Latvian history, some from USSR history… and she was telling about [when the Red Army entered Latvian in 1940]…and this little child comes to the front of the class to answer. And the book has two sentences, one followed by another, but he combined them into one. The text read so – they [the Soviets] came because

> the [USSR] border had been illegally crossed and they [Latvians] had not complied with what not, and then came the Soviet tanks. And then Soviet rule was founded. And this little boy combined the sentences and said that the Soviet tanks came and brought Soviet rule. And then that teacher had a big mess on her hands….A committee from Riga had come – inspectors from the Central Committee. And they reported her. An uproar over this little child's answer. That's the way it was, and teachers experienced lots of trouble. (#10; 19.06.07)

The pupils' confusion serves to illustrate the poor results of learning by rote with little understanding of the material. This lack of understanding appears to have continued right on through secondary school resulting in poor results in university entrance exams. Minutes of meetings discussing results of entrance exams for the Faculty of History at the State University of Latvia, reveal that students have an unclear or highly superficial understanding of ideologically correct interpretation of facts (LVA, 1340, 11, 1). This is apparent for all university applicants, not just history candidates, as illustrated by exam results in 1950. Students applying to various faculties that year had a choice of the follwing topics: *Stalin – the Latvian nation's best friend*, *Collectivization of agriculture in the Latvian SSR*, or *The struggle for peace around the world*. By all accounts, the results were not impressive (LVA, 1340, 11, 13). The seemingly innocent statement resulting in the incorrect interpretation of the Soviet version of Latvian history by a child and the continued poor results shown by hopeful students illustrates the sensitive nature of teaching and possible political and personal repercussions for the teacher.

Milda noted how one of her secondary school students was required to write an entrance examination for medical school, even though his acceptance was guaranteed by virtue of the fact that his mother was the school's director. The paper was well written and comprehensive, but did not have the required number of pages needed for acceptance. It is common knowledge among former Soviet era students that major papers would be supplemented with dozens of long quotes from Lenin just to reach the required number of pages. Yurchak (2006) describes in great detail the method of 'cut and paste' as a form of writing articles and creating speeches with appropriate Marxist-Leninist phraseology. "Regurgitation" of facts in precisely formulated sentences was required, and the only acceptable form, as noted by Jānis (#7; 23.08.08). Gita described final exams as reproductive retells of memorized facts that required no presentation of one's opinion, which also was never requested. Final history exams usually consisted of one question about Latvian history and two about USSR history. Gita gave two

examples of classic final examination topics – *Describe the first 5-year plan* and *The causes of The Great Patriotic War* (#7; 24.10.07). The predictability of final exam topics was also a source of humour in later years. Jānis told a popular Soviet-era joke about final exams in which a student is requested to discuss the Stalin cult. The student proceeds to talk about everything but Stalin, and when interrupted by the examiners, who asks why he is avoiding the assigned topic, the student replies, "I don't want to talk about that horrible man." (#7; 23.08.08) The ultimate example of control within this unified and centralized system is illustrated by the fact that all doctoral dissertations were sent to Moscow for final approval. Yurchak (2006) describes the role of authoritative discourse in the Soviet system. Although he writes from the position as a member of the Russian-speaking elite, Yurchak's description of the role of language in society offers a key to understanding the descriptions of oral and written utterances described by the respondents.

The examples of acceptable language given by the teachers were not unique to Latvia but rather a hallmark of the entire Soviet system. How adequately language described reality could not be challenged or verified (Yurchak, 2006). Yurchak describes Soviet discourse as a reflection of knowledge, rather than playing an active role in creating knowledge. He discusses Bakhtin's (1994) theory of 'authoritative discourse' which coheres around a strict idea or dogma (as cited in Yurchak, 2006, p. 14). This discourse has two main features: 1) authoritative discourse has a special 'script' which sharply demarcates it from other types of discourse with which it co-exists, but it does not depend on these co-existent discourses, but rather precedes them and cannot be changed by them, and 2) all other types of discourse are organized around authoritative discourse and their existence depends on the position in relation to it, but they cannot interfere with the coding of authoritative discourse which is immutable and therefore unquestionable (Yurchak, pp. 14-15). Bowers (1996) notes that the power structure sets not only the language rules, but also sets the ground rules for which the language functions (p. 493). Yurchak classifies the function of language into two categories as described by Austin (1999) – performative utterances and constative speech acts (as cited in Yurchak, 2006, p.19, 23).

What makes an utterance performative is not the intention of the speaker, but rather the accepted conventions surrounding the utterance, which require the appropriate person uttering the appropriate words in the appropriate circumstances in order to obtain the conventional results (Yurchak, 2006, p. 19). The reproduction of ritualized acts of authoritative discourse, such as the word-for-word recitation of facts

by pupils, or identical compositions written by students, became more important than engaging in their constative meaning. The internalization at the structural level of authoritative discourse resulted in the replication of fixed and normalized forms of discourse, which became an end in itself, while the constative meaning became increasingly unimportant (Yurchak, p. 25).

Yurchak notes that the younger generation of Soviet citizens born after the 1950s had not experienced the major transformations of the Soviet system, so they were particularly skilled in the performative production of authoritative discourse. This is highlighted by the contrast between the younger teacher Zane who claimed she had no difficulty creating appropriate ideological outcomes for history lessons, and Jānis, a slightly older teacher, who described how he struggled to string together the appropriate phrases.

Stalin had assumed the position of master of the authoritative discourse after suppressing political factions and debates in the party. He led the production of a widely-circulating metadiscourse on ideological representations in which literary texts, artistic products, and scientific theories were publicly evaluated as either correct or incorrect as determined by the Marxist/Leninist worldview (Yurchak, 2006, pp. 40-41). Stalin intervened in this discussion in 1950 when he launched a major paradigm shift in how authoritarian discourse was to be evaluated for accuracy. He eradicated any idealist, avant-garde remnants in thinking processes about science and aesthetics and replaced them with the 'realism' of objective scientific laws. Thus, discourse based on publicly circulating knowledge was abandoned for an independent 'canon' determined by a 'master' and based on 'objective scientific laws'. These laws were not known in advance, could not be controlled by anyone else, and therefore did not form any external canon resulting in the destruction of any form of metadiscourse.

Khrushchev pushed this one step further by ridding the metadiscourse of the master, thus leaving the authoritative discourse untouchable. The discourse became based on an implicit understanding that the meaning of authoritative texts depended on the objective scientific laws of language and was independent of anyone's subjective opinion (Yurchak, 2006, pp. 44-47). As a result, Soviet culture divided into official and unofficial culture, a binary model (pp. 4-5) in which citizens, who could not publicly discuss or participate in the process, would complain privately about the system by privately passing around unauthorized literature, and as many teachers noted, tell derogatory jokes about the system and its leaders. In fact, Milda commented that

something had to be seriously amiss with a society that was the butt of so many derogatory jokes and anecdotes.

The process of this authoritative discourse can be viewed in the language of the books, both history textbooks and pedagogical books and articles that epitomized this language of discourse. Ideological literacy became the technical skill of reproducing precise passages and structure of language, paying particular attention to linguistic form. The language became "hypernormalized" and did not simply affect all levels of linguistic, textual, and narrative structure, but also became an end in itself, resulting in static and cumbersome forms of language that were difficult to interpret at the level of constative meaning. Foreign words would be translated and highlighted by quotation marks or noted as "so-called" to indicate that these words or phrases did not subscribe to the ideological meaning "accepted in our literature" (Yurchak, 2006, pp. 50-51). Displaced agency is described as the use of long noun phrases to transform the authorial voice into the voice of the mediator – the agent of the assertion can be displaced from the author of the text (Yurchak, p. 70). This hypernormalized language became organized into specific structures, as well, by transforming the author's voice into a voice of a mediator of knowledge, rather than creator, and by shifting the temporality of discourse into the past. This ultimately created a discourse of mediated knowledge that is already known rather than as a new assertion (p. 60). This form of mediation of knowledge rather than assertion is clear in the teachers' recounts of both oral and written presentations where students would regurgitate memorized statements as opposed to discussing the topic in their own words. As I was interviewing the teachers, I also became acutely aware of my own lack of the ability to understand some of this hypernormalized authoritative discourse. While the majority of the teachers were very open and free in their discussion of their experiences teaching history, some, most notably Anna and Dace, would often use long sentences including complex terminology with which I had not yet become familiar. Some would repeat an oft-cited phrase and smile knowingly, at which point I would have to ask for explanation as to its meaning. Also, all the teachers consistently used the passive voice in discussion, and I would frequently ask for clarification as to who committed the actions they were describing. This ever-increasing and refined control over what teachers would say indicates the effective function of state control over the educational process as discussed by Depaepe (1998), particularly Elias' view of external compulsion becoming internal compultion and Foucault's ideas on normalization of that which was once considered abnormal (p. 16).

While many of the respondents agreed that unified curriculum and teaching materials was a positive factor, the same number agreed that the curriculum was biased and ideologically slanted as previously noted in Table 5. This was particularly noticeable in the teaching of Latvian history and will be discussed in greater detail further on in this section. How the teachers taught this curriculum was also under constant scrutiny. The efficacy of the unified methodology courses can be noted in virtually identical descriptions from every teacher about how he or she conducted his or her history class.

The typical history class would begin with calling on students to recall information from the previous lesson. Sometimes additional questions would be asked of the students. Some of the teachers noted that in classes that had 36 and even 44 pupils, they would divide this recall session into several parts – one group of students would be required to write answers to questions posed by the teacher about the previous days lessons, while other individuals would be asked to orally answer questions. Using maps to check knowledge appeared be a popular strategy, and Roberts noted that maps were one thing the classroom was not short of, even though they were published in Russian, not Latvian (#8; 20.11.06). Several teachers noted that to 'activate' the class, supplementary questions would be posed to other members of the class, not only the student called upon. The teacher would assign grades for these responses, both oral and written.

The teacher would then present the new information to be learned. Sometimes the information would be supplemented with illustrations, the most important names and dates would be written on the chalkboard, unfamiliar words and concepts, and so on. Pupils took notes. Karla noted how she encouraged her students to draw illustrations of what she was relating in their notebooks, a practice she enjoyed and learned from one of her history teachers when she went to school (#8; 14.08.08).

Towards the end of the lesson, the teacher would quiz the students on the material covered in class and assign homework. Homework usually consisted of reading an assigned number of pages. At the end of the lesson that lasted 45 minutes, the teacher would assign a mark indicating the behaviour of the class during the lessons and note this in the class daybook. Classes would be supplemented with trips to museums and historicly significant sites in Latvia.

This description did not deviate in any of the teacher recounts. The lessons were typically teacher driven with focus on reproductive skills, rather than thinking or analysis skills, in the modern understanding of these skills, and the teacher was clearly

the presenter and the pupils the recipients of knowledge. Lesson structure remained consistent, and presentation of historic material was also relatively consistent, because all teachers used the same books and supplementary materials. However, all the teachers discussed how he or she would labour creating their own materials to supplement lessons.

Zane, who taught in the countryside, described how she spent hours poring over Russian travel magazines collecting additional information and photos, cutting and gluing them and creating materials to supplement history lessons (#5; 13.06.08). Karla mentioned that her father-in-law traveled to Egypt and that she would use his slides to supplement lessons on ancient Egyptian history. Other students would also bring photos from their parents' trips abroad to class. Karla's father-in-law also happened to teach history, and she would use the schematic drawings he had created to illustrate historic events. Karla also noted the use of a beautifully illustrated book sent to her by a relative from abroad about North American Indians, which her pupils leafed through with great interest. Karla is also the only teacher to mention the use of any non-Russian materials in her class (#5; 14.08.08). The younger teachers had more books and access to travel information previously unavailable to many of the older teachers, but participation in seminars where teachers would share in their experiences was more prevalent among the older teachers and those who taught in rural areas.

Lack of foreign materials was a source of frustration expressed by all teachers – text was strictly forbidden, but illustrations were more available. The strict process of censorship led to the banning and destruction of 'ideologically unsound' materials. Most foreign materials, as well as pre-1940 materials, were placed in 'restricted access' collections. Very little of the foreign materials that were sent to Latvia actually made it into libraries and were diverted to Moscow. In addition, Latvian libraries were required to buy copies of Soviet publications, depleting meager library budgets. The status of individual libraries depended on its holdings, so the emphasis on the development of library collections focused on quantity of material, rather than its educational or cultural value.

West and Lowe report that libraries were also a means of control, as librarians were charged with the ideological task of monitoring and spying on readers and colleagues alike by listening in on telephone conversations and checking what users were reading (1998, p. 60), although not all librarians did so. This lack of access to materials was not just limited to foreign sources. The many examples of creation of teaching aids supports Heer's claim that the regime fostered stratified levels of access to

historic sources and professional discussion as funneled to them through the approved hierarchy (Heer, 1971, p. 52-53). Access to several classes of state documents according to one's position, the amazing spectrum of types of publications and sizes of editions designed to keep more exploratory or revisionist research in the hands of a tiny circle of scholars, and official censorship of all published materials indicate that knowledge and access to information was stratified, and the average history teacher was far down the pecking order. History had become static, and the teacher was no longer an active participant in the writing of history, as history had already been pre-determined by the teleological nature of Marxism/Leninism.

Ilze mentioned month-long practical seminars that would take place in Riga as a source of material (#6; #11; 19.06.07). She described how teachers would participate and share examples of practical ideas for creation of materials, and how that was something she was never taught in teacher training in Daugavpils. Zane, who taught in a rural school described what she considered to be very fruitful discussion of successful practice in methodology seminars held in the local town. Reports of these discussions would be forwarded to Riga (#6; #11; 13.06.08). The teachers I interviewed never mentioned having any of their work published in the pedagogical journal *PLS* or the teacher newspaper. Many respondents also mentioned reading as much historic material as was available to them to make their history lessons more interesting. Most also noted that they were more interested in cultural history rather than political history. The politicized nature of the course material resulting in control over content and assessment was clearly one reason for this choice of focus.

The respondents were divided about the positive nature of control over teacher performance. In general, the younger teachers noted that general control was beneficial for the system as a whole, although some complained about the amount of paperwork involved. All the teachers who taught during the Stalin era expressed a negative attitude towards teacher observations. The older teachers commented more consistently about the amount and strict control of their work and performance. There was no consistency as to who was responsible for controlling and assessing teacher performance, and the teachers interviewed mentioned curriculum chairs, school directors, other teachers, and even Communist Party functionaries among those who came to observe and comment upon lessons. This overlapping of functions and duties is characteristic of totalitarian regimes, and served to intimidate teachers and instill a strict adherence to the status quo. The amount and type of work was also a means to control teachers.

One of the oldest respondents, Roberts, spoke of the amount of pupil work to be corrected on a daily basis that included homework and tests for all his classes. His work would be checked daily by the curriculum head to ensure that every question was properly corrected, and he cited the exceptional amounts of work as influential in his decision to teach history. He initially wanted to teach Latvian and spoke of the likelihood of having a class of 44 students in addition to other classes, and how all students' work had to be marked daily. Robert's wife was also a teacher, and he described his life by stating: "Normal people went out. Young people were having fun, but we were at home surrounded by our piles of notebooks. We had to check to find every mistake, because the curriculum head checked them regularly. So I decided that history is a subject with much less marking, and chose to do that…" (#7; 20.11.06).

Arnold taught in a town school and spoke of how the Communist Party Secretary would observe his class every month and "comment on methodology, not pedagogical principles." (#7; 10.02.07) He noted that he only taught history for two years until he was replaced because, as he admitted, he was causing too much trouble (#10; 10.02.07).

Anna was more evasive when questioned about observations (#7; 19.06.07). She did not describe this event as being particularly unpleasant. She became the regional head for the history methodology commission and would attend seminars organized by the Ministry in Riga where she would be informed about methodological principles, which she would then pass on to the teachers in her region. Anna noted that the teachers visiting other schools would observe how well the teacher led the lesson, how engaged the students were, how much they knew, and how well students answered questions. The visiting team would also observe student independent work skills and use of original documents, such as they were at the time.

Ilze, who taught in a larger city, expressed frustration at the frequent observations. She complained how history was considered an ideological subject and was, thus, reviewed more frequently than other less politically controversial subjects. Ilze did not specifically state who came to observe, but her description indicates it may have been observers from several different offices. She said that the teacher never knew who would be observing, and that one observer would complain that the lesson did not sufficiently stress patriotism, another would claim insufficient anti-religious education, and yet another would note a lack of discussion of Soviet work principles. Ilze laughed, indicating the absurdity of the situation, as she described how these observers would stress meeting such ideological requirements in her lessons on the ancient and medieval

world (#7; 19.06.07). She also described how students, who would sometimes cause trouble in class, would often be supportive of her and make an effort to participate and answer questions when she was being observed. Indeed, the inspectors who were charged with reviewing teacher performance were themselves directed to also actively cooperate with the Communist Party by participating in teacher unions and pupil Pioneer organizations, thereby ensuring proper communist up-bringing in all aspects of education and up-bringing.

This checking of one institutional bureaucracy by another, characteristic of totalitarian regimes, has been well documented in all aspects of Soviet society, including historiography. Heer (1971) describes an imperfectly coordinated and sometimes competing multiplicity of research institutes, journals, and publishing houses manipulated by the party elite, known as 'family circles' that were based on old school ties or common institutional or scholarly associations and opinions, unlike economic circles where gains were often material. But for historians, this offered access to publication opportunities, professional prestige, and in some cases protection from exposure for shoddy research practices or even plagiarism (p. 50). Not all the teachers interviewed reached this level or desired to further their professional goals within the system, but it serves to illustrate the purposefully secretive and complicit nature of the system, which frustrated everyday life for many of the teachers. It also shows the limitation of the teacher's function as that of presenter of information, and no longer that of active participant in the writing of history, as encouraged in the parliamentary period of independent Latvia.

The majority of the respondents noted that teaching as a profession was highly regarded in society. The scientific status given to pedagogy, as well as history, fit well with the high status the Soviet system placed on exact sciences over social sciences. This was especially apparent in higher education. Yet, the respondents were not equally positive about the prestige of teachers in society.

Students were for the most part respectful, and parents would defer to teachers in educational matters. However, teachers were not paid for all the extra-curricular work performed outside class, as Milda noted. They spent vast amounts of time preparing materials for class and correcting homework and tests. Many of the teachers also noted that they would lead the school's History Club and help secondary school students prepare for entrance exams for the Faculty of History. All these activities were described as voluntary, although younger teachers were often assigned the job of leading the History Club, as described by Karla, for which teachers often received no

remuneration. Nevertheless, by their own admission, the history teachers were passionate about their subject and were willing to participate.

They also viewed the opportunity for students to participate in all types of extra-curricular activities free of charge as a positive feature of the Soviet system as noted in Table 6.

Table 6

Assessment of Extra-Curricular Requirments in Soviet Curriculum as Indicated by Percentage of Teachers

N=19	**Positive (%)**	**Negative (%)**	**Undecided (%)**
Obligatory participation in events and Communist Youth activities	15	55	30
Free extra-curricular activities and obligatory work education (community work, summer practicum).	95	0	5
Teacher/student relationships	50	15	35

Teachers were also expected to accompany students on excursions outside the school day and were required to participate in all parades and other Communist Party organized public events. It is, however, interesting to note that the teachers did not complain about the amount of time spent away from their families when participating in these compulsory activities, even though they specifically mention the requirement to do so.

The Soviet education system placed up-bringing at the top of its priority list and forced many teachers to preach a value system foreign to Latvians, particularly immediately following the war. This intense scrutiny of history teacher performance indicates that while teachers in general may have been highly regarded, history teachers were not to be trusted and needed constant surveillance, particularly during the Stalin era. The majority of teachers agreed that obligatory participation in Communist Party events and other school functions was not a positive aspect of the Soviet education system. This focused on the ideological nature of the events they were required to attend. The highly ideologized nature of public events, as well as history lessons, also led to incidents of misbehaviour on the part of the students, and several teachers described the need to protect students.

In general, none of the respondents or interviewed teachers noted any consistent or severe discipline problems. Most of the discussion of misbehaviour dealt with incidents in class that challenged the system and not the authority of the teacher. Ilze expressed frustration and a sense of powerlessness as she described challenges experienced in class. Everything that was positive was related to socialism and everything negative was attributed to capitalism. She related an incident when a Grade 8 student raised his hand and asked:

> 'Teacher, why does capitalism rot, and rot, and never completely rot?'… and it doesn't collapse, and I stand there, understand? Stand like a fool in front of the class. And I don't know how to tell them. But I was thinking the same… I was not raised a communist… but I taught [material] I was told [to teach]. I stood in front of the class while they smirked at me, when I told them that everything over there was bad, and everything here is good. The children smirked. So it was. (#10; 19.06.07)

Roberts described this type of behaviour as outrightly bold and brazen. He described a discussion with his pupils about Soviet elections:

> Well, the children say what is the point in voting, if there is only one candidate? There is no choice … the work collective have discussed this and have chosen him, and now he is the candidate. And then [the students], and rightly so, say elections aren't necessary. And I had to agree with a grin, that maybe they aren't necessary. But no – the argument is that you can cross out his name. Cross him out and he won't get elected. But … we know that is for the birds, yes? (#10; 20.11.06)

Roberts noted that some of the students were not afraid of speaking out, but he also related an incident when a pupil was so brazen in his public speaking that Roberts had to interrupt him. "I had to go talk to his dad and tell him that he will take down the whole family speaking like that. I told him, 'Don't talk like that at school, you see, in front of the whole class.'" He noted this as a special incident in which he had to protect the pupil, but this was not an isolated incident.

Milda, too, described an incident when she had to explain reality to a student who described the Red Army incursion into Czechoslovakia as annexation. Authoritarianism was not a term used at the time, according to Milda, and this child was called out, but continued to argue by supporting his argument on statements made by Lenin claiming that action was annexation.

> I had to call his mother. [The student] confronts me saying he is correct. His mother was a school director. He can enroll without taking the exams. We were telling him that …if he chooses the role of the dissident, that things would be so. I explained to him that Lenin teaches this in a revolutionary situation. We are not in a revolutionary situation. Being a dissident will mean repressions. His mother was crying – her only son, Grade 11…

Yurchak (2006) notes that dissidents caused problems for peers and colleagues and their behaviour was considered abnormal. Political protest was tantamount to moral indecency and was equally unhealthy (p. 107). Yurchak's placement of overt political protest and moral indecency in one basket illustrates Stalin's lasting influence. While Yurchak's discussion deals with political dissention as a whole, many of the actions of the teachers were to protect their students, particularly if the dissention was based on nationality.

Teachers were also assigned a homeroom class, and Roberts described one of his homeroom classes in which he knew all the pupils and their families, and how they all traveled to the countryside to celebrate the end of the school year. Roberts related how they sang completely innocent songs that, nevertheless, were not known to the pupils because the songs were of the previous generation of independent Latvia. He taught them a song, and they all sang in subdued voices as they stood around in a circle. Even though it was an 'innocent' song, they all felt the need to hide the fact they were singing it. His close relationship with the pupils and mutual trust allowed both teacher and pupils to participate in what appears to be insignificant, yet obviously politically inappropriate, and even dangerous activity.

Misbehaviour, as described by Ilze, was often due to the inappropriate nature of the material presented to the class. She was required to teach the works of Lenin to Grade 5 students, but she described this work as a philosophical treatise more appropriate for secondary students, with predictable results in behaviour:

> And, understand, those Latvian children sat calmly. But, those Russian children, they are more active and jolly. They were burning matches in class, throwing things around. Understand? Try sitting there for an hour and a half – with a philosophical work for fifth-grade children! (#7; 19.06.07)

Ilze also differentiated between the behaviour of Latvian and Russian children. In her general discussion of the class she noted that Latvian students generally showed more respect towards the teacher than did Russian students, but did not elaborate

whether this was because she was Latvian, or just a general sense of entitlement exhibited by Russian pupils in particular.

Misbehaviour wasn't relegated to boring classes alone. The many events they had to attend also created mistrust. Ilze continued:

> …and we had too many of those organized events. And if you take them there one, twice, then a third and fourth time, and then when you, the homeroom teacher, tell them something, the children don't believe [you] anymore. Understand? This was because you had brought them where they didn't belong. You have taken them somewhere a homeroom teacher shouldn't. But they called me and told me to bring them. Those were the methods back then. There were many events forced upon us. (#7; 19.06.07)

The 'they' Ilze refers to were not mentioned specifically, but clearly refer to an institution or individuals concerned with the political and ideological up-bringing in the school. Anna also mentioned that up-bringing lessons were the responsibility of the homeroom teacher and were highly ideologized, and it was very hard to teach 'objectively'. "That was initiated directly from the Marxist worldview; let's say the continued development of humankind and so on. It was more difficult back then." (#7; 19.06.07) The pupils did not particularly enjoy these lessons.

Only one teacher mentioned an incident that might be considered classic pupil 'disrespect' for teachers. Karla noted that she was assigned an unflattering nickname after teaching a history lesson about heretics, and the similarity between the spelling of her last name and the topic led to relatively blatant use of this term by students. She did note, though, it was not malicious.

While participation in obligatory political functions was generally considered a negative trait of the Soviet education system, participation in organizations was not necessarily considered undesirable, as noted in Table 7.

Ilze compared the current situation of the Latvian education system with that of the Soviet era, and the current lack of a sense of homeland, which she said was definitely not the case during her time as a teacher. She mentioned this as a positive aspect for kindergarten-aged children who joined the Little October Group [*Oktobrēni*], and who could immediately recognize Lenin from his portrait. Children would continue on into the Pioneers and Communist Youth and so on. She also mentioned that not all would join these organizations, but there were few parents who did not want their children to participate. The parents who would not allow their children to do so were predominantly the very religious or those who had experienced deportations. But

generally, most children joined throughout their school career. Ilze agreed that it was very ideologized and meant expressely to instill Soviet patriotism.

Table 7

Assessment of Participation in Extra-Curricular Activities as Indicated by Percentage of Teachers

N=19	**Agree** (%)	**Disagree** (%)	**Undecided** (%)
Participation in events and Communist Youth activities was a positive thing	16	74	10
Free extra curricular activities and work practices and service was a positive thing	85	5	10
Authoritarianism dominated teacher/student relationships and student individuality was ignored	60	20	20

Zane, one of the younger teachers, noted that these youth organizations, ideologized or not, were the only opportunity to express oneself and be active, so they were not completely negative. She mentioned that her education took place in a very small village and the Communist Youth was the only opportunity in town to be active. Zane's view supports Yurchak's (2006) assertion that many of these rituals were performed, because they were generally considered to be good and necessary for socialist life to be possible, and for some were the only opportunity for social activity. Although many were alienated from the boring activities, senseless rhetoric, and corrupt bureaucracy, they continued to be involved in activities designed to achieve communist goals. Yurchak claims that this was not in opposition as might appear, but rather mutually constitutive (pp. 95-96).

The final aspect of education, which elicited much discussion, was the question of attitudes towards Latvian culture, folk traditions, and language. In discussion of history didactics, Plaude (1969) uses Lenin's quote about how the Russian nation is proud to emphasize the need to teach the youth history, particularly one's own history. This statement, however, never mentions the word Latvia or Latvians, but rather highlights friendship among peoples and socialistic patriotism and proletarian internationalism, and the need to know the Homeland's history (p. 156). The homeland refered to is not explicitly stated, but implies the Soviet Union, and not necessarily

Latvia. This view frequently appears in teachers' descriptions of conflicts surrounding identity issues.

Table 8

Assessment of Soviet Views on Latvian Language and Culture in the Curriculum as Indicated by Percentage of Teachers

N=19	Positive (%)	Negative (%)	Undecided (%)
Attitude towards Latvian folk traditions and language	20	40	40

Table 9

Assessment of Actual Opportunities for use of Latvian Language and Culture as Indicated by Percentage of Teachers

N=19	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)	Undecided (%)
Schools provided limited opportunities for use of Latvian folk traditions and language	40	45	15

Tables 8 and 9 indicate that teachers were divided on this question. Soviet law required opportunities for education and culture in each republic's mother tongue, and all the teachers indicated that at least some form of Latvian language and culture was available in schools. However, some teachers described nuances that indicated a bias against Latvian culture and language. Arnolds stated: "The Latvian language and traditions were not inhibited, but there were 'uninhibited' opportunities to use the Russian language and Russian language materials." (#9; 10.02.07) This implied that Latvian resources were small in number because of the lack of importance and status afforded the language.

Arnold's implication was not imagined and based in fact, as previously mentioned in the discussion about articles published in *PLS* encouraging teachers to learn Russian, as history textbooks in Latvian would not be published for some time. Shafir (1995) states that Russian immigrants, as members of the dominant ethnic group of the USSR, not only had the advantage of Russian as the language of central authority, but an abundance of readily available and cheap educational and cultural materials. Russians, recalcitrant in their willingness to learn Latvian, increased interaction with other Slavic immigrants to Latvia, thus reinforcing their distinct

cultural identity. For Latvians and other Balts, Russian economic control coupled with cultural separatism was experienced as greater Russian chauvinism and colonial control (p. 145).

Arnolds also noted that something Russian had to be incorporated into all aspects of Latvian cultural life, whether it was the Song Festival or simple school events. Latvian history and culture did not feature as part of the curriculum and was only mentioned in passing as part of the general history of Russia, such as mention of Latvia during the reign of Peter I, as described by Anna (#9; 19.06.07). Latvian history was, by and large, ignored or portrayed in a negative light through references to activities of World War II. Mention of Latvian history in the first post-war years usually occurred as challenges by students of facts the teacher stated in class as described by the interviewees.

Latvian history was not introduced into the curriculum until the 1950s and was the source of much discussion at the time. One of the champions of this cause was Milda Vernere, who was a director of a school in Riga and a deputy in the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet. She was born in Russia and was one of the repatriated Latvians that answered the call to return to Latvia. Milda freely admitted that she enjoyed many privileges not afforded other teachers, because she was born in Russia. She was also self-deprecating and admitted that she became a school director and member of government, not because of her abilities, but by birthright.

She described her education in a village predominantly inhabited by Latvians in northwestern Russia, and how learning took place in Latvian until 1937/1938, after which Stalin decreed all minority language schools be closed. She began school the next year in Russian, although she did not speak the language. Milda noted that although she originally wanted to study philology in Latvia, she did not consider her skills in Latvian or Russian good enough to enter this faculty. She attended the Riga Teacher Institute and later the State University of Latvia. She also noted some elements of fear as she described how her parents were kulaks “several times over”, and that her father fled to Central Asia during the Stalin purges. Once the war started, kulaks were no longer of interest, and her father returned to the family. In her biography, Milda noted that she would downplay her family status and would write that her parents were peasants of average wealth, even though she had considerable standing because she had been born in Russia.

Milda admitted, as well, to a certain naiveté in her actions and beliefs. She stated that she believed what was written in the Soviet Constitution and acted according to

those beliefs. One of her major battles was the introduction of Latvian history as a separate course of study in schools, as well as the addition of a year to obligatory schooling. This was suggested as a means to reduce the amount of work for pupils because of additional courses taught in Latvia, not just in language, but also in the arts. This took place during the Khrushchev thaw in the late 1950s and early 1960s as she describes:

> I was a deputy and, being naïve, I wrote Khrushchev a letter explaining that this was no bourgeois nationalism that we were proposing, but we read the constitution, which states rights, and we are asserting our rights. I was reprimanded that we have become overly nationalistic. That happened frequently in education….Also in language, because the fault was with nationalism, resulting in such a decree by a socialist ruling body requiring that anyone who comes to Latvia must learn Latvian within two years. That raised quite the uproar. They sent responsible party leaders from Moscow, and Russians had a hard time then learning languages. Everybody knew that – they couldn't learn languages… (#7, #10; 14.02.07)

Milda's description of the events of this period coincide with general agreement of this period in Soviet history as the first in which the Russian language was officially thrust into the primary role of all Soviet peoples. Oral histories by the former and current faculty members of Liepaja Pedagogical Institute (LPI), founded in 1954, desribe the requirement that all documentation, even course descriptions for foreign language classes, be translated and submitted in Russian (Medveckis, 2004, p. 106). A LPI faculty member considered the reprimands by department head at comments uttered in Latvian during meetings to be demeaning (Medveckis, p. 41). In a discussion with a faculty member of Riga Technical Univesity about the use of Russian in university life, she also described feeling demeaned and subservient because of the requirement that all documentation and official proceedings take place in Russian (personal communication with Ilze Siliņa, March 2011).

Russification was aimed at persuading or coercing the members of other nationalities to learn Russian, and more demanding Russification sought to impose not only the Russian language, but also Russian cultural, political, and economic interests. All-union conferences and school reforms focused on expanding and improving proficiency in Russian throughout the USSR, and in 1984, reform went as far as requiring the teaching of Russian in Grade 1 and kindergarten classes (Shafir, 1995, p. 144).

The thaw of the late-1950s in Latvian SSR politics was short-lived, as previously discussed, and Milda was forced to resign from her position as school director. She noted that during this time Latvians became more aware, and young people dared to speak out more, particularly against the Russians. One such incident related by Milda occurred in the late 1950s when some boys founded an underground organization calling for an independent Latvia:

> …and they were discovered, but we did not notice them at school. They participated in the drama club. They had written notices and distributed them…and the KGB discovered who they were from their handwriting. The KGB did not inform the school, but reported hooliganism, but only later did we find out what it really was about. They were sent to Russia for two years, for being against the brotherhood of nations…they wanted Russians out of Latvia. They weren't against socialism, but against Russians… When this matter was being decided, the Russian ladies screamed that they had stood against the dearest aspect of socialism, against the brotherhood of nations. But the KGB said that the main thing is socialism, and the children did not stand against that… (#10; 14.02.07)

Anna noted that in her school the Russian language teacher would "stand and fall" for the Russian language. She also related how once, when she was asked to substitute for a history class taught in Russian, she incorporated elements of Latvian history and was later called into the director's office who told her that the Russian students had complained that she had spent too much time talking about Latvian history (#10; 19.06.07). Roberts noted that once when he was teaching at the State University of Latvia, he happened to mention that he thought people were happier when they married someone of their own kind and did not think 'mixed marriages' were a positive thing. He recalled that he was called into the rector's office to explain why he publicly announced that Latvians should not marry Russians, even though Roberts had not mentioned Latvians or Russians specifically (#10; 20.11.06).

Not only was the Russian language glorified, but once Latvian history began to be taught, aspects of Latvian history were also tied to the benevolence of the Soviet Union and its predecessor, the Russian empire. Milda described the main ideology that went along with Latvian history lessons: Latvia was part of Russia, it was not a separate nation, and the heart of Latvia was in Russian territory. Because of this period of Russian rule, Latvia had been able to maintain its Latvian mentality, and that this connection had enriched Latvian culture. Latvia had been liberated from Germany at the

end of World War II, and now that Latvia had come under the protection of Russia, the road to socialism and culture was secure. The Soviet era was stressed as a period of modernization with industrialization, factories, and manufacturing – all part of enriching Latvian culture. Dace noted the teaching of the relationship between the USSR and the individual republics was always written and discussed in terms of how Russia had incorporated various geographical territories and nations, but never did the question arise as to how those who were joined to Russia felt about that (#7; 14.02.07).

Latvian history was allotted a minimal number of lessons, and the materials used were overly ideological and denigrated the period of Latvian independence in the interwar years, as noted by Arnolds. The first history textbook for school use devoted to Latvian history was published in 1956, but none of the teachers I interviewed who taught at that time knew of its existence and mention that use of Latvian history textbooks only began during the 1970s. Initially, discussion of Latvian history and the way to teach it was presented in issues of *PLS*. Roberts explained that, gradually, sections of Latvian history were written by him and others and added to existing Soviet history books, but he was never acknowledged as the author of those sections. He mentioned how some "complete nonsense" was included in these texts, such as a detailed description of Lenin's visit to Riga in 1902, as if to prove the solidarity between Latvian and Russian proletariat (#7; 20.11.06). Milda also described this supposed visit by Lenin as fiction, and added that the house Lenin apparently stayed in had become a sort of shrine frequently visited by students (#7; 14.02.07).

Roberts was also the author of Latvian history textbooks, and, by his own admission, he had to include historic statements he knew not to be true. He was forced to describe the occupation of Latvia in 1940 in terms of a glorious socialist revolution by the Latvian people, and his reaction to that was, as he said: "I had to swallow that." (#7; 20.11.06) Roberts also noted that the book was not allowed to be titled Latvian History, but rather Latvian History Stories, implying that stories are not necessarily facts, and therefore not necessarily true. This was in contrast to the standard Soviet history textbook titled USSR History. Arnolds also picked up on this nuance. Despite the fact that Latvian history textbooks began to appear, they were not always available to the teachers. In fact, none of the interviewed teachers could describe a set program or methodology for teaching Latvian history. But Anna, apparently, had created her own methodology, and expressed a specific viewpoint about the teaching of history, unlike any other teacher.

Anna stated that she was a firm believer in teaching facts and that through presentation of facts alone, students would come to conclusions. She professed to teaching facts about the period of independence and Ulmanis, but added that her students would keep their opinions to themselves, even if they knew what the teacher was telling to be false. When questioned about any repercussions regarding her history lessons, Anna absolutely denied having any problems and claimed that the current trend in Latvian society is to exaggerate and highlight the difficulties of life during the Soviet regime. She described history teaching as follows: "History teaching in school teaches how we view ourselves, how we perceive ourselves, and if history is taught in one way, then you can raise people who think completely differently." She continued that literature could be highly ideologized, but not history, which was the presentation of facts. Anna continued to contradict herself several times by stating that every history teacher understood that the Red Army had occupied Latvia, but no teacher would say that openly because then they would not have been allowed to teach. She also recalled an event in 1940 when she witnessed her father asking an occupying soldier a question in Russian about what was happening, and how the soldier turned his back on her father. She said the soldiers were not allowed to speak to the locals because "we were kulaks".

With regard to the teaching of facts, Roberts also mentioned that there were ways of using the Marxist interpretation of history to actually describe the facts to students. He agreed that the interwar period was couched in terms of the evil bourgeois who had seized the wealth of the land in their own hands, but stated that the highly censoring methodology could be skirted by explaining to the students exactly how those greedy bourgeois managed to get so rich. "And that was a perfectly legal way of explaining, and no elementary school pupil complained about that." (#7; 20.11.06) However, Arnolds discovered that stating the facts did not necessarily sit well with the Soviet authorities. He mentioned that before his career change, when he was working as a tractor driver in forestry, he was involved in the Communist Youth where he was an instructor. He was required to encourage the planting of corn, but naïvely told the local farmers how much production of milk and how many head of cattle that area supported before the war and compared those figures to current production. He recalled that he was summoned to the Central Committee office: "A member of the committee said, 'If Stalin were still alive, you would not be standing before me!' So, I was a supporter of the bourgeoisie!"

Younger teachers tell very different stories of teaching Latvian history. Karla taught Grade 5 and 6 and therefore was not required to teach Latvian history, and stated that if she had had to, she would not have been able to say much because she was taught very little. She only remembered Latvian ethnography classes, art history, and some information about the Social Democratic and Communist Party activities in Latvia as part of the Communist Party history course. She could not recall any university courses on Latvian history, though she believed that more detailed information regarding Ulmanis' 'fascistic coup d'état' was required. Karla remembers her Latvian history professor well, but not what she learned. She did recall a lesson she presented to a Grade 10 or 11 class as a student teacher in which she was required to talk about 1940. She noted that the classroom teacher did not want to teach this period, so it was assigned to her. As Karla described:

> I explained as I was taught in university – how the socialist revolution occurred. A girl stood up at the back of the class and said that her grandmother says that there was no revolution. Russian tanks just drove into Latvia. The whole class was smirking, because they knew that you couldn't say that and were waiting to see how I would deal with this situation. I can't remember what I replied, probably nothing, and I just continued the lesson… And it also ended there. (#10; 14.08.08)

But she did recall a statement made by her secondary school history teacher about the events of World War II, which she quoted, because it had made such an impression upon her:

> 'It is not good for small nations to get in the way of large nations.' He stood quietly for a moment looking at us knowingly… Now that seems like nothing, but then that was brave and we all understood… It's for good reason I still remember this moment.

Karla also mentioned that this same teacher must have experienced some unpleasantness because rumours were circulating through her school about how he was no longer allowed to teach Grade 8 history. Karla mentioned that he taught her history in all grades, except Grade 8.

Gita also recounted negative experiences about teaching Latvian history mostly because she could not create quality lessons in the short amount of time allotted to Latvian history. The books were also of poor quality. In addition, she was not completely sure about what she was teaching – her parents had told her nothing because they themselves knew very little, and they had little proof of life during the first period

of independence, such as photos. Her grandparents said nothing, and her family had not experienced deportations, but she did note the air of skepticism surrounding Latvian history as presented. Gita noted that although she did not experience any repercussions for statements made of actions taken, she knew that she could not make negative statements about Russians and noted that Russians and everything Russian was overly glorified. The status quo was sacred and "… if you come to the right conclusion, then everyone will think in the same manner."

Zane described her teaching of Latvian history as a series of recitations about the negative aspects of bourgeois Latvia. She had no knowledge of Latvian history herself because her parents and grandparents would not tell her anything, stating that they did not want to burden their children – "such were the times in which we were living". However, Zane did note that she could not bring herself to tell the story which had taken on cult status in Soviet up-bringing education about the Young Pioneer Morozov who had turned in his kulak father for being an enemy of the state, resulting in Morozov's death shortly after by enemies of the state. Zane said she could not relate that story because she thought it utterly unacceptable to turn in one's father (#7; 13.06.08). Despite Zane's lack of explicit knowledge of life during the interwar period, her up-bringing indicates clinging to values of the previous era.

While the older generation of teachers had a basis in Latvian identity through initial childhood experiences and contacts with teachers who were also firmly rooted in the experience of independent Latvia, the younger teachers did not. Their relationship between personal narrative and the socio-cultural narrative they encountered, particularly between the public and the private spheres, such as school and family, was clearly full of tension and conflict. Readings in school textbooks during the Soviet era were a source of this tension in which Latvian fiction and poetry were, by-and-large, exluded and replaced by a new form of Soviet content that focused on exemplary performance, rather than the tensions and contradictions of life. Soviet values were highlighted, collective grandeur and military themes extolled, and values assigned to exemplary people and behaviour, rather than interaction between people and their environment. Rather than guiding behaviour, these portrayals served to amplify the conflict between the glorified model and actuality (Skultans, 1998, pp. 155-156), resulting in conflict as a recurring theme in the teachers' narratives.

Conformity and obedience was part of the status quo and of utmost importance, if one wanted to survive in the totalitarian Soviet regime. However, discussing the consequences is not a simple matter. The narratives described here share problems

experienced by all victims of state perpetrated violence in that these types of narrative do not lend themselves well to story-telling. The raw data of their past experiences may create the need to transcribe it in the form of a narrative, but narratives seek connections so that listeners and readers can recognize coherence, which is all about belonging (Skultans, 1998, p. xii-xiii). Discussion of this topic is sensitive and it is difficult to create coherence if people are unwilling to share. Custodianship of history by the state makes personal testimony all the more important in discussions of the effects of living in totalitarian societies.

Obedience is a unifying factor in all the recollections by the teachers. For older teachers, this obedience was clearly inspired by fear, but in the younger teachers, it was already an internalized way of life. In real terms, the Twentieth Communist Party Congress and Khrushchev's condemnation of the Stalin cult ended ideological certainty and the situation of permanent revolution, and pragmatic politics began. Continuity was ensured without the terror associated with the hero cult (Menschel, 2000, pp. 93-94).

Hamilton, Sanders, and McKearney (1995) describe the orientation towards authority in an authoritarian state and the correlation between powerlessness and disobedience. They differentiate between disobeying orders from authority and dissenting against authority. The former is reactive while the latter is proactive. They also find a contradiction between the stereotype of the obedient Soviet citizen and the decline in the legitimacy of the Soviet regime, and that evidence of alienation was high just prior to the break up of the USSR in 1991 when the legitimacy of the government was quickly falling. However, powerlessness is the most important predictor, and greater powerlessness was associated with lower predicted disobedience (Hamilton, Sanders, McKearney, p. 362).

Although older teachers expressed feelings of powerlessness on a regular basis, younger teachers described incidents relating this, as well. For older teachers it was associated primarily with their Latvian identity and family history, in particular. Many of the younger teachers had no personal knowledge of the incidents in their family histories, but were clearly aware that Latvians were second-class citizens through societal relationships. The lack of disobedience on the part of the teachers, thus, could be attributed to feelings of powerlessness, admitted or internalized.

By the end of the 1980s, the Soviet unified and centralized system had been thoroughly entrenched, and while the political and ideological façade was still intact, belief in the validity of the system had disappeared. Gita noted that not only teachers, but also society in general, for the most part, would disregard the Communist Party and

smirk at its validity, and while the majority played the political game, no one truly believed anymore. Jokes about the Soviet Union, socialism, and politics, as well as endemic corruption were rampant. However, it is a description by Karla about her final exam in history in secondary school that summarizes the bankrupt and trivialized nature of the unified and centralized Soviet system and the devaluation of Marxism/Leninism as a political philosophy:

> I still remember how at my final history exam in my last year [of secondary school] someone from the commission asked me which historic personality I would want to be like. I replied, 'The first cosmonaut Gagarin, because he was truly brave.' Everyone started to laugh and [my history teacher] said that at my university entrance exams I should, for safety's sake, say 'Like Lenin'. Another member of the commission called out, 'Brezhnev, better like Brezhnev!' (#10; 14.08.08)

This final narrative clearly indicates the fragility of bureaucratic rule and the breakdown of authority as the principle of knowledge that had been such an integral part of the Stalin era as apparent in the experiences of the older teachers. Soviet historiography had taken place at the elite level. It was a political sub-system responsible for creating traditions and legends, and the legitimization of this ideological and theoretical rationalization of policies was in the hands of the dominant factions or individuals. History, specifically CPSU history, had become the most political of the sciences, and the reduction of history to the position of deeds, and not documents, as the sole arbiter of truth affected historiography for 50 years (Markwick, 2001).

Fear was no longer a significant factor, and devaluation of Latvian history had happened by default through institutionalized glorification of the ruling minority. Teaching methods reflected this in the formalist approach to history teaching in general. The lack of Latvian history was due also, in part, to this formalism, but also to the lack of verifiable and believable materials supporting the Soviet interpretation of Latvian history. The relationship between the elite and the populace as a whole, in this case the average teacher of history, had delegitimized the symbols and rituals of not only the CPSU, but also the entire education system.

4.3.2. Analysis of pupil interviews and responses

On-line structured interviews of former pupils of history to determine their views on the teaching of Latvian history were not part of the original intent of this dissertation. However, discussion of a paper I read presenting the results of teacher

interviews relating the intrusion of power in their teaching at the Association for Teacher Education in Europe in Riga in May 2008 resulted in several listeners expressing dismay at the negativity of my findings, and many related the positive memories of their history lessons. It was suggested that I include the opinions of former pupils about these same issues. I modified the teacher questions to present them from a participant's point of view, but I largely based them on the same categories as completed by teachers of history (see original text in Appendix C). I circulated these questions, for the most part, electronically among people who are not teachers to broaden the perspective for comparison, but also had several interviews face-to-face.

The majority of pupils who participated (n=27) were born in 1960 or later. The oldest respondent was born in 1931 and the youngest was born in 1975. Of the 27 respondents, 17 attended school in larger cities, 5 in towns, and 5 in rural areas. All of the respondents attended school in the Latvian language stream. Of the respondents 15 were female and 12 were male.

Table 10

Enjoyment of History as a Subject as Indicated by Pupils of History

N=27	**Agree (%)**	**Disagree (%)**	**Undecided (%)**
I enjoyed history as a subject	78	15	7
The activities of the History Club were more interesting than history lessons	22	17	61

Most of the former pupils responded that they enjoyed learning history as indicated in Table 10. Some of the respondents added that their like or dislike of history depended on the type of history being taught. Those who commented agreed that history in elementary school was more interesting than history in secondary school. In elementary school the focus was on ancient and medieval world history, and in secondary school modern history was the main topic. One respondent commented that he liked history because in his school they mostly had good teachers who could make history come alive through the telling. Another respondent commented in great detail about the wonderful stories her teacher would tell about ancient Greece and Rome, which remain with her to this day, but the "…watery tales about Lenin have long been forgotten." Yet another specifically noted that ancient and medieval history was interesting, but her secondary school history teacher was a "…boring, dogmatic

Communist who forced the memorization of each Communist Party Congress, the years they took place, and other such related issues." Perhaps this was a form of escapism for both teachers and pupils – teachers, all apparent lovers of history, could indulge their passion in the telling of 'safe' periods of history, while pupils could escape in the romantic stories about antiquity and the Middle Ages. However, students could not escape from the boring lessons on Communist Party Congresses as all secondary school students, particularly those in Grade 11, were required to take final exams in history that included a detailed report on the latest Party Congress. These lessons were described typically as sessions devoted to recording notes that students had to memorize in order to pass the final examination. Nevertheless, all the students described most of their lessons as lecture format with much taking of notes.

It is interesting to note that although the majority of the respondents agreed they enjoyed history lessons, most were ambiguous about the activities of the History Club. Participation in an after-school history club was an option for some, but other respondents noted that such a club did not exist in their school. Others commented that they did not participate, but did not specify why. This may be a reflection of the pupil's relationship to the teacher and the interesting or boring ways the teacher approached history lessons or the focus of the activities of the club.

Table 11 indicates the respondents' views on curriculum and materials. The vast majority of former pupils agreed that there were, indeed, no materials or books from foreign sources available in class. The respondents who did not agree with this statement, or indicated that it was hard to say, did not elaborate. Perhaps the definition of foreign was not clear – during the Soviet era, 'foreign' materials were comprised of sources obtained from the German Democratic Republic and other countries outside the borders of the USSR, but firmly within the Soviet sphere of interest; materials from Western Europe or North America were strictly controlled and rarely allowed.

The vast majority also agreed that the pedagogical process was too ideologized. However, one respondent noted that she did not realize this at the time and only came to this conclusion after the fall of the Soviet regime. One of the younger respondents noted: "While this ideology was assumed, they could no longer get away with blatant and transparent lies, and [the lies] no longer existed." This statement reflects the hegemonic development of Soviet language and the resulting singular representation of reality that was, if not shared by, then presented to all people in the USSR. Because the description of reality could not be challenged or verified, the Soviet citizen could never be quite certain what was real and what was simulated, resulting in transformation of

reality as presented by the system into several different simulations of lived reality. While the nature of the system required teachers to tow the party line, they could no longer blatantly make idealistic statements about a system that did not live up to its expressed ideology. Many of these pupils understood that ideology existed, and that history had to be presented within the framework of accepted ideology, yet none of the pupil respondents bothered to elaborate on this thought. These sentiments indicate the degree to which much of the ideology, though unbelievable, had already been internalized, particularly by those born in the post-Stalin period, indicating normalization of a seemingly abnormal system and resulting groundless society.

Table 11

Views on Curriculum and Methodology as Indicated by Pupils of History

N=27	**Agree (%)**	**Disagree (%)**	**Undecided (%)**
There was little opportunity to use foreign history materials and a limited selection of information	76	9	15
Lessons were overly-ideologically biased towards the interests of the Communist Party and materials were biased and ideological in nature	76	15	9
The relationship between teacher and pupil was dominated by authoritarianism	50	33	17
Teaching methods were unified, and pupils were often passive in the learning process; history books were not interesting and of poor quality	48	33	29

Results on the discussion of school books and teaching methods, as well as pupil/teacher relations can also be found in Table 11. Soviet books were the only officially sanctioned history books in the system and most of them were translated from Russian, although Latvian history textbooks were original texts written in Latvian. One respondent noted that they were very dry and "…probably fulfilled the function they were meant to fill. However, a good teacher could make the book interesting." This statement and previous statements about the nature of history teaching of historic periods other than the 20th century and positive evaluations of enthusiastic history teachers could explain the mixed response to the question regarding the quality of history textbooks. Another respondent described how books were distributed to

students. Acquisition of new books required 'book coupons'. This respondent recalled how at the end of the school year, pupils would return their books to school so that the students in the next class who did not get new books, because of the shortage of books, could receive the used ones for free. He stated that he was often the unlucky one and received many used books, among which an history book could usually be found. He also claimed that he would "…definitely read the history books, primarily because I liked history and the books were interestingly written, once the ideological 'additional baggage' was discarded." One respondent noted specifically that "…pre-20th century [text] was generally accepted as being fine, but the bias and politicization was more acutely felt in the teaching of 20th century history."

With regard to use of additional materials in class aside from textbooks, one respondent noted: "The use of technical apparatus was mandated by the government, but often that was a 'catastrophe' because the teachers too were poorly-trained to use the machines that were quite primitive." Although the exact type of this apparatus was not specified, it may be film viewers such as noted by several teachers.

Views on relationships between pupils and teachers as well as thoughts on pupil passivity were mixed. The authoritarian nature of teaching appears to be restricted to acceptable and unacceptable topics. One younger respondent noted, "…the so-called new Soviet citizen knew which lines could not be overstepped. As long as they remained within these designated borders, they were not passive at all." Another former pupil noted that passivity was dependent on the teacher and how well he or she could engage the student in class. The respondents were generally in agreement as to the overly political nature of the materials and methods mandated, but did not agree that this methodology created passive students. However, these comments appear to indicate that the majority of the respondents equate the biased and politicized nature of the history curriculum with inferior standards of knowledge of 20th century history in particular, but not necessarily other periods of history.

Learning about the history of independent Latvia did not exist for most of the pupil respondents, as noted in Table 12. One respondent did note that independent Latvia was like the 'hot potato' that no one wanted to touch. She noted that while something may be have been assigned about that historic period, she was never asked to recall any facts pertaining to it in a history lesson. Another respondent commented:

> When I studied history, Latvian SSR history had just recently been introduced – and we were proud that we could study Latvian SSR history and not just USSR history. Of course, we viewed the material critically, but were proud about a

large part of the history – the ancient Latvians, the Riflemen, and also about achievements during the Soviet era! We critically viewed the first period of independence and particularly the entry of the USSR army, and also Russification! Some teachers were ideologically communists, but others made us understand that they had similar views as we did.

Table 12

Latvian History Education in Soviet Schools as Indicated by Pupils of History

N=27	**Agree** (%)	**Disagree** (%)	**Undecided** (%)
There were few opportunities to learn about Latvian history and insufficient attention was paid to the first period of Latvian independence	87	2	11
My parents or grandparents sometimes told me things that were different than what I was told in history class	89	7	4
I did not always believe what my teacher told me about history or what was written in Soviet history books	89	4	7

With regard to the teaching of interwar Latvian history this same respondent added:

> The period of Latvian independence was taught, bet always in an altered and negative light. We were taught about how workers were oppressed, high unemployment, the crisis, and the Ulmanis authoritarian 'clique'. Information about Latvia was just negative; it wasn't even neutral, except maybe things about Rainis…

The understanding that some teachers did not necessarily believe what they were teaching was felt:

> …through tone of voice or a sudden adoption of a 'theatrical' presentation uncharacteristic of the teacher. Also use of a stern, but not angry voice, that exaggerated the importance of what was said. If such comments elicited sniggers from pupils, they would be admonished playfully, and not with sternness, etc.

Another respondent who described her history teacher in positive terms and as being very knowledgeable, however, related an incident in Latvian history class in which the teacher became irate and extremely angry when the facts as presented were

challenged. The respondent was a pupil of history in the early 1980s and the lesson dealt with the interwar period of Latvian history. The teacher, who was generally well liked, followed the material in the text to the letter, which did not portray Latvian society in a positive light. A grandparent of this student had been deported to Siberia and one of her parents had also been born there. These adults had not shied away from relating their experiences and other historic facts about life in independent Latvia, but had been clear in warning her about relating this information outside the home. The respondent described how she and other like-minded students decided to challenge their history teacher's telling of Latvian history, and she volunteered to do so.

She rose to her feet and stated that she and others in the class did not believe what the teacher had told them or what was written in the book about the interwar period. The teacher became livid, turned 'beet red', and, as she slammed the book on the desk, shouted that everything in the book was true and could not be contradicted. The respondent noted that the teacher gave the impression that she was a true believer in communism, but she was nevertheless surprised at the teacher's violent reaction. However, she did not mention any repercussions following this incident. This shows that some pupils were exposed to alternative interpretations of contentious historic events, and not all were afraid to express their differing opinions indicating a generational shift in attitudes about possible repercussions. The fear that drove some of the older teacher respondents to reprimand pupils for such outbursts in order to protect the pupil, as well as themselves, was no longer necessary as the population did not fear the draconian measures employed under Stalin.

As Table 12 indicates, most respondents agreed that they did not always believe what the teacher taught in history or what was written in history textbooks, but one respondent differentiated between historic periods – anything pre-20th century was believable, but not the 20th century. Secondary school education was also the time when pupils questioned the validity of what the teacher was saying, according to another respondent.

Questioning history, as taught by the teachers, required that pupils have information that varied from the status quo. This information was not available through officially-sanctioned books or other teaching materials, but rather through stories told by parents and grandparents. One pupil respondent replied: "My parents told me nothing, because they didn't believe I knew how to lie, and therefore, it was better for me not to know anything." Another respondent, who was an outstanding athlete, expressed a similar attitude. His grandparents were afraid because of what they had

witnessed during the initial years of Soviet occupation, and his parents did not want to ruin any hope he had of traveling abroad with his sports team. Even though he had not heard stories, he said he could tell by looks and silences that things weren't the way the ruling order claimed. However, most respondents noted that they had, in fact, been given information by parents and grandparents that conflicted with that presented in school. One responded said: "Of course, they told me, but they also taught me the lines that I could not cross, which, as it turns out, most of my classmates also knew how to do." Discipline with regard to challenging the status quo in history as presented by the teacher was taught to children by elders as a matter of survival, and it served as a self-monitoring and self-censoring tool for the Latvian segment of Soviet Latvian society in general.

One respondent did note that while virtually all topics could be discussed, discussion of the ruling order was forbidden, and that pupils rarely did so because they were afraid, as discipline in this regard was strict. The respondents were divided on their views on the positive aspects of strict discipline, as well as the authoritarian nature of relations between teachers and pupils. This difference of opinion was not specific to an age group, but crossed all ages. Many of the respondents added comments stating that both discipline and teacher/pupil relations varied depending on the teacher and pupil. One respondent noted that he was a good student and was, therefore, well-liked by his teachers. He did note that he learned discipline during sports training and at home, rather than at school, and teachers often could not handle discipline issues at school.

This was also the case with regard to the authoritarian nature of the teacher. Half of the respondents, across all age groups, did not agree, or were undecided, about authoritarianism in the class. Several respondents noted that teachers generally had more authority when they attended school, particularly in comparison with today. However, one added that he agreed that having teachers raise themselves "unnecessarily high" was also not a positive trait. The respondents also generally disagreed with the assumption that students' individual interests and development were ignored.

One respondent, who was a pupil during the time the Soviet Union fell apart, noted how quickly her history teacher switched from one ideology to another: "She was a true Communist who was animated and passionate about her ideological explanations of history, and suddenly the next day was equally animated and interested as she taught Latvian history in a Latvian-nationalist style." The commitment to the Soviet system may be questioned here, or perhaps a survival strategy was employed, similar to the

ones used by teacher respondents during their educational careers. In follow-up comments, one respondent noted that survival strategy was important, and not all people towed the line just to survive, but to survive in order to be able to protest in the future: "If too many Latvians would have protested against the Soviet order, than even more would have been deported and annihilated – then the Latvian ratio [to Russians] would be even lower."

Table 13

Obligatory Participation in Extra-Curricular Activities as Indicated by Pupils of History

N=27	**Agree (%)**	**Disagree (%)**	**Undecided (%)**
Pupils and teachers were too often forced to participate in obligatory events	61	13	26
The Soviet school system was based on the Soviet work ethic (work on the kolkhoz, joint projects, summer practicum)	68	16	16

Extra-curricular activities were an essential element of the Soviet education system as their purpose was to instill Soviet patriotism, collectivism, and the Soviet work ethic. They were many and varied during the Soviet era, ranging from mandatory participation in political demonstrations and meetings (viewed less favourably as previously noted), to obligatory excursions to rural areas to harvest potatoes or the cleaning and maintenance of one's school. Over half of the respondents agreed that reinforcing the work ethic was a positive element of the Soviet system as noted in Table 13. But, as one respondent noted, these excursions were not optional, and some were obligatory week-long work programs. The nature of the activity often determined the respondent's response.

An obligatory work practicum, where one respondent was required to learn to repair trucks, took place in Russian. This same respondent expressed an intense dislike of trips to sites of Soviet battles, the Salaspils Concentration Camp memorial to the Jews and others killed during World War II, or the obligatory military education, in Russian, in secondary school and university that lasted an entire day once a week. Most respondents did not think that having students clean the school or participate in community projects was wrong. In fact, many respondents who grew up in the city

noted that going out to the country to dig up potatoes may have been hard work, but they had fun partying with their friends after the work was completed. However, one respondent did note that while these community chores were meant to teach collective responsibility, at the time it was clear to him that the system was on 'shaky' foundations, and the teachers themselves were not particularly interested in the Soviet work ethic. This highlighted the reality of the chasm in Soviet society in terms of hierarchy and power in the daily operations government and society. In management structures, the human consequences of totalitarianism are represented in vertical differentiation in organization, leading to narcissism among the elite and cynicism among the participants. The direction of the participant's life is not self-determined but ceded to another, resulting in that the "…definer of happiness is not the person whose happiness is being defined…" (Schwartz, 1987, p. 41). This forced fulfillment of civic duty by the pupils with teachers leading the way was an expected requirement of the Marxist/Leninist educational philosophy without regard to the wishes, aspirations, or capabilities of the type of work in which the pupils would have liked to engage.

Participation in meetings and demonstrations was also mandatory, as was joining the Communist Youth movement. Some younger respondents noted that at the time, participation was a positive experience, and they learned to organize and develop other practical leadership skills. Another noted that while membership in the Communist Youth helped in career building, others managed to succeed in life without joining. By the late 1980s, belonging to the Communist Party was no longer a requirement for entrance to university, as it had been before. Participation at meetings was still obligatory, as noted by another respondent, who recalled people knitting, doing homework, and other quiet activities while ignoring the proceedings. This lack of attention was blatant, and another respondent noted that when she first attended these meetings, she paid careful attention and hoped to actively participate in discussions, but this opinion soon changed: "When I realized that discussion was not expected at these meetings, I quickly understood their purpose and started bringing something to do." When the call to vote was made, all would raise their hands in unison in favour, not really knowing what they were voting for as discussion and dissention were not possible and did not occur. Meetings were often considered a waste of time and appear to have been particularly disliked, but, like the teachers who responded, they participated because it was an unpleasant, yet required aspect of socialist society. Another respondent agreed that many people did not join the Communist Youth, and that by the

late 1980s, joining the Communist Party was no longer a requirement to further one's career, but:

> … many joined, like the Lithuanians had done, to gain a majority in the Communist Party… For instance, one communist was a kolkhoz director [in Ķekava] – and he tried as much as possible not to employ Russians – and even today Ķekava is Riga's most Latvian suburb! He was a Berklavs' type of Communist[2] – he swallowed that bit in order to secretly support Latvian interests, and it's a pity there weren't more like him. If the USSR had not fallen apart, I would probably have considered becoming a Communist, so I could do things to benefit Latvian interests that I could not do otherwise. I sympathize with Ziedonis, Skulme, and Vācietis[3] who were Communists, but Latvian patriots. This is a very important thing, and one must not paint all communists with the same brush!"

Although the respondents generally agree that the overall system of education and teaching of history was biased and politically ideologized, most expressed sincere fondness for their history teachers. Because of her seemingly contradictory answers, one of the oldest pupil respondents felt compelled to give a more detailed testimony of the education system and the values she learned:

> My [answers] may appear a bit strange. This is because I was very lucky – secondary school history …lessons were always very interesting, specifically because [the history teacher] allowed pupils to express their individuality and also explained things in a lively and engaging way, and always significantly added to the material printed in the book. Even now, 50 years later, I remember how I looked forward to his classes. Of course, and unfortunately, these were not Latvian history lessons… we all understood very well, that it is not our teacher who creates the school curriculum, and they are not responsible that only a few lessons were devoted to Latvian history. I came in contact with those pointless subjects such as 'scientific communism' or Communist Party history in university, but I have no such memories about secondary school!... Despite the fact that my school years and youth took place under a totalitarian regime, teachers, the same as my parents, taught me to honour basic values – virtue, heart-felt wisdom, and true knowledge.

[2] Berklavs was one of the national communists who tried to initiate reforms during the late 1950s, and with whom Milda Vernere was associated.
[3] Notable Latvians in the arts.

The pupils of Latvian history expressed similar sentiments about the education system to those of many of the teachers. The pupil respondents noted that history teaching was clearly geared for purposes of understanding the progression of society and its inevitable march towards communism. History teaching was interesting, as long as it did not involve the teaching of 20th century and Latvian history, which would inevitably digress into politicized discussions and statements of facts that pupils, and some teachers, believed to be dubious in nature, but they were not entirely sure because of insufficient facts and information. In addition, some, but not all pupils, heard different versions of more recent Latvian history at home. Teachers on the whole were interesting in their presentations of history, but some pupil respondents also noted deficiencies in materials and practices by some teachers. The quality of textbooks and materials were also tied to the historic period being taught, with positive comments associated with materials and books not related to the teaching of 20th century or Latvian history.

5. HISTORY TEACHING IN INDEPENDENT DEMOCRATIC LATVIA (1991–2008)

Readings (2000) notes that the collapse of the Soviet empire had less to do with the social impact of rampant acquisition of consumer goods than with the rejection by nationalities within the USSR of the Soviet government's claims that Marxist doctrine speaks for universal human nature (p. 112). This rejection of the anti-humanist nature of Marxist/Leninist historic doctrine was clear, but what was not clear was its replacement. Fifty years of intense Russification and Sovietization had left its mark, and renewed Latvian independence offered yet another challenge to history teaching. Debate focuses on specific aspects of Latvian history, as well as methodological approaches. As this is an on-going debate, I will briefly touch on some of the most salient aspects of the current discussions.

For the third time over the course of a century, Latvians are faced with the task of reviewing and rewriting their history. History teaching in the post-Soviet period of Latvian independence reflects various views of history that include internalized Soviet axioms, historic interpretations adopted from the interwar period, and modern views. Education is nationally-based and includes democratic principles. Research in general education practices, as well as the content of history textbooks, are quite liberal and focus on the most modern educational perspectives. Of the ten teachers who participated in the semi-structured interviews, only Gita and Roberts have continued to teach history since Latvia regained its independence. Gita described the removal of old textbooks in the early 1990s resulting in teachers, once again, creating new teaching materials to replace the ones that were no longer politically acceptable. Even textbooks about ancient history were pulled from the education system, because the focus was on class struggle, no longer an acceptable basis for the interpretation of history. The teaching of Latvian history as a separate subject continues to be a debated issue, and Roberts, as well as some pupil respondents, expressed frustration on this question. Roberts stated that he could not understand how after so many years of occupation and the struggle for the teaching of Latvian history as a separate subject during these times, many educators and historians can express the opinion that Latvian history should be taught as a part of world history in general, and not separately.

To date, Latvian history is incorporated within the framework of European and world history. Gita noted that one-third of class time devoted to history is required to be

devoted to Latvian history, but did not state how frequently or closely this was monitored. The exemplar of the unified Latvian and World History curriculum for Grades 6-9 published in 2005 offers the following single goal: "Improve pupils' understanding of the main elements of the development of humanity so that they may develop a national and European identity and to encourage the development of responsible, tolerant, and democratic national and European citizens" [Pilnveidot skolēnu izpratni par cilvēces attīstības pamattendencēm, lai sekmētu nacionālās un eiropeiskās identitātes veidošanos, veicinātu atbildīga, toleranta un demokrātiska savas valsts un Eiropas pilsoņa izaugsmi] ("Latvijas un pasaules vēsture 6.–9.klasei", p. 4). The word Latvia or Latvian does not appear in this goal.

The Grade 6 programme introduces history and historic thinking focusing on pupils' perspectives on their immediate surroundings and then expands to include Latvia, Europe, and the rest of the world in ancient times. Grade 7 focuses on medieval history – Latvian, European, and world, as well as research skills and presentation of arguments, with teacher assistance, by using history concepts. Pupils in Grade 8 study modern history and are expected to begin forming and defending personal opinions, as well as understand the possibility of different perspectives. The Grade 9 curriculum discusses Latvia, Europe, and the world from World War I on and includes understanding of the causes of historic events of this period. Pupils are also expected to learn how to conduct research using various resources, work independently, and create and defend arguments based on their skills and knowledge. A brief look at the two suggestions for organization of the Grade 9 programme indicates a total of 70 40-minutes lessons are to be devoted to all history from World War I on. The proposed plans offer quite specific suggestions on how many lessons could be devoted to specific topics and include the main concepts to be discussed. Suggestions for methodology stress development of both knowledge and thinking skills. However, I found no mention of specific textbooks, internet sites, or other resources that teachers could use to present these lessons in the democratic manner suggested.

In 2008, two versions of a new Latvian and World History curriculum were introduced to be implemented in the 2009/2010 school year for secondary school pupils – Grades 10-12. The goal of this programme is: "Encourage within the learner the comprehensive development of an identity representative of a democratic and civic-minded member of society through investigation of Latvian, European, and world historic processes" [Sekmēt izglītojamā kā demokrātiskas un pilsoniskas sabiedrības locekļa identitātes daudzpusīgu attīstību, izzinot Latvijas, Eiropas un pasaules vēstures

procesus] (“Latvijas un pasaules vēsture”, p. 3). Here too, the concept of identity is not directed towards a national sense of self, but rather a supranational ideal. The programme is set more conceptually with Grade 10 mirroring the Grade 6 programme, albeit in greater detail and depth. The Grade 11 and 12 programmes both cover Latvian, European, and world history from the Middle Ages on, but vary in their contextual focus. The total number of lessons is not stated, but percentages are assigned to topics indicating suggested amounts of time to be spent on each period of history or concept. Both versions include skill-building and creative thinking aspects. This programme is supplemented with rubrics for teachers indicating suggestions for diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment, but as in the elementary school materials, does not list possible resource materials.

Renewed independence has exposed Latvia to what are deemed “Western” and “democratic” ideas about the teaching of history, some of which appear to be quite different from the didactics of Soviet history teaching previously described. This democratic trend is apparent in history textbooks as well as in discussion of methodological practice for teachers, however, the transference of these theories into didactical practice is less apparent. Fifty years of Soviet rule and Marxist/Leninist/Stalinist historiography entrenched formalist didactic practices, which discouraged critical thinking skills. The fall of the Soviet Union in 1991 required the adoption of democratic methodological practices with which history teachers were unfamiliar. Latvian historians have understood that certain periods of history, in particular, are contentious in nature because of conflicting political agendas, which have led to vastly different historiographies. Some attempts have been made to address this situation on a teaching level by several historians and teachers, as well as government officials. History teaching has been addressed at conferences and also through publications on history teaching didactics, specifically in the daily newspaper *Latvijas Avīze* in 2009, but an organized, systematic public discussion has yet to take place.

In general, history teachers in Latvia have adopted the accepted notion of history as being a multi-faceted subject, as noted in published works by several historians and teachers about the teaching of history. Gundare (2000) introduced a handbook on history teaching for teachers stating: “There can never be just one history because there exists the history of the occupier and occupied, oppressor and oppressed, rich and poor, victorious and defeated, majority and minority, and their stories are rarely similar.” (p. 5). She continues by stating that times have changed and there is no longer a ‘correct’ history, and as long as Latvia is a democratic nation and society, differing views and

opinions will be tolerated, if not respected. This handbook was designed for teachers to review the most contentious aspects of Latvian history and to help overcome the divisions in modern Latvian society. In this same handbook, Ķīlis (2000) offers a social anthropologic view of history as a point of reference for teachers (pp. 8-12), which differs greatly from the one in which they were educated during the Soviet era. The handbook offers concrete lesson plans and suggestions on how to teach what can be considered the most debated historic periods in Latvian history, including the incorporation of Latvian territories into the Russian empire during the reign of Peter I, the Ulmanis regime, activities of Latvian soldiers in the German and Soviet armies during World War II, the resistance and partisan activities following WW II, and the collectivization of the Latvian countryside. The handbook, published by the Latvian History Teacher Association, is also translated into Russian indicating that Latvian history is being taught by Russian-speaking teachers to Russian-speaking pupils.

A collection of papers presented at conferences of Lithuanian and Latvian history teachers at Daugavpils University from 1998 to 2001 (Saleniece, Šēnberga, Oļehnovičš, 2001) gives several examples of history lessons and methods currently used. Of the five papers published in Latvian, all discuss methods of teaching, but have no reflection on actual lessons. One lesson on patriotic up-bringing during history lessons in Grade 5 (Brokāne, 2001) discusses the necessity of starting at a local level for instilling patriotism. This could be achieved through trips to locally significant places, and revisited later outside of class on weekends or holidays in cooperation with the homeroom teacher and the prescribed advisory curriculum. Use of competitions to test student knowledge, which is enjoyed by all students, regardless of level of knowledge, is also a suggested method. Students can also be placed in the role of tour guide who would explain facts to fellow students.

All in all, the methods suggested by Brokāne are not much different than the Soviet methods previously described by the teachers I interviewed, and differ mainly in that the terms ‘democratic nation’ and ‘European citizen’ replace ‘socialism’ or ‘communism’ and ‘Soviet citizen’. They are replicative in nature, and do not offer students opportunities to critically assess, analyze, or offer deeper explanations for events. One exception to the Soviet model is a brief mention addressing the needs of students of other nationalities in order not to offend their own sense of national pride. Brokāne notes the need to do this with care so that other nationalities living in Latvia will also become proud of Latvia – the land in which they live. This sentiment harkens back to statements made by educators of the parliamentary era of the first period of

Latvian independence. Suggestions on implementation are not given, and reflections on actual lessons or more modern methods of developing critical thinking skills are lacking. Perhaps this can be explained by the lack of experience Latvian history teachers have with the democratic teaching process in their teacher education, which is exacerbated by a lack of didactic texts and examples of good practice in the Latvian context.

Fifteen years after the regaining of independence, Purēns (2006) published a handbook for teachers on how to teach history in a democratic society – *Kā mācīt vēsturi* [How to Teach History]. I will examine this text in greater detail as it reveals how Purēns' Soviet up-bringing influences elements of history teaching he considers hallmarks of democratic systems.

Purēns is an historian, educated under Soviet rule, and has written several history textbooks. The title of the book indicates that he offers suggestions on history teaching, and he does not hesitate to state his opinion about the positive and negative benefits of certain methods. However, it as also clear that this book contains translations of foreign texts in which he describes history teaching methods and uses terminology untraditional in the Latvian context and unfamiliar to the typical Latvian history teacher. It is also resembles an instruction manual in that it has few exemplars illustrating good practice. Nevertheless, it is one of few comprehensive texts available today in Latvian illustrating alternative teaching practices.

In his introduction, Purēns (2006) addresses the philosophical questions regarding the purpose of teaching history and history's role the education system. He states that almost all previous era societies have erred in the way they taught history. They have sinned in that they taught history in such a way as to indicate that the current society is the best. He states that authoritarianism and totalitarianism used history to prove the correctness of their philosophy of hero glorification. Other societies compare the 'bad' past to the 'good' life of the present, or their own nation's perfection in contrast to other misguided ones, thus, solidifying the nation and encouraging people to sacrifice for the good of the nation. Purēns states that democratic history teaching traditions indicate that history should be presented as a ball of contradictions where all parties have erred, and society can only be strong if it is self-critical and acknowledges its deficiencies (p. 5).

This statement appears to indicate that this is a long-standing tradition in well-established democracies such as the United States or Great Britain. However, this idealized presentation of democratic ideals in history teaching is not as long-standing as

Purēns implies. Researchers in the field of critical pedagogies can attest to the biased and decidedly white middle-class interpretations and representations of history in textbooks that were used in classrooms until very recently, and in many places throughout the 'Western' world, are still available. Pedagogies of difference, such as oppressed and feminist pedagogies, continue to challenge mainstream pedagogical ideas and are not regularly included in history textbooks.

Purēns claims that society usually does not understand the need to study history, and society does not realize that it uses its knowledge of history on a daily basis. He contends that the average citizen analyzes political campaigns, political processes, and cultural accomplishments on a daily basis. People choose holiday destinations and books in the library based on their knowledge of history. Society compares the accomplishments of its own society with that of others. Purēns continues that this is so self-understood, society neglects to ask itself how it came to such an understanding. This ingrained ability must make the reader accept the importance of history teaching, particularly in elementary school, and that learning about history is just as important as learning to read and write (Purēns, 2006, p. 6). While I would not argue the value of history lessons as a course of study, Purēns confuses erudition with critical thinking skills. Deciding to visit Egypt because of a fascination of the pyramids acquired in an ancient history class is vastly different from being able to analyze political campaigns and make decisions based upon these analyses. Purēns misguidedly assumes that all former history students have acquired the critical analysis skills needed to make such decisions.

Some discussion about history and its effects on patriotism can be found in Purēns introduction reflecting the recent debate about the role of the teaching of history in developing and strengthening national identity throughout Europe. Here it appears that he may be conflating the generally more positive concept of patriotism with the negative associations surrounding nationalism. He mentions that Latvia has experienced both authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, and that many citizens still believe that the purpose of historians is to raise patriots at all costs, and that this view is misleading and dangerous. Patriotism is love of one's homeland, but it cannot be forced upon anyone, and patriotism based upon fear of expulsion does not encourage ties to one's homeland, but rather makes one feel hatred towards one's society (Purēns, 2006, pp. 7-8). However, Purēns does not differentiate between the Ulmanis authoritarian regime and Stalin's totalitarianism in this regard. Purēns also neglects to mention that Latvia experienced parliamentary democracy prior to Ulmanis dictatorship during which the

government actively supported innovative methodological practice and was a leader in models for minority education, although its creation of a history curriculum took on a decidedly patriotic nature. This error of omission is a classic tactic of Soviet historiography, which continues to remain evident in modern day Latvian historiography. Some may consider reminders of these omissions unnecessary and redundant for the audience of this book, but the insidious nature and effects of propaganda cannot be underestimated, and knowledge should never be assumed.

Purēns notes that the number of history lessons have been reduced in the curriculum of several countries based upon the assumption that historians unnecessarily burden children's brains with facts, and that teaching social theories would be more beneficial. Purēns states that this is misleading, as theories are only valuable when history shows us examples of their effects on society. History is the only repository of examples of social theories. If students do not know history, then knowledge of political or social theories are pointless and meaningless statements (Purēns, 2006, p. 7). Indeed, this reduction of history to a general field of study frequently called social studies or civics in the West has often been accompanied by a general reduction in the hours devoted to the subject. Historians and devoted history teachers continue to advocate for history as a separate subject stressing the critical thinking skills proper study of history can develop.

Purēns highlights some fallacies assumed by the general public as a result of history teaching didactics of the Soviet era starting by stating that only the uninformed assume that historians only retell facts in chronological order. The second common misconception, according to Purēns, is that to achieve objectivity, the teacher must teach only facts, but students only should come to conclusions. He disagrees with this method of instruction stating that in addition to generally accepted ethical norms (do not kill, steal, or lie), the basis of democracy (listen, respect, reach a consensus) needs to be taught.

Secondly, students need to understand the mechanisms by which views are formed, and that almost every statement about historic facts can be debated. However, students must be protected from having ideology forced upon them (Purēns, 2006, p. 9). Here Purēns assumes that generally accepted ethical values have remained intact in a society in which the ruling order actively persecuted those who adhered to religion, the primary advocate of ethical norms. Lying and stealing were regular occurrences in both public and private life as a means of survival for many and personal benefit for some. While most individuals may have not lost their own sense of a moral compass, the

corrupt nature of Soviet society changed the social fabric instilling in society a general belief of inevitable inherent corruption as opposed to a positive hope for moral and decent behaviour geared towards the good of all members of society.

Nevertheless, Purēns suggests that students can be taught to think for themselves without having ideology impressed upon them. This statement, again, may show a problem with translation and resulting confusion between the terms ideology and propaganda, but he does suggest methods to prevent this. All statements must be supported by facts; not only facts supporting a statement, but also contrary statements are necessary. Students need to be aware of how opinions are formed, values must be defined, which are the basis of what is being studied, and students must be able to explain how their opinions are connected to the defined value. Also, students' attempts to formulate their views must be positively supported, and they must be assisted in their formulations (Purēns, 2006, p. 10). How this is done appears to be addressed by Purēns in his brief discussion on the science and pedagogy of history.

Purēns states that history teachers must base their teaching on scientific acknowledgments. Purēns continues to use Soviet-style terminology describing what in democratic societies is generally accepted as humanities, in 'exact' science terms. He states that scientists complete research to support or refute hypotheses, and that the history teachers' job is to encourage student thought processes and ability to assess facts from various viewpoints. Teachers should be interested in 'colourful' facts to create interest and encourage reflection on the part of the student. Teachers have the right to use scientific materials and sources, such as modern interpretations of historic events, movies, and comics. They do not have to ask that students' interpretations be scientifically accurate (Purēns, 2006, p. 10). This differentiation between teacher and historian fits the Soviet mold where the teacher was the passive recipient of information supplied to him or her to be passed on to students. His description also does not suggest that the teacher is an active participant in his or her own continued education. He suggests that questions of history should be left to the 'scientists' and not history teachers, whereas passionate history teachers in democracies will take on challenging issues in history lessons. This leads into Purēns discussion of curriculum and student interests.

Under authoritarianism and totalitarianism, education policy is determined by a narrow elite group appointed by politicians. They determine what youth should learn and force their opinions upon society. Purēns asserts that democratic societies include a dialogue between teacher and student in the creation of curriculum. Purēns idealizes

democracies by implying that both teachers and students have a say in history curriculum. Careful study will show that this is highly unlikely because, democracies, like other forms of government, keep a close watch upon what is taught in schools. A quick check of most departments or ministries of education will indicate what history curriculum is to be taught in what grades and textbooks approved by the government for use in classrooms.

Such an example is Ontario, Canada where the history curriculum is clearly described in The Ontario Curriculum and lists of government-approved textbooks are found on The Trillium List – both documents are easily accessed on-line. This list of government-approved textbooks, however, does not exclude the use of non-approved materials in the classroom, but rather indicates that only approved books can be purchased with public funds. Also, defined curriculum does not exclude discussion of topics not specifically mentioned in curriculum documents, as teachers and students are not always under pressure of performing well on state history exams, which do not exist in Ontario, unlike Latvia. Finally, such discussion about content implies a degree of confidence and knowledge about history as a subject in the teacher that may not exist, as many teachers of history are not necessarily students of history.

This discussion of the short introduction by Purēns to his book indicates a very superficial and idealized look at the teaching of history in democracies. It also indicates yet another Soviet legacy, in that those who lived under the Soviet system realize the inferior nature of their system with a resulting attitude that everything foreign must be better. Teachers of history, for whom this book was written and who have limited, if any experience teaching outside Latvia, could find this utopian in nature and dismiss it as yet another example of the liberal views of teaching, which have only shown poor academic results in the West. However, this offers a point of reference for thought and reflection on the practice and purpose of teaching history.

The remainder of Purēns book offers some concrete examples and suggestions for methods to be used in history lessons. Some of the suggestions are practical in nature and understandable to the average Latvian history teacher. He also offers information on pitfalls teachers should avoid. Purēns encourages that primary sources should be carefully assessed according to the time frame and source of the material, implying that Soviet sources may not be reliable, an assertion found to be true about Soviet information in many spheres of life. Some of his suggestions are, however, tainted by the Soviet experience and could have been explained in greater detail to make

them more appealing. Such is the suggestions to use classic debates and discussion as a means of expressing oneself.

During Soviet occupation, after Communist Party meetings, the floor would officially be opened to debate, but predictably, no one would actually express their opinion or thoughts, as that was not what was expected or desired, but rather only agreement with the Party line. Purēns could have addressed this issue by offering examples of informal debates, which do not require the discipline needed to perform a classic debate, and are more inclusive. His discussion on assessment consists almost exclusively of reproductive assignments similar to assignments given to students in the Soviet era, as well as during the period of Latvian independence before World War II. He includes an example of a rubric, as well as inquiries as to the students' capability to create his/her own assessments and come to conclusions, but does not offer exemplars of what could be considered upper level work in comparison to lower level work. Purēns gives very few examples of the type of assignments and strategies he suggests to teachers adopt.

The conclusion of the book asks the teacher to reflect upon his/her work. This, too, does not come easily without practice and some indication of what part of the teaching and learning process needs reflection. Purēns compares the previous totalitarian system to newly independent Latvia by stating that the totalitarian education system was formal, and completion of assignments was of primary importance. He claims that in democracies knowledge has a different function in that formal requirements and testing are less important than realizing how the student will use his/her knowledge in every day life. Purēns' stress on the use of factual knowledge in every day life belies the claim by leading Latvian educators of the importance of learning critical thinking skills, which can be developed during the study of history. He cites various Internet sites on Latvian law regarding teaching standards for history and information about centralized exams as an appendix to the book, as well as other educational sites that may be useful to history teachers. However, the educational sites are predominantly foreign sources focusing on the needs, requirements, and educational culture of the education system in foreign countries. During Soviet occupation, foreign examples of practice consisted of work from other communist-led countries or Russian models. Today, Purēns adopts a similar tactic by using only Western examples, ignoring any possible positive contributions current Russian or other ex-Soviet bloc country's teaching practices may offer.

While the purpose of this book as a didactical handbook might seem clear on the surface, its dense nature could be overwhelming for a new teacher of history, or for those who have not had training in this style of teaching. The book would have been well served by the addition of concrete examples for the many practices Purēns indicates. It also appears that, despite a lack of references, this book is based on translated sources, and the terminology and concepts might be misunderstood, if not completely foreign, to local Latvian teachers. This didactic offering to teachers attempts to assist teachers in approaching history teaching in a purportedly democratic fashion. Recent history texts have also exhibited similar tendencies.

History textbooks authors in Latvia have adopted a writing style used in many democratic societies. Most notably they have moved away from the blatant nationalism characteristic of both the Soviet totalitarian and the Ulmanis authoritarian regimes. As a point of comparison in the discussion of the Teutonic invasion, a modern Latvian history textbook for secondary schools (Kurlovičs, Tomašūns, 1999) is much more accurate in its description of locations and tribes using historic names, not modern national identifiers. The maps used to describe events of the time are localized, but they also include others maps that show Latvian territory within the framework of Europe to help students understand why the local map looks as it does. Language in the book is not sanitized to make Latvians look more positive in historic context, nor does it glorify historic successes.

The 20th century Latvian history textbook for elementary schools (Goldmane, et al., 2006) appears to be non-judgmental of this period of history. The book is very text-laden with quotes from contemporaries of the historic period being discussed, as well as current historians' commentaries, and it is interspersed with visual images to supplement tables and other statistics. The modern textbook attempts to offer a neutral, factual approach to the period. The Soviet occupation is also described in relatively neutral terms. There is a series of photos in the 2006 Latvian history textbook showing Soviet troops marching into Latvia – there are no images of women greeting them with hugs and flowers. Industrialization and collectivization is also described in detail, but the numbers of workers from other parts of the USSR brought in to work at these factories and collective farms are not described in as glowing terms as in the Soviet text. Like other events, this period is supplemented with entries from eyewitnesses to the era, in addition to current historians' perspectives. It is interesting to note that the 2006 text also pays relatively little attention to Latvian exiles, relegating all Latvian exile periods, not just the post-WW II period, to eleven pages out of 175, thus

marginalizing, if not excluding Latvians outside of Latvia from the fold of the Latvian nation. The pictures and descriptions of life of exiled Latvians in the West is limited to their attempts to maintain Latvian ethnicity, and the only mention of accomplishments in local society by post-WW II Latvian exiles is a photograph of a Latvian girl who won the Miss USA beauty pageant in 1963. Both these history textbooks offer differing views of historic events in Latvian history, but do not pose any questions for thought. Neither book clearly offers descriptions of conflicting interpretations of events in history, nor do they attempt to explain these differences of opinion. Such descriptions might help to build student awareness of different interpretations of history and develop a sense historic thinking.

This can only be achieved through development of critical thinking skills, a subject that is touched upon, but true reflection on this as practice appears to be lacking in current discussion on the teaching of history in Latvia. Rubene (2002) notes that educational institutions as social structures have traditionally been conservative, but the nature of the Soviet school system, where schools were specifically subjected to totalitarian ideological norms and standards, has resulted in the continuation of a closed social model, even after political transformations have taken place. She continues by stating educational institutions are not only catalysts for social change through reforms in the system, but through particular emphasis on participation in emancipatory and self-determination processes (Rubene, p. 156). This appears to be lacking, as demonstrated by comments made by one respondent whose children attend school today and who testifies to a lack of this process. She noted the similarity between then and now:

> It upsets me more that supposedly correct history teaching today is entrusted to 'strange' teachers – my youngest son can't stand history. I went to [his] school – the history teacher there is a formalist, pedantic, and completely stiff. History has to be recited like a verse, and when opinions are requested, they have to concur with the teacher's. This was clear 30 years ago when that was required by foreign power, but now? I have no supporting arguments to say that this type of history teaching is important.

This final reflection indicates that the shift from the authoritarian style of teaching to one characteristic of democracies is not a simple process. This introduction to the post-Soviet era of history teaching indicates the progression and growth of Latvian awareness in history teaching that conflicts with the internalized motivation and purpose as experienced during the Soviet regime. Unlike the national and unifying

history agenda adopted during the first parliamentary period, the current ruling order professes to view history from a democratic perspective in which a unified history creating a unified identity is no longer considered to be positive trait. The purpose of history teaching continues to emphasize gaining knowledge, although modern democratic principles would encourage a stress on critical-thinking. Research in curriculum continues to be the domain of professional historians, although research on methods and materials is taken on by teachers pursuing higher education. History books reflect the study of the Latvian history through a European-centric lens. The discussion of the realities of teaching under the Soviet system indicates that many aspects have become internalized, and a shift away from this methodology towards a more open and creative methodology does not occur naturally, and must be not only be taught, but practiced.

This may indicate, in the case of Latvia at least, that personal experience continues to be more influential than official education. The oldest teachers interviewed spoke of professors and teachers who had been educated during the interwar period and who continued to teach as they had been taught, despite the change in ruling order. Testimony from former pupils of history attest, in at least one instance, that despite the shift to democracy, some teachers are still teaching in the authoritarian style in which they were educated. The question remains whether methods adopted through a teacher's lived experience are changeable through education alone. Perhaps an entire generational change needs to take place before the entire system can be considered reflective of the democratic ideals proposed by the various bodies involved in the history teaching process.

CONCLUSION

As the goal of this dissertation defines, I have compared the democratic and authoritarian periods of Latvian history and identified the traits of history teaching peculiar to each period. Following the objectives of this dissertation, I have researched the background of teaching in Latvia in a sociopolitical and cultural context during the periods of authoritarian and democratic regimes leading to several conclusions.

The Latvian experience over the course of the 20th century reveals that periods of extreme political change are often accompanied by the revision of history, which is reflected in history teaching in schools. History curriculum changed to reflect the shift in power resulting in the marginalization, vilification, or deletion of the previous regime's heroes, myths, etc. Under the new regime, history includes the criticism and denigration of the previous regime, and a new, official history with new heroes and new interpretations is created. The consequences of authoritarian rule and associated control and threats can change teachers' perspectives leading to lasting detrimental effects on teacher self-esteem, even after the establishment of democracy.

Research into independent Latvia during the 1920s and 1930s, as well as after 1991 reveals that, along with the creation of a national state, interest in a national history and presentation of that history develops. Because previous teaching practices were no longer considered acceptable, methodological practice from abroad is adopted, for example, progressive methods used during the 1920s and 1930s and books from the West after 1991, or positive examples of methods used previously are re-examined, such as history teaching practice from the 1920s and 1930s after regaining independence in 1991.

The second and third objectives of my dissertation are discussed simultaneously within the comparison of the two periods of authoritarian regime in Latvian history as they are indubitably intertwined. Analysis of history teaching in Latvia under authoritarian rule reveals that under authoritarianism, the teaching of history falls under strict state control, and can be controlled by the authoritarian leader, as occurred both under Ulmanis and Stalin. The leader assumes the role of the 'father' or guardian of the nation claiming sole responsibility for the creation of a national history. Although these leaders are not usually professional historians, their interpretation of history is often considered the 'gospel truth' and may not be challenged or criticized.

Authoritarian regimes assign to history the task of propaganda that supports and glorifies the foundation and continued existence of the regime with focus on the celebration of the current nation and its rulers. As a result, history becomes not just a teachable subject, but also a propaganda tool that can create cynicism towards history teaching and learning.

Both literature analysis and interviews with teachers reveal that one of the functions of the teacher is primarily the medium of the power structure of the ruling order. After political change, the new order traditionally is suspicious of teachers as they are products of the old order having studied and/or taught under the previous regime. This is usually sufficient to view teachers as unreliable. This mistrust results in subjection of teachers to strict controls, often including the use of fear that ultimately leads to reduction of teachers' self-worth and level of teacher prestige in society.

Analysis of history textbooks and curricula reveals the importance of the role of the hero in history. Interviews reveal that in democracies, heroes are equally recognized as such not only 'officially' in society, but also 'unofficially' at home or among friends. Sources reveal that authoritarian regimes take this further and acknowledgement of heroes becomes idolization and glorification. Historic figures embody or are reflected in the leaders of authoritarian regimes. In occupied or colonized nations, this usually includes the official devaluation, deletion, and marginalization of the occupied or colonized nation's heroes and leaders. As a result, local figures of importance are pushed aside along with associated societal values. However, it should be noted that hero worship is not solely the hallmark of authoritarianism. Research by several authors reveals that this also occurs in democracies where power is concentrated with the president, royalty, or religious leaders.

Soviet era sources and interview analysis reveals a separation of roles under this regime – the propaganda of the regime assumes a missionary role bringing light to the people, but results in the indigenous people identifying themselves as victims. This creates feelings of helplessness and lack of self-worth sometimes resulting in deference to and identification with the foreign ruling order. This situation can continue even after the re-introduction of democratic rule.

The research also reveals differences in teaching methods in authoritarian and democratic systems. The practice of collecting oral histories and autobiographies is an accepted method of historic research. While democratic systems do not inhibit the use of such methods, authoritarian regimes control this method. In the case of Soviet Latvia, oral histories were restricted to Red Riflemen and veterans of "The Great Patriotic

War", and others equally politically acceptable. Under distinct authoritarian rule, such as that of Ulmanis and Stalin, teachers are not allowed to experiment resulting in a decidedly conservative teaching process.

This research also indicates, that in the field of the history of pedagogy, study of internal factors, which motivate teachers, such as fear, may be difficult to outwardly observe. However, each individual teacher chooses teaching aspects upon which to focus as determined by the needs of the individual teacher, or the needs of the pupil as interpreted by the teacher. These needs are determined by the political system in which teaching takes place.

Sources reveal that language plays a major role in history teaching. Under authoritarianism, language is controlled and regulated, a practice used most vividly during Stalin's totalitarian regime. The use of Russian under Soviet totalitarianism legitimized the formulation and acquisition of the "correct" version of history, particularly phrases that were demagogic or belittling in nature. Language is an important component of national identity, and the official language of history may have influenced Latvian national identity.

Several identifiers describe nationalistic history teaching under authoritarian regimes, the most significant of which are:

1. The aims of history teaching are essentially dehumanizing and designed to strengthen the status quo by propagandizing the ruling order and its heroes at the expense of the interests and ideals of the individual citizen,
2. History curriculum is changed resulting in the marginalization or deletion of the heroes and history of certain groups based upon social or ethnic identity, and replaced with new, glorified heroes,
3. The teacher is a passive transmitter of ideologically correct information and is the medium through which transmission of the official version of history takes place,
4. Curriculum and textbooks are strictly controlled under authoritarianism, but teachers have relative freedom with regard to teaching methods.

Table 14

Comparison of significant characteristics of history teaching in democracies and authoritarian regimes

Historic period	Authoritarianism		Democracy	
	Ulmanis authoritarian regime 1934-1940	**Stalin totalitarian regime 1945-1954**	**1918 – 1934**	**1991 – 2008**
History teaching components				
Concept	• unified • nationalistic • hero worship • leadership cult • propaganda of ruling order	• unified • Sovietization • hero worship • leadership cult • propaganda of ruling order	• democratic • cultural diversity • national	• democratic • cultural diversity • European-based
Teaching goals	• develop national identity • raise national- and civic-minded citizens • teach Latvian interpretation of history • create patriots	• raise Soviet citizens and patriots in spirit of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism • teach Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist interpretation of Latvian history	• develop national identity • raise citizens • teach national interpretation of Latvian history	• develop civic responsibility • facilitate development of citizen identity in democratic and civic society
Curriculum	• nationalistic	• chauvinistic • xenophobic	• national	• neutral
Organization and methods	• state regulated • formalist	• state regulated • formalist	• democratic, based on principles of humanism	• democratic, based on principles of humanism
Teaching materials	• government approved, restricted authorship of history textbooks • written, oral historic records	• government approved, restricted authorship of history textbooks • state sanctioned historic records	• variety of history textbooks • written, oral historic records	• variety of history textbooks • written, oral historic records
Teacher position	• transmitter of official history • control over teaching	• transmitter of official history • strict control over teaching in atmosphere of fear	• teacher-experimenter	• teacher-experimenter

Outline of Outcomes

1. Modern democratic societies stress the inclusion of all social groups in the telling of a nation's history. Under authoritarian rule, teachers and pupils are clearly told who represents 'the self' and 'the other'.
2. Totalitarian rule can create two cultures in history teaching – official and unofficial. Official history taught in schools offers the ideologically acceptable and abbreviated interpretation of history in which heroes are politicians/political leaders and/or representatives of foreign cultures. Unofficial history heard in the private sphere, results in the 'folklorization' of Latvian history, which allowed many Latvians to maintain their sense of national identity under foreign totalitarian rule.
3. The goals of history teaching under authoritarianism are essentially dehumanized and designed to strengthen the power of the ruling order at the expense of the interests and ideals of the individual citizen:
    1. The first goal is the development of patriotism or nationalism with the assistance of history. Officially this means obedience to the state, led by the authoritarian leader, the 'father' of the nation.
    2. The second goal is to create a world view based on a unified system – one nation, one leader, one history (one correct version of history) grounded in one correct theory.
    3. The final goal supports the purpose of the propaganda of the existing regime through the legitimization and glorification of its order.
4. The role of the teacher differs in democracies and authoritarian regimes. Under democratic rule, teachers can be active participants in the creation of the historic process. Under authoritarianism, the function of the teacher is primarily as passive mediator between the ruling order and pupils, parents, and others and transmitter of the officially sanctioned and ideologically correct version of history.
5. The more authoritarian the regime, the narrower the scope and choice of history textbooks and the narrower the authorship of these books. Under Soviet totalitarianism, the learning process centred around one officially accepted textbook for each grade and each subject, including history.
6. Curriculum and textbooks are strictly controlled under authoritarianism, but teachers have relative freedom with regard to teaching methods. During Soviet occupation, history as a subject was uniform, and teachers had virtually no access to materials created during the interwar period or foreign sources. Inspired teachers

who taught general history strove to find materials and methods that would make lessons more interesting for the pupils resulting in methodological developments within Latvia.

Suggestions for further research

History teaching is a relatively recent addition to curriculum when considering the history of education in general, and it has grown in importance with the development of the nation state and corresponding nationalism. Researchers agree that more work needs to be done on identity issues in the field of history teaching and textbook writing. While discussion of a unified European history in terms of a meta-narrative is currently being discussed, clearly Europe cannot be discussed as a whole because of the many differences in historic experience between the various regions of Europe.

One view of history not often associated with Europe is that of history writing from the perspective of colonized peoples. Europeans, as a whole, are often accorded the over-arching role of colonizers in the global context, but what of individual regions within Europe colonized by other European nations? The culture and language of smaller ethnic groups, such as Basques, Catalans, the Sami, and the Roma are threatened in the face of the larger cultural entities into which they have been absorbed. Even in what history considers established Western European countries, the discussion about history curriculum revolves around nationalism in the face of multiculturalism, which appears to threaten a sense of national identity ("Notes on a small island", 2005; Bilefsky, 2007). Language issues and identity are the source of conflict in many more European nations and play a significant role in discussion of history. Discussion about other ethnic groups who have lived under the shadow of a politically and culturally more powerful group would be an interesting point of comparison for Latvia.

Another topic of research could be the concept of defamiliarization inquiry using anti-oppressive and decolonizing research methodologies to look beyond familiar dominant narratives as described by Kaomea (2003) in her discussion of colonized Hawaiians. While Hawaiian colonization falls, yet again, into the category of overseas colonization by Europeans, she discusses injustices and neglect issues endemic to colonized peoples that anger Hawaiians, but are treated as something to be kept below the surface and never to be revealed. This is a sentiment often heard in Latvian society. Kaomea notes that this repression would never happen in an African or Jewish Studies program and that use of this method of peeling away layers of familiar hegemonic surfaces to reveal historic erasures in textbooks and curriculum guides would take away the 'automatization' of everyday situations. This ambiguity of the patterns of power as

relates to Latvia should also be researched more thoroughly in order to give a better perspective on the nature of Latvian society.

Bowers (1996) discusses rhetorical conditions as patterns of power that are assumed or imposed by a society (p. 491), and that these agendas create ambiguity in the discourse of collectives (Bowers, p. 494). Members of Latvian society, particularly in the government, stress the nature of Latvia's multicultural society, basing this on the presence of a large percentage of minorities. However, if one compares multiculturalism in the context of Latvian society to multiculturalism in other countries in the West which have also experienced an influx of immigration, one may consider this term to be misrepresented and determine that Latvian society is not multicultural at all, but rather consists only of two main groups: the ethnic Latvian collective, which was once the oppressed majority, and the Russian-speaking collective, which is made up of Russians as well as Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Lithuanians, Kazaks, Uzbeks, and a host of other ethnic groups from various parts of the former Soviet Union whose lingua franca was Russian and the majority of whom have been Russified over the course of time. The vocal members of the Russian-speaking collective are clear about their sense of identity, which is closely tied to Russia. This situation is not unique to Latvia, and research into the nature of 'multicultural societies' in the post-Soviet sphere might add to a better understanding of those societies.

The discourse of collective is influenced by memory. The Soviet regime employed tactics of the colonizer by erasing the stories of the indigenous people and subsequently erasing the people by erasing their history (Fanon, 1967). This process was reinforced by writing textbooks to reinforce Soviet hegemony, informing the oppressed population of their position in society while justifying their marginalization and subsequent annihilation (Brandon, 2004, p. 646). Kansteiner (2002) states that collective memory is as much a result of conscious manipulation as unconscious absorption, and it is always mediated between intellectual and cultural traditions that frame representation, the memory maker, and the memory consumer (as cited in Brandon, p. 641). The memory consumers in this case are Latvians who are required to internalize what the memory maker, the overtly pro-Russian and anti-Latvian Soviet system, creates. Memory studies have taken place in the Latvian context, particularly among those deported to Siberia and those who fled into exile, but the recollections of those who lived in Latvia during the Soviet era are not systematically recorded. Bela (2007) notes a difference in oral histories told by these three different groups. While Latvians who had been deported to Siberia avoid placing themselves in the centre of

events, Western exiles not only relate incidents from the position of eyewitness, but also portray themselves as active players. Local Latvians often avoid describing their lives in terms of moving forwards towards a set goal. While the first person position is apparent, their narratives often assume the role of spectator, stressing their reliance on an outside force, and they are less likely to place themselves as active determiners of their own fate (p. 22). Memory studies of Latvian society within Latvia would be beneficial for a clearer picture of collective social memory and issues of power surrounding memory.

Another perspective and point of comparison could be place-based pedagogy that places importance on the peculiarities of where people actually live and its connection to global development trends that impact local places. Place-based pedagogy is concerned with the context and the value of learning from and nurturing specific places, communities, or regions. Latvian history and identity have traditionally been rooted in a strong sense of place, but many years of Soviet collectivization devalued the homestead philosophy, and glorification of urban life as opposed to rural life may have spurred the current trends of Latvians leaving their home for other, supposedly 'better', places.

More detailed study of the effects of authoritarianism on history teaching in Latvia could involve a much greater number of participants throughout all the regions of Latvia through questionnaire surveys as well as personal interviews. As time passes, the older generation may become more willing to describe and discuss history teaching and learning under authoritarianism, but this needs to take place soon, while as many witnesses to this time period can be interviewed as possible. Current students and teachers could also be interviewed on a national basis to determine what issues resonate in history teaching today and the extent of continued prevalence of authoritarianism in the teaching of history. The History Teacher Society in cooperation with the Institute of Latvian History at the University of Latvia and other orgnizations actively involved in historic research would be an ideal start for such research.

References

Primary sources

***Latvijas valsts vēstures arhīvs* LVVA [Latvian State History Archives] and *Latvijas valsts arhīvs* LVA [Latvian State Archives]**

1. LVVA, 6637, 1, 651 – Izglītības Ministrijas sēžu protokoli
2. LVA, 700, 5, 31 – Instruktīvi-metodiski norādījumi par skolēnu organizācijām
3. LVA, 700, 5, 45 – Skolotāju konferenču materiāli
4. LVA, 1340 – Latvijas valsts universitāte vēsturiskā izziņa
5. LVA, 1340, 11, 1 – Pārskats par iestāju pārbaudījumiem
6. LVA, 1340, 11, 13 – Iestājpārbaudījumu priekšmetu komisiju priekšsēdētaju atskaites

History Textbooks

1. **Aņisimova, V., Strods, H., Kanāle, V**. *Latvijas PSR vēstures hrestomātija (no vissenākajiem laikiem līdz XIX gs. beigām* [Latvian SSR History Chrestomathy (from ancient times until the end of the 19th c.]. Rīga: Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība, 1977. 330.lpp. 75.lpp.
2. **Balodis, Fr., Tentelis, A**. *Latviešu vēsture* [History of Latvians]. Rīga: Valtera un Rapas Akc. sab. apgāds, 1938. 215.lpp.
3. **Birkerts, A**. *Latwijas wehsture. I daļa. Pamatskolu kurss* [History of Latvia. Part I. Primary School Course]. Rīga: Kultūras Balss, 1920. 128.lpp.
4. **Birkerts, A**. *Mazā vēsturnieka lasāmā grāmata* [Young Historian's Reader]. Rīga: Kultūras Balss, 1923. 176.lpp.
5. **Birkerts, A**. *Latvijas vēsture – Pamatskolas kurss* [History of Latvia – Primary Course]. Rīga: A. Gulbja apgāds, 1924. 234.lpp.
6. **Birkerts, A**. *Mazā Latvijas vēsture – Pamatskolas III. un IV. klases kurss* [Abridged History of Latvia – Course for Primary Grades 3 and 4]. Rīga: Izglītības kooperatīva Kultūras Balss, 1925. 114.lpp.
7. **Cimermanis, S., Kripēns, J., Plaude, E., Ziemelis, S**. *Latvijas PSR vēstures hrestomātija* [Latvian SSR History Chrestomathy]. Rīga: Latvijas Valsts Izdevniecība, 1960. 330.lpp.

8. **Goldmane, S., Klišāne, J., Kļaviņa, A., Misāne, I., Straube, L**. *Latvija 20. gadsimtā – vēsture pamatskolai* [Latvia in the 20th Century – A history for elementary schools]. Rīga: Zvaigzne ABC, 2006. 175.lpp.
9. **Grīns, A**. *Latvijas vēsture pamatskolām, papildskolām un pašmācībai* [Latvian History for elementary schools, supplementary schools and self-study]. Zemnieku doma, 1935. 294.lpp.
10. **Kanāle, V., Stepermanis, M**. *Latvijas PSR vēsture* [Latvian SSR History]. Rīga: Zvaigzne, 1967. 271.lpp.
11. **Klein, S**. *Leitfaden für den Unterricht in der Weltgeshichte*. Freiburg: Herderische Berlagshandlung, 1860. 191 S.
12. **Kurlovičs, G., Tomašūns, A**. *Latvijas vēsture vidusskolai – I* [Latvian History for High Schools – I]. Rīga: Zvaigzne ABC, 1999. 255.lpp.
13. Latvijas vēsture V pamatskolas klasei [History of Latvia for Elementary School Grade 5]. Rīga: Latvju Grāmata, 1942. 120.lpp.
14. **Plaude, E., Kripēns, J., Lielā, E**. *Latvijas PSR vēsture vidusskolām* [Latvian SSR History for Secondary Schools]. Rīga: Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība, 1958. 218.lpp.
15. **Strazdiņš, K**. (Ed.) *Latvijas PSR vēsture* [Latvian SSR History]. Rīga: Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmija, 1956. 551.lpp.
16. **Zālītis, A**. (Ed.) *Mana tēvu zeme* [My Fatherland]. Rīga: Izglītības Ministrija Mācibas līdzekļu nodaļa, 1936. 447.lpp.
17. **Zālītis, Fr**. *Latvijas vēsture vidusskolām* [History of Latvia for Secondary Schools]. Rīga: Valtera un Rapas akc. sab. apgāds, 1937. 404.lpp.

Educational Journals

Izglītības Ministrijas Mēnešsraksts [Education Ministry Monthly]

1. **Bērziņš, J**. *Darba princips vēstures pasniegšanā* [Concept of work in history teaching]. 1924, Nr. 3, 270.–277.lpp., Nr.4, 393.–400.lpp.
2. **Dreimanis, P**. *Īsa vispārēja vēsturē* [Short general history]. 1921a, Nr.1, 104.–106.lpp.
3. **Dreimanis, P**. *Latvijas pamatskolu programma vēsturē* [Latvian primary school history curriculum]. 1921b, Nr.1, 101.–104.lpp.
4. **Dreimanis, P**. *Skolotāju sagatavošanas kursu programma* [Teacher education program]. 1921c, Nr.2, 158.–174.lpp.

5. **Dreimanis, P**. *Seno laiku vēsture* [Ancient history]. 1921d, Nr.4, 313.–314.lpp.
6. **Dreimanis, P**. *Pamatskolu programma vēsturē* [Primary school history curriculum]. 1921e, Nr.5, 531.–535.lpp.
7. **Klaustiņš**. Latvijas vēstures chrestomatija [Latvian history chrestomathy]. 1920, Nr.5, 469.–475.lpp.
8. **Kronlīns, J**. Untitled report. 1935, Nr.5–6, 454.–490.lpp.
9. **Lapiņš, J**. *Nacionāli īpatnejais* [The nationally unique]. 1922, Nr.6, 561.–572.lpp.
10. **Lapsiņš, P**. *Par jauno darbu skolas druvā* [On new work in the field of schooling]. 1934, Nr.7/8, 35.–39.lpp.
11. Latvijas vēstures instituta konference [Institute of Latvian History conference], 1936,Nr. 5/6, 596.lpp.
12. **Melnalksnis, K., Zālits, Fr**. *Latwijas wehsture* [Latvia's history]. 1920, Nr.3, 270.–275.lpp.
13. **Melnalksnis, K**. *Skolotāju sapulce 1921. gada vasarā* [Teachers' conference, summer 1921]. 1922a, Nr.2, 256.–270.lpp.
14. **Melnalksnis, K**. *Skolotāju sagatavošanas kursi 1921./22. m. gadā* [Teacher preparatory courses in the 1921/22 school year]. 1922b, Nr.12, 1283.–1297.lpp.
15. **Pētersons, Ed**. *Autoritāte un brīvība atjaunotās Latvijas skolās* [Authority and freedom in renewed Latvian schools]. 1936, Nr.2, 124.–138.lpp
16. *Rīkojums Nr. 815, 13 February 1933*. 1933, Nr.2, 167.lpp.
17. *Rīkojums Nr. 816, 13 February 1933*. 1933, Nr.2, 167.–168.lpp
18. **Šmidts, P**. *Latvijas vēsture. J. Krodzneeka.* 1920a, Nr.8, 173.–176.lpp.
19. **Šmidts, P**. *Latvijas vēsture. A. Birkerta*. 1920b, Nr.10, 378.–380.lpp.
20. **Teodors**. *Latviešu tautiskā kustība* [Latvian nationalistic movement]. 1921, Nr.6, 646.–651.lpp.
21. **Ulmanis, K**. *Draudzīgs aicinājums* [Friendly invitation]. 1935, Nr.2, 182.–184.lpp.
22. Untitled. 1936, Nr.5/6, 667.lpp.
23. Uzaicinājums. 1920, Nr.11, 496.lpp.
24. Uzaicinājums skolotājiem. 1920, Nr.11, 493.–495.lpp.
25. V.V. Nr. 201, Noteikumi par Latvijas vēstures un Latvijas ģeografijas stundu skaitu mazākuma tautību skolās. 1934, Nr.7, 305.lpp.
26. **Vīksniņš, N**. *Ievada stunda vēsturē ģimnazijas V kl* [Introductory lesson to history for gymnasia Grade 5 class]. 1936, Nr.2, 227.–232.lpp.

27. **Zālits, Fr**. *Latvijas vēsture*. 1920, Nr.2, 184.–186.lpp.
28. *15. maijs*. 1935, Nr.5/6, 528.–529.lpp.

Padomju Latvijas Skola [Soviet Latvian School]

1. **Baltijskis, N**. *Par patriotismu* [On patriotism]. 1945, Nr.9, 61.–69.lpp.
2. **Draudiņš, T**. *Latvijas darba ļaužu cīņa par padomju varu 1919. gadā* [Latvia's proletarian struggle for Soviet rule in 1919]. 1949, Nr.3, 98.–101.lpp.
3. **Dubins, H**. *Latvijas PSR vēsture PSRS vēstures stundās* [Latvian SSR history in USSR history lessons]. 1948, Nr.3, 66.–67.lpp.
4. **Dušina, M**. *Daži komūnistiskās audzināšanas principi* [Several principles on communist up-bringing]. 1946, Nr.3, 55.–58.lpp.
5. **Egle, A**. *Krievu valoda latviešu skolās* [The Russian language in Latvian schools]. 1945, Nr.1, 80.–92.lpp.
6. **Funks, M**. *Par skaistumu* [On beauty]. 1948, Nr.6, 29.–40.lpp.
7. **Graudonis, J**. *Kultūras jautājumu aplūkošana PSRS vēsture stundās* [Treatment of cultural issues in USSR history lessons]. 1951, Nr.9, 83.– 95.lpp
8. **Jakovļevs, N**. *Par dzimtenes vēstures mācīšanu* [On teaching history of the homeland]. 1948, Nr.2, 10.– 21.lpp.
9. **Kadeks, M**. *Latvijas Valsts Universitātes I zinātniskā sesija* [Latvian State University first scientific session]. 1945, Nr.7, 24.–29.lpp.
10. **Kadeks, M**. *Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmija* [Latvian Academy of Sciences]. 1946, Nr.4, 14.– 28.lpp.
11. **Kauliņš, K**. *Padomju varas nodibināšanās Latvijā 1919. gada janvarī* [The founding of Soviet rule in Latvia in January 1919]. 1949, Nr.1, 41.–52.lpp.
12. Latvijas PSR izglītības ministrijas pavēle Nr. 179 – vispārīga [Latvian SSR Ministry of Education general directive Nr. 179]. 1949, Nr.2, 110.–111.lpp.
13. Latvijas vietvārdu pareizrakstība latviešu un krievu valodā [Correct spelling of Latvian place names in Latvian and Russian]. 1945, Nr.10, 99.lpp.
14. Mācību metodes Padomju Savienības skolā – Mācības metožu loma un nozīme [Teaching methodology in Soviet Unions schools – the role and significance of methodology]. 1940, Nr.1, 42.–48.lpp.

15. **Miķelsons, R**. *Padomju skola Lielā Tēvijas kaŗa laikā* [The Soviet school during the Great Patriotic War]. 1945, Nr.1, 22.–26.lpp.
16. **Miške, V**. *Par Oktobra revolucijas sagatavošanu Latvijā* [On preparations in Latvia for the October revolution]. 1946, Nr.10, 13.–25.lpp.
17. **Nāburgs, P**. *Standartizētās grāmatas* [Standardized books]. 1940*,* Nr.1, 74.–79.lpp.
18. **Niedra, J**. *Latviešu literatūra* [Latvian literature]. 1941*,* Nr.6, 11.–17.lpp.
19. Noteikumi pamatskolu krievu valodas skolotājiem Nr. A-2477 [Directive for primary school Russian language teachers]. 1940, Nr.1, 87.lpp.
20. Padomju Latvijas himna [Soviet Latvian anthem]. 1945, Nr.9, 75.lpp.
21. Padomju Savienības skolas mācību grāmatas [Soviet Union schoolbooks]. 1940, Nr. 1,53.–58.lpp.
22. **Pētersons, K**. *Jaunas mācības grāmatas vēsturē* [New history textbooks]. 1941*,* Nr.6, 77.–81.lpp.
23. Piezīmes par vēstures mācību [Notes on the teaching of history]. 1940, Nr.1, 37.–41.lpp.
24. Projekts – Latvijas PSR vēstures programma VII klasēm [Project – Latvian SSR history program for Grade 7]. 1945, Nr.7, 86.–93.lpp.
25. **Šacs-Aniņš, M**. *Latviešu tautas kultūrvēsturiskā sadraudzība ar krievu tautu* [The Latvian nation's cultural historic friendship with the Russian nation]. 1952*,* Nr.1, 10.–19.lpp.
26. **Strazdiņš, K**. *Izglītības darbinieka uzdevumi atbrīvotajā Padomju Latvijā* [Tasks for educational workers in liberated Soviet Latvia]. 1945a, Nr.1, 7.–14.lpp.
27. **Strazdiņš, K**. *Par nacionālsimu un internacionālismu* [On nationalism and internationalism]. 1945b, Nr.2, 10.–29.lpp.
28. **Strazdiņš, K**. *Mācību gadu sākot* [Starting the school year]. 1945c, Nr.6, 10.–16.lpp.
29. **Strazdiņš, K**. *Padomju skolotāja godapilnais un cēlais uzdevums* [The Soviet teacher's honourable and noble duty]. 1945d, Nr.7, 18.–23.lpp.
30. **Strazdiņš, K**. *Par dažādiem trūkumiem un uzdevumiem skolas darbā* [On several deficiencies and duties in the job of teaching]. 1948a*,* Nr.1, 18.–23.lpp.
31. **Strazdiņš, K**. *Par mācību un audzināšnas darba uzlabošanu skolā* [On improving teaching in schools]. 1948b, Nr.2, 3.–9.lpp.

32. **Straževs, A**. *Par vēstures mācīšanu skolā* [On teaching history in school]. 1947, Nr.2, 87.–91.lpp.
33. **Upītis, A**. *Staļins un tautu brālība* [Stalin and the brotherhood of nations]. 1947*,* Nr.3, 3.–6.lpp.
34. **Ūsiņš, V**. *Rūpīgāk mācīsim krievu valodu* [Let us teach Russian more thoroughly]. 1948*,* Nr.3, 93.–98.lpp.
35. Vārdu, tēvvārdu un uzvārdu rakstība latviešu un krievu valodā, latviešu valodas terminoloģijas un pareizrakstības komisijas atzinumi [Correct writing of name, patronymic, surname in Latvian and Russian as acknowledged by the Commission for correct Latvian language usage], 1945. Nr.9, 99.lpp.
36. **Vilks, J**. *Par pedagoģisko izglītību* [On pedagogical education]. 1945, Nr.1, 27.–29.lpp.

Other Primary Sources

1. **Adamovičs, L**. *Latviešu vēsturnieka un vēstures skolotāja uzdevumi* [Duties of the Latvian Historian and History Teacher], Rīga: Latvijas vēstures skolotāju biedrība, 1938. 15.lpp.
2. **Allunans, A**. *Iewehrojami Latweeschi* [Notable Latvians]. Jelgava, 1887. 45.lpp.
3. **Balode, S**. (Ed.). *Kā jāmāca vēsture* [How One Must Teach History]. Rīga: Grāmatu apgāds, 1946, 47.lpp.
4. **Brokāne, L**. Patriotiska audzināšana. **In**: I. Saleniece, I. Šēnberga, D. Oļehnovičš (Eds.). *Vēstures mācību aktualitātes skolā – DU vēstures katedras II-IV metodiskās konferences rakstu krājums* [Developments in history teaching in schools – DU history department II-IV methodology conference papers]. 2001, 40.–43.lpp.
5. **Dēķens, K**. Pirmā vēstures stunda. *Latvijas Skola* [Latvia's School], 1920, Nr.4, 108.–113.lpp.
6. **Gundare, I**. *Pretrunīga vēsture* [Contradictory History]. Rīga: Latvijas Vēsture skolotāju asociācija, 2000. 148.lpp.
7. **Kaudzīte, M**. *Atmiņas no tautiskā laikmeta* [Memories of the National Awakening Period]. Rīga: Zvaigzne ABC, 1924/1994. 616.lpp.

8. **Ķīlis, R**. Vēstures pretrunīgums: interpretācijas, fakti, notikumi. **In**: I. Gundare (Ed.). *Pretrunīga vēsture* [Contradictory History]. Rīga: Latvijas Vēsture skolotāju asociācija, 2000, 8.–12.lpp.
9. **Kronvalds, A**. Divi svētku dienas Turaidā (1869a). **In**: *Kronvalda Atis – Kopoti raksti I* [The Complete Works of Kronvalda Atis I], A. Goba (Ed.). Rīga: Valters un Rapa, 1937, 341.–353. lpp.
10. **Kronvalds, A**. Kāds vārds par mūsu tēvu valodu (1869b). **In**: *Kronvalda Atis – Kopoti raksti I* [The Complete Works of Kronvalda Atis I], A. Goba (Ed.). Rīga:Valters un Rapa, 1937, 411.–429. lpp.
11. **Kronvalds, A**. Par skolas grāmatu izrādīšanu (1870a). **In**: *Kronvalda Atis – Kopoti raksti I* [The Complete Works of Kronvalda Atis I], A. Goba (Ed.). Rīga: Valters un Rapa, 1937, 354.–362. lpp.
12. **Kronvalds, A**. Vēl kāds vārds par latviešu laikrakstu lasīšanu (1870b). **In**: *Kronvalda Atis – Kopoti raksti I* [The Complete Works of Kronvalda Atis I], A. Goba (Ed.). Rīga: Valters un Rapa, 1937, 316.–322. lpp.
13. **Kronvalds, A**. 'Mājas viesis' pret augstākām skolām (1871). **In**: *Kronvalda Atis – Kopoti raksti I* [The Complete Works of Kronvalda Atis I], A. Goba (Ed.). Rīga: Valters un Rapa, 1937, 375.–384. lpp.
14. Latvijas un pasaules vēsture, retrieved March 10, 2010 from http://visc. gov.lv/saturs/vispizgl/programmas/vidskolai/vesture_2v_06062008.pdf
15. Latvijas un pasaules vēsture 6.–9.klasei, retrieved March 10, 2010 from http://visc.gov.lv/saturs/vispizgl/programmas/pamskolai/vesture_6_9.pdf
16. **Lieknis, J**. Piezīmes vēstures stundām. *Mūsu nākotne* [Our Future], 1933, Nr. 1. 370.–376.lpp.
17. **Plaude, E**. Daži skolēnu komūnistiskās audzināšanas jautājumi Latvijas PSR vēstures mācīšanā. **In**: E. Rolava (Ed.). *Skolēnu komunistiskā audzināšana vēstures stundās un ārpusklases darbā* [Pupil Communistic Up-Bringing During History Lessons and During Outside Class Activities], Rīga: Zvaigzne, 1970, 5.–16.lpp.
18. **Plaude, E**. Vēstures mācīšanas attīstība. **In**: R. Miķelsons (Ed.). *Skolas un pedagoģiskās domas attīstība Padomju Latvijā* [Development of Schools and Pedagogical Thought in Soviet Latvia], Rīga; Zvaigzne, 1969, 145.–163.lpp.
19. **Purēns, V**. *Kā mācīt vēsturi* [How to Teach History], Rīga: RaKa. 2006, 210.lpp.

20. **Saleniece, I., Šēnberga, I., Oļehnovičš, D**. (Eds.). *Vēstures mācību aktualitātes skolā – DU vēstures katedras II-IV metodiskās konferences rakstu krājums* [Developments in history teaching in schools – DU history department II-IV methodology conference papers]. 2001, 113.lpp.
21. **Skatkins, M**. *Vidusskolas didaktika* [Secondary School Didactics, tr. N. Bērziņa, J. Rudzītis]. Rīga: Zvaigzne, 1984. 289.lpp.
22. **Stalin, J**. Par dažiem bolševisma vēstures jautājumiem. **In**: S. Balode (Ed.). *Kā jāmāca vēsture* [How One Must Teach History]. Rīga: Grāmatu apgāds, 1931/1946, 3.–19.lpp.
23. **Stalin, J., Kirov, S., Zhdanov, A**. Piezīmes pie PSRS vēstures mācības grāmatas konspektu. **In**: S. Balode (Ed.). *Kā jāmāca vēsture* [How One Must Teach History]. Rīga: Grāmatu apgāds, 1934/1946, 28.–31. lpp.
24. **Stalin, J., Zhdanov, A., Kirov, S**. Piezīmes pie PSRS vēstures mācības grāmatas konspektu. **In**: S. Balode (Ed.). *Kā jāmāca vēsture* [How One Must Teach History]. Rīga: Grāmatu apgāds, 1934/1946, 25.–27. lpp.
25. **Stokmanis, A.B**. *Skolēnu darbi vēsturē* [Student projects in history]. Rīga: Valters un Rapa, 1927. 51.lpp.
26. **Ušinskis, K**. *Pedagoģisko rakstu izlase* [Selection of Pedagogical Works]. Rīga: Zvaigzne, 1861/1980. 229.lpp.
27. **Valdemārs, K**. Grāmatu krātuves kā tautas gara modinātājs (1880). **In**: K. Eliass (Ed.). *Kr. Valdemāra Rakstu Izlase* [A Selection of the Writings of Kr. Valdemārs], Rīga: Militāras literatūras apgāds, 1938, 194.–198. lpp.
28. **Valdemārs, K**. Kā un kur būtu jāietaisa grāmatu krātuves (1881)? **In**: K. Eliass (Ed.). *Kr. Valdemāra Rakstu Izlase* [A Selection of the Writings of Kr. Valdemārs], Rīga: Militāras literatūras apgāds, 1938, 198.–200. lpp.
29. **Valdemārs, K**. Latviešu skolas (1884). **In**: K. Eliass (Ed.). *Kr. Valdemāra Rakstu Izlase* [A Selection of the Writings of Kr. Valdemārs], Rīga: Militāras literatūras apgāds, 1938, 172.–176. lpp.
30. **Valdemārs, K**. Latviešu nākotne krievu un vāciešu starpā (1886a). **In**: K. Eliass (Ed.). *Kr. Valdemāra Rakstu Izlase* [A Selection of the Writings of Kr. Valdemārs], Rīga: Militāras literatūras apgāds, 1938, 207.–209. lpp.
31. **Valdemārs, K**. Piemiņa par Durbes kautiņu 13. jūlijā 1260. gadā (1886b). **In**: K. Eliass (Ed.). *Kr. Valdemāra Rakstu Izlase* [A Selection of the Writings of Kr. Valdemārs], Rīga: Militāras literatūras apgāds, 1938, 225.–226. lpp.

32. **Valdemārs, K**. Maskavas prēmija par vēsturiskiem rakstiem (1890). **In**: *Kr. Valdemāra Rakstu Izlase* [A Selection of the Writings of Kr. Valdemārs], K. Eliass (Ed.). Rīga: Militāras literatūras apgāds, 1938, 218.–223. lpp.
33. **Zeile, P**. Tautu draudzība. **In**: V. Samsons (Ed.). *Latvijas PSR Mazā enciklopēdija*, Vol.3, Rīga: Zinātne, 1970, 508.lpp.

Secondary Sources

1. **Agnew, J**. Nationalism. **In**: J. S. Duncan, N. C. Johnson, R. H. Schein (Eds.). *A Companion to Cultural Geography*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2004, pp. 223–237. Retrieved from Google Books, May 28, 2009.
2. **Altemeyer, B**. Reducing prejudice in right-wing authoritarians [Electronic version]. **In**: M. P. Zanna, J. M. Olsen (Eds.). *The Psychology of Prejudice: The Ontario Symposium Volume 7*, 1993, pp. 131–149.
3. **Althusser, L**. Marxism and Humanism. **In**: N. Badmington (Ed.). *Posthumanism*. New York: Palgrave, 2000, pp. 30–33.
4. **Aņisimova, V**. Vēstures mācīšana Latvijas PSR skolās laikā no 1944.-1980. gadam. **In**: A. Staris (Ed.). *Humanitārā cikla mācību priekšmetu saturs un metožu attīstība Latvijas PSR vispārizglītojošā skolā – zinātniskie raksti* [Humanities Curriculum and Teaching Methods in Latvian SSR General Schools – Scientific Papers], Rīga: Latvijas PSR Izglītības Minsitrija, 1983, 39.–57.lpp.
5. **Anspaks, J**. *Pedagoģijas idejas Latvijā*. [Pedagogical ideas in Latvia]. Rīga: RaKa, 2003. 476.lpp.
6. **Arendt, H**. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Inc., 1951/1968. 562 p.
7. **Badmington, N**. *Introduction: Approaching Posthumanism*. In: N. Badmington (Ed.). *Posthumanism*. New York: Palgrave, 2000, pp. 1–10.
8. **Barr, A. S**. Vitalizing the Teaching of American History [Electronic version]. *NASSP Bulletin*, 1926, Vol.10, pp. 8–14.
9. **Barton, K. C., Levstik, L. S**. *Teaching History for the Common Good*. London: Routledge, 2004. Retrieved September 25, 2008, from Google Books.
10. **Bela, B**. Stāsta dzīve valoda: naratīvās stratēģijas Latvijas un trimdas dzīvesstāstos [The language of stories – Narrative strategies in Latvian and exile oral histories]. **In**: B. Bela, I. Gāle-Karpentere, I. Garda, N. Naua, V. Skultāne,

M. Zirnīte (Eds.). *Dzīvesstāsti: Vēsture, Kultūra, Sabiedrība*. Rīga: LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts, 2007, 15.–33.lpp.

11. **Bennich-Björkmann, L**. The cultural roots of Estonia's successful transition: How historic legacies shaped the 1990s. *East European Politics and Societies*, 2007, Vol.21, 2, pp. 316–347.
12. **Bergmann, K**. *Multi-perspektivität – Geschichte selber denken*. Wochenschau Verlag, 2000, 296 S.
13. **Berkowitz, M. W**. Civics and Moral Education. **In**: B. Moon, M. Ben-Peretz & S. Brown (Eds.). *Routledge International Companion to Education*. London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 897–908. Retrieved November 9, 2008, from Google Books
14. **Bilefsky, D**. Modern Belgians return to 'glorious' Middles Ages. *International Herald Tribune*, 2007, April 4, p. 1, 8.
15. **Bleiere, D**. Nacionālkomunisms Latvijā un 1959. gada Latvijas PSR izglītības likums. *Latvijas vēstures institūta žurnāls* [Institute of Latvian History Journal]. 2004, Nr.1, 126.–149.lpp.
16. **Bleiere, D., Butulis, I., Feldmanis, I., Stranga, A., Zunda, A**. *Latvijas vēsture 20. gadsimts*. Rīga: Jumava, 2005. 444.lpp.
17. **Booth, A**. Rethinking the scholarly: Developing the scholarship of teaching in history [Electronic version]. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 2004, Vol.3, pp. 247–266.
18. **Bowers, D. L**. When outsiders encounter insiders in speaking: Oppressed collectives on the defensive [Electronic version]. *Journal of Black Studies*, 1996, Vol.26, pp. 490–503.
19. **Brandenberger, D**. *National Bolshevism – Stalinist Mass Culture and the Formation of Modern Russian National Identity, 1931 – 1956*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002. 378 p.
20. **Brandon, L. T**. W/Righting History: A pedagogical approach with urban African-American learners [Electronic version]. *Urban Education*, 2004, Vol.39, 6, pp. 638–657.
21. **Broudy, H. S**. The Uses of Humanistic Schooling. **In**: C. E. Finn, D. Ravitch, R. T. Fancher (Eds.). *Against Mediocrity: The Humanities in America's High Schools*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1984, pp. 15–29.
22. **Button, H. W**. Creating more useable pasts: History in the study of education [Electronic version]. *Educational Researcher*, 1979, Vol.8, pp. 8–14.

23. **Cipro, M**. Konstantin Dmitrievitch Ushinsky. *UNESCO International Bureau of Education,* 1984/1994, Vol.24, 3/4, pp. 1–7.

24. **Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K**. *Research Methods in Education* (5th ed.). London & New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2000. 446 p.

25. **Denzin, N., Lincoln, Y**. (Eds.). *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc, 1998. 462 p.

26. **Depaepe, M**. An Agenda for the History of Colonial Education. **In**: A. Novoa, M. Depaepe, E.V. Johainingmeiier (Eds.). *The Colonial Experience in Education, Historic Issues and Perspectives*. Ghent: CSHP, 1995, pp. 15–21.

27. **Depaepe, M**. Educationalisation: A key concept in understanding the basic processes in the history of Western education. *History of Education Review*, 1998, Vol.27, 1, pp. 16–28.

28. **Depaepe, M**. Dealing with the historic paradoxes of a globalised educationalisation - A way to write the "new" cultural history of education? **In**: M. Cijntje-Van Enckevort, M. George, S. Scatolini Aspóstolo (Eds.). *Re-thinking education in the Caribbean: yesterday, today and tomorrow - A local imperative in a global context.* Philipsburg (N.A.): University of St. Martin, 2006, pp. 33–44.

29. **Depaepe, M., Herman, F., Surmont, M., Van Gorp, A., Simon, F**. About Pedagogization… From the perspective of the history of education. **In**: P. Smeyers, M. Depaepe (Eds.). *Educational Research: the Educationalization of Social Problems*, Springer Netherlands, 2008, pp. 13–18.

30. **Dewey, J**. *Democracy and Education*. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan Canada, Ltd., 1916/1968. 378 p.

31. **Dewey, J**. *Experience and Education*. New York: Collier Books, 1938/1974. 91 p.

32. **Duckitt, J**. Authoritarianism and group identification: A new view of an old construct. *Political Psychology*, 1989, Vol.10. Abstract retrieved September 28, 2008, from Auhttp://www.jstor.org/pss/3791588

33. **Easly, L. J**. The enhanced lecture – A bridge to interactive teaching. **In**: D. A. Trinkle (Ed.). *Writing, Teaching, and Researching History in the Electronic Age: Historians and Computers*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1998, p. 65–72. Retrieved April 29, 2007, from http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=94412455

34. **Eliass, K**. *Kr. Valdemāra rakstu izlase*. Rīga: Militārās literatūras apgādes fonds, 1938. 362.lpp.
35. **Errante, A**. But sometimes you're not part of the story: Oral histories and ways of remembering and telling. *Educational Researcher*, 2000, Vol.29, 2, pp. 16–27.
36. **Fanon, F**. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press, 1967. 232 p.
37. **Feldman, S., Stenner, K**. Perceived threat and authoritarianism. *Political Psychology*, 1997, Vol.18, 4. Abstract retrieved September 28, 2008, from http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/119170866/abstract
38. **Forbes, H. D**. *Nationalism, Ethnocentrism, and Personality: Social Science and Critical Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985. 255 p.
39. **Fromm, E**. *Man for himself: an inquiry into the psychology of ethics*. London: Routledge, 1947/1999, 268 p. Retrieved from Google Books, January 11, 2010
40. **Garda, I**. Padomju totalitārās sistēmas diskurss Zveidrijas latviešu dzīvesstāstos. **In**: J. Kursīte, A. Cimdiņa, I. Kalniņa, L. Muižniece, V. Butkiene, S. Rižakova (Eds.). *Kultūra un vara.* Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 2006, 74.–81. lpp.
41. **Gellner, E., Breuilly, J**. *Nations and Nationalism*. Wiley-Blackwell, 1983/2006. 152 p. Retrieved from Google Books, May 28, 2009
42. **Goba, A**. *Kronvalda Atis – Kopoti raksti I* [The Complete Works of Kronvalda Atis I], A. Goba (Ed.). Rīga: Valters un Rapa, 1937, 687. lpp.
43. **Gundem, B. B**. Understanding European didactics. **In**: B. Moon, M. Ben-Peretz, S. Brown (Eds.) *Routledge International Companion to Education*. London: Routledge, 2000, p. 235–262. Retrieved September 25, 2008, from Google Books
44. **Halfin, I**. *From Darkness to Light – Class, Consciousness, and Salvation in Revolutionary Russia.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2000. 474 p.
45. **Hamilton, V. L., Sanders, J., McKearney, S. J**. Orientations toward authority in an authoritarian state: Moscow in 1990. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1995, Vol.21, pp. 356–365.
46. **Heer, N. W**. *Politics and History in the Soviet Union.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1971. Retrieved March 17, 2007, from http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=57180675

47. **Henry, N. B**. (Ed.). *Modern Philosophies and Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955. Retrieved May 6, 2007, from http://www.questia. com/PM.qst? a=o&d=11822419

48. **Hiden, J., Salmon, P**. *Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in the Twentieth Century.* London: Longman, 1994. Retrieved March 18, 2007, from http://www.questia. com/PM.qst?a=o&d=98798931

49. **Housden, M**. Ewald Ammende and the organization of national minorities in inter-war Europe. *German History*, 2000, Vol.18, 4, pp. 439–460.

50. **Jowett, G.S., O'Donnell, V**. *Propaganda and Persuasion*, 4th ed. London, New Delhi: Thousand Oaks, 2006. 422 p.

51. **Kalyvas, A**. The tyranny of dictatorship – when the Greek tyrant met the Roman dictator. *Political Theory,* 2007, Vol.35, 4, pp. 412–442.

52. **Kaomea, J**. Reading erasures and making the familiar strange: Defamiliarizing methods for research in formerly colonized and historicly oppressed communities. *Educational Researcher*, 2003, Vol.32, 2, pp. 14–25.

53. **Kasekamp, A**. *A History of the Baltic States*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. 251 p.

54. **Keruss, J**. Sovjetizācija (1944-1956). **In**: *Latvijas Universitātes Vēstures un filozofijas fakultātes vēsture padomju laikā: personības, struktūras, idejas (1944-1991)* [University of Latvia Faculty of History and Philosophy during the Soviet era: personalities, strctures, ideas [1944-1991]. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte Akadēmiskais apgāds, 87–129.lpp.

55. **Ķestere, I**. A few aspects of the Soviet school system. **In**: *ATEE Spring University III: Decade of Reform: Achievements, Challenges, Problems*. Rīga: Izglītības soļi, 2002, 237.–248.lpp.

56. **Ķestere, I**. Development of General Education in Latvia until 1940. **In**: A. Krūze, I. Ķestere, V. Sirk, O. Tijūnieliene (Eds.). *History of Education and Pedagogical Thought in the Baltic Countries up to 1940: An overview*. Rīga: RAKA, 2009, pp. 163–195.

57. **Ķestere, I**. *Pedagoģijas vēsture* [The History of Pedagogy]. Rīga: Zvaigzne ABC, n.d. 182.lpp.

58. **Kreindler, I. T**. A second missed opportunity: Russian in retreat as a global language [Electronic version]. *International Political Science Review*, 1993, Vol.14, 3, pp. 257–274.

59. **Krūze, A**. Augusts Tentelis – izglītiības ministrs. **In**: *Professors Dr. honoris causa Augusts Tentelis*. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 2009, 99.–112.lpp.

60. **Laitin, D. D**. Secessionist rebellion in the former Soviet Union [Electronic version]. *Comparative Political Studies*, 2001, Vol.34, 8, pp. 839–861.

61. **Latkovskis, D.** *Nacionālā atmoda Latgalē* [National Awakening in Latgale]. Rēzekne: Latgales Kultūras centra izdevniecība, 1999. 272.lpp.

62. **Leerssen, J**. *National Thought in Europe – A Cultural History*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006. 312 p.

63. **Leont'ev, A. N**. On Vygotsky's Creative Development. **In**: *Collected Works of L.S. Vygotsky: Problems of the Theory and History of Psychology, Vol.3*,. R. W. Rieber, J. Wollock, R. Veer (Eds.). 1997, p. 9–24, Retrieved March 23, 2009, from Google books.

64. **Macfarlane, A**. To Contrast and Compare. **In**: V. Srivastava (Ed.). *Methodology and Fieldwork*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004, pp. 94–111.

65. **Markwick, R.D**. *Rewriting History in Soviet Russia – The Politics of Revisionist Historiography, 1956-1974*. New York: Palgrave, 2001. 327 p.

66. **Medveckis, A**. (Ed.). *Liepājas Pedagoģijas akadēmijas darbinieku dzīvesstāsti, 1. laidiens* [Liepaja Academy of Pedagogy Employee Life Stories, Vol. 1]. Liepāja: LiePA, 2004. 164 lpp.

67. **Medveckis, A**. (Ed.). *Liepājas Pedagoģijas akadēmijas darbinieku dzīvesstāsti, 2. laidiens* [Liepaja Academy of Pedagogy Employee Life Stories, Vol. 2]. Liepāja: LiePA, 2006. 310 lpp.

68. **Menschel, S**. Theories of Totalitarianism and Modern Dictatorship: A tentative approach [Electronic version]. *Thesis Eleven*, 2000, No. 61, pp. 87–98.

69. **Metuzāle-Kangere, B**. Political Identity and Nationalism, Literature under the Ulmanis Regime. **In**: B. Metuzāle-Kangere (Ed.). *The Ethnic Dimension in Politics and Culture in the Baltic Countries, 1920-1945*. Stockholm: Södertöns högskola, 2004, pp. 141–154.

70. **Milton, J. R**. 'Delicate learning', Erudition and the Enterprise of Philosophy. **In**: *Humanism and Early Modern Philosophy*. J. Kraye, M.W.F. Stone (Eds.). London and New York: Routledge, 2000, pp. 159–171.

71. Notes on a small island. (2005, August 20). *The Economist*, p. 24.

72. **Ozoliņš, K**. *Valkas-Valmieras skolotāju seminars* [Valka-Valmiera Teacher Seminar]. Riga: Gulbis, 1936. 157 p.

73. **Pavlovičs, J**. Latvijas skolas 1941.-1944. gadā. *Latvijas vēsture institūta žurnāls* [Institute of Latvian History Journal]. 2004, Nr.1, 96.–116.lpp.

74. **Paxton, R. J., Wineburg, S**. Expertise and the teaching of history. **In**: B. Moon, M. Ben-Peretz, S. Brown (Eds.). *Routledge International Companion to Education*. London: Routledge, 2000, p. 855–864. Retrieved September 25, 2008, from Google Books

75. **Payne, S. G**. *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945*. London: UCL Press, 1995. Retrieved April 1, 2007, from http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d= 103605221

76. *Pētera Stučkas Latvijas valsts universitāte 40 gados (1919-1959)* [Pēteris Stučka Latvian State University Over 40 Years (1919-1959)]. Rīga: Latvijas valsts izdevniecība, 1959.

77. **Peterson, T., Bach, J., Inselberg, E**. *Das ritterschaftliche Parochiallehrer-Seminar in Walk, seine Lehrer and Söglinge. 1839 – 1890*. 1898, Riga, 269 S.

78. **Piaget, J., Pomerans, A. J**. *The Child's Concept of Time*. London: Routledge, 1969. 285 p.

79. **Plakans, A.** *The Latvians – A Short History*. Stanford: Hoover Press, 1995. 257 p.

80. **Pocock, J. G. A**. Classic and Civil History: The Transformation of Humanism. *Cromohs*, 1996, Nr.1, p.1–34. Retrieved November 8, 2008 from http://www. unifi.it/riviste/ cromohs/1_96/pocock.html

81. **Popkewitz, T. S**. The Production of Reasons and Power – Curriculum History and Intellectual Traditions. **In**: T. S. Popkewitz, B. M. Franklin, M. A. Pereyra (Eds.) *Cultural History and Education: Critical Essays on Knowledge and Schooling*. New York, London: Routledge, 2001, pp. 151-186.

82. **Potter, W. J**. *An Analysis of Thinking and Research About Qualitative Methods*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996. 393 p.

83. **Prawat, R.S.** Dewey meets the "Mozart of Psychology" in Moscow: The untold story [Electronic version]. *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol.37, 3, 2000, pp. 663–696.

84. **Preiswerk, R., Perrot, D**. *Ethnocentrism and History: Africa, Asia and Indian America in Western Textbooks.* New York: NOK Publishers International Ltd., 1978. 324 p.

85. **Readings, B**. Pagans, Perverts or Primitives? Experimental Justice in the Empire of Capital. **In**: N. Badmington (Ed.) *Posthumanism*. New York: Palgrave, 2000, pp. 112–128.

86. **Rinkužs, K**. *Jānis Cimze*. Rīga: Valters un Rapa, 1938. 196.lpp.

87. **Roiser, M., Willig, C**. The hidden history of authoritarianism [Electronic version]. *History of the Humans Sciences*, 1995, Vol. 8, pp. 77–97.

88. **Rubene, Z**. Jauniešu kritiskās domāšanas izpēte studiju procesā universitātē [Research on Critical Thinking in Youth in the Study Process in University]. Rīga: University of Latvia, 2003, 244 lpp.

89. **Rupaiņs, O**. *Pīters Miglinīks*. Rēzekne: Latgolas Kulturas centra izdevnīceiba, 2000. 85.lpp.

90. **Saleniece, I**. *Latvijas Republikas skolas politika 1918 – 1934* [Education Politics in the Republic of Latvia 1918 – 1934]. Daugavpils, Latvia: Saule, 2002, 191.lpp.

91. **Schwartz, H. S**. On the psychodynamics of organizational totalitarianism [Electronic version]. *Journal of Management*, 1987, Vol.13, 1, pp. 41–54.

92. **Service, R**. *Stalin – A Biography.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005. 715 p.

93. **Shafir, G**. *Immigrants and Nationalists: Ethnic Conflict and Accommodation in Catalonia, the Basque Country, Latvia, and Estonia.* Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1995. Retrieved March 17, 2007, from http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=63294263

94. **Šilde, Ā**. *Pirmā republika.* Rīga: Elpa, 1982/1993, 379.lpp.

95. **Skultans, V**. *The Testimony of Lives – Narrative and memory in post-Soviet Latvia.* London: Routledge, 1998. 217 p.

96. **Smith, A. D**. *Nationalism and Modernism: a critical survey of recent theories of nations and nationalism*. Routledge, 1998. 270 p. Retrieved May 28, 2009, from Google Books

97. **Smolucha, L., Smolucha, F**. *A Vygotskian Perspective on Critical Thinking*. 1989. Abstract downloaded from ERIC database, 27 February 2009

98. **Soll, J**. Introduction: The Uses of Historic Evidence in Early Modern Europe, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 2003, Vol. 64, Nr. 2, pp. 149-157. Abstract retrieved February 20, 2009 from http://muse.jhu.edu/login?uri=/journals/journal_of_the_history_of_ideas/v064/64. 2soll01.html

99. **Srinivar, M. N.** The insider versus the outsider in the study of cultures. **In**: V. Srivastava (Ed.). *Methodology and Fieldwork*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004, pp. 413–420.

100. **Švābe, A**. *Latvijas vēsture 1800 – 1914* [History of Latvia]. Uppsala: Daugava, 1958. 752 .lpp.

101. **Taylor, T**. The past, present and future of history teaching in schools. **In**: B. Moon, M. Ben-Peretz & S. Brown (Eds.). *Routledge International Companion to Education*. London: Routledge, 2000, p. 843–854. Retrieved September 25, 2008, from Google Books

102. **Tomāss, Ed**. (Ed.) *Baltijas skolotāju seminārs 1870 – 1919* [Baltic Teacher Seminar 1870-1919]. Rīga, 1940. 599.lpp.

103. **Tucker, R. C**. *Stalin in Power: The Revolution from Above, 1929-1941*. New York: Norton, 1990. Retrieved March 25, 2007, from http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=103246514

104. **Vanags, P**. Language Policiy and Linguistics under Ulmanis. **In**: B. Metuzāle-Kangere (Ed.). *The Ethnic Dimension in Politics and Culture in the Baltic Countries, 1920-1945*. Stockholm: Södertöns högskola, 2004, pp. 121–140.

105. **Vičs, A**. *Latviešu skolu vēsture, 2, Kurzeme no 1800. – 1885. gadam* [History of Latvian Schools, vol. 2, Kurzeme from 1800 – 1885]. Rīga: Rīgas Latviešu Biedrība, 1926. 467.lpp.

106. **Vinovskis, M**. No Child Left Behind and Highly Qualified U.S. History Teachers. **In**: *Clio at the Table – Using History to Inform and Improve Education Policy*. New York: Peter Lang, 2009, pp. 221–247.

107. **Vygotsky, L. S**. Play and its Role in the Mental Development of the Child. 1933/1966, *Voprosy psikhologii*, Nr. 6. Retrieved February 27, 2009, from http://www.marxists.org/archive/vygotsky/works/1933/play.htm

108. **West, S., Lowe, M**. Out of the cold: Libraries in the Baltic States after communism [Electronic version]. *Journal of Librarianship and Information*, 1998, Vol.30, pp. 57–66.

109. **Wild, J**. Education and Human Society: A Realistic View. **In**: N. B. Henry (Ed.), *Modern Philosophies and Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955, pp. 17–56. Retrieved May 6, 2007, from: http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=11822419

110. **Wineburg, S., Wilson, S.** Models of Wisdom in the Teaching of History. *The History Teacher*, 1991, Vol.24, 4, pp. 395–412.

111. **Yakushko, O**. Career Development Issues in the Former USSR: Implications of Political changes for Personal Career Development. *Journal of Career Development*, 2007, Vol.33, 4, pp. 299–315.

112. **Yurchak, A**. *Everything was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006. 331 p.

113. **Zeile, P**. *Latgales pirmā atmoda*. Rīga: Izglītības, kultūras un zinātnes ministrija, 1994, 48.lpp.

114. **Zīds, O**. Ievads. **In**: A. Staris (Ed.). *Pedagoģiskā doma Latvijā no 1940. gada līdz mūsu dienām* [Pedagogical thought in Latvia from 1940 to the Present]. Rīga: Puse, 1998.

115. **Žogla, I**. *Didaktikas teorētiskie pamati* [Theoretic Foundations of Didactics]. Riga: RAKA, 2001, 275.lpp.

116. **Žukovs, L**. *Pedagoģijas vēsture.*[History of Pedagogy]. Rīga: RaKa, 1999, 303.lpp.

Appendices

Appendix A

Vēstures skolotāju intervijas jautājumi

Vecums……. **Dzimums**……..
Izglītība……
Ieņemais amats……
Laika periods, kad ieguva padomju skolas pieredzi……
Skola atradās: lielpilsētā mazpilsētā laukos
Skolā mācību valoda bija: latviešu krievu

Padomju izglītības sistēmas un skolas iezīmes	Vērtēja pozitīvi	Vērtēja negatīvi	Grūti pateikt
1. Centralizēta un unificēta izglītības sistēma			
2. Obligāta bezmaksas vidējā izglītība			
3. Padomju skolā iegūto zināšanu apjoms un kvalitāte			
4. Ideoloģizēts pedagoģiskais process			
5. Ierobežota pieeja ārzemju pedagoģijas pieredzei			
6. Disciplīna un kārtība skolas pedagoģiskajā procesā			
7. Vienotas, obligātas mācību programmas un līdzekļi			
8. Bezmaksas mācību līdzekļi			
9. Mācību līdzekļu saturs un kvalitāte			
10. Mācību metodes un formas padomju skolā			
11. 5 punktu vērtēšanas sistēma visās izglītības pakāpēs			
12. Vienots, obligāts skolēnu formas tērps			
13. Jaunatnes komunistisko organizāciju darbība			
14. Darbaudzināšana (talkas, vasaras prakses utt.)			
15. Bezmaksas interešu izglītība			
16. Obligāta piedalīšanās pasākumos			
17. Attieksme pret latviešu tautas tradīcijām un valodu			
18. Attieksme pret bērna personību padomju skolā			
19. Skolēnu un skolotāju savstarpējās attiecības			
20. Stingra skolotāja darba kontrole			
21. Padomju skolotāja prestižs sabiedrībā			

Padomju skolas iezīmes	Piekrita	Nepiekrita	Grūti pateikt
1. Izglītība bija bezmaksas un līdz ar to visiem pieejama			
2. Padomju skolā pastāvēja ierobežotas iespējas iepazīties ar ārzemju pedagoģisko pieredzi			
3. Skolas pedagoģiskais process bija pārāk ideoloģizēts atbilstoši komunistiskās partijas interesēm			
4. Pozitīvi, ka visiem bija garantēts darbs pēc izglītības iestādes absolvēšanas			
5. Padomju skola sniedza plašas un kvalitatīvas zināšanas			
6. Pozitīvi, ka skolā valdīja disciplīna un kārtība			
7. Visi skolēni bija vienlīdzīgi, viņu vidū nepastāvēja materiālā noslāņošanās			
8. Pozitīvi, ka visiem bija jāvalkā vienots, obligāts skolēnu formas tērps			
9. Skolēnu un skolotāju attiecībās dominēja autoritārs stils			
10. Pozitīvi, ka pastāvēja visiem vienotas, obligātas mācību programmas un līdzekļi			
11. Mācību saturs un līdzekļi bija neobjektīvi, ideoloģizēti			
12. Nepietiekama uzmanība tika pievērst svešvalodu apguvei			
13. Pozitīvi, ka lielākā daļa mācību līdzekļu bija bezmaksas			
14. Mācību metodes un formas bija vienveidīgas, skolēni bieži bija pasīvi mācību procesā			
15. Mācību līdzekļi bija neinteresanti un nekvalitatīvi			
16. 5 punktu vērtēšanas sistēma visās izglītības pakāpēs bija skaidra un saprotama			
17. Skolēniem un skolotājiem pārāk daudz bija jāpiedalās obligātos pasākumos			
18. Obligātā līdzdalība komunistiskajās jaunatnes organizācijās vērtējama pozitīvi			
19. Skolā bija ierobežotas iespējas izmantot latviešu tautas tradīcijas un valodu			
20. Padomju skolā pastāvēja pārdomāta darbaudzināšana (darbs kolhozos, talkas, vasaras prakses)			
21. Pozitīvi, ka visiem pieejama bija bezmaksas interešu izglītība un pulciņi			
22. Netika ievērota skolēna individualitāte (intereses, attīstības process)			
23. Skolotāja profesijas prestižs sabiedrībā bija augstāks			
24. Skolotāju darbu pārāk stingri kontrolēja			

Appendix B

Semi-structured interview questions

1. Please tell me about your own education – what school did you attend and when?
2. Which was the language of instruction in the school in which you taught – Latvian or Russian?
3. Why did you want to become a teacher, and why did you chose history as your teachable subject?
4. How were you taught to teach history while receiving you teacher education?
5. What kind of teaching aids and teaching methods did you use?
6. What kind of professional development was required and available to you? What reading material was available?
7. What directions did you receive from the Ministry of Education and other institutions regarding the teaching of history?
8. Describe a typical history lesson.
9. What did you teach about Latvian history – both the period of independence and other history periods?
10. Did you ever experience any reprimands because of the content or methods you used when teaching history, and if so, describe the experience.
11. What was required of you with regard to professional development?

Appendix C

Skolēnu intervijas jautājumi

Dzimšanas gads:
Dzimums: sieviete vīrietis
Skola atradās: lielpilsētā mazpilsētā laukos
Skolā mācību valoda bija: latviešu krievu

Padomju skolas vēstures stundas iezīmes	Piekrita	Nepiekrita	Grūti pateikt
Vēsture kā priekšmets man patika.			
Vēstures stundās pastāvēja ierobežotas iespējas iepazīties ar ārzemēs sagatavotām grāmatām un citiem mācību līdzekļiem.			
Vēstures stundās pedagoģiskais process bija pārāk ideoloģizēts atbilstoši komunistiskās partijas interesēm.			
Vēstures stundās sniedza plašas un kvalitatīvas zināšanas.			
Pozitīvi, ka skolā valdīja disciplīna un kārtība.			
Skolēnu un skolotāju attiecībās dominēja autoritārs stils.			
Pozitīvi, ka pastāvēja visiem vienotas, obligātas mācību programmas un līdzekļi.			
Mācību saturs un līdzekļi vēstures stundās bija neobjektīvi, ideoloģizēti.			
Nepietiekama uzmanība tika pievērsta Latvijas pirmās brīvvalsts vēstures posmam.			
Es ne vienmēr ticēju tam, ko skolotāja/s stāstīja par vēsturi un ko lasīju padomju vēstures grāmatās.			
Mācību metodes un formas bija vienveidīgas, skolēni bieži bija pasīvi mācību procesā.			
Vēstures grāmatas bija neinteresantas un nekvalitatīvas.			
Mani vecāki vai vecvecāki kādreiz stāstīja ko citu, ko stāstīja vēstures stundās.			
Skolēniem un skolotājiem pārāk daudz bija jāpiedalās obligātos pasākumos.			
Obligātā līdzdalība komunistiskajās jaunatnes organizācijās vērtējama pozitīvi.			
Skolā bija ierobežotas iespējas mācīties Latvijas vēsturi.			
Padomju skolā pastāvēja pārdomāta darbaudzināšana (darbs kolhozos, talkas, vasaras prakses).			
Vēstures pulciņa darbība bija interesentāka par vēstures stundām.			
Netika ievērota skolēna individualitāte (intereses, attīstības process)			

Appendix D

Promocijas darbs *EffectS of Authoritariansim on the Teaching of Latvian History* izstrādāts LU PPMF Pedagoģijas nodaļā.

Ar savu parakstu apliecinu, ka pētījums veikts patstāvīgi, izmantoti tikai tajā norādītie informācijas avoti un iesniegtā darba elektroniskā kopija atbilsts izdrukai.

Autore: Aija Ingrīda Abens _____
paraksts un datums

Rekomndēju darbu aizstāvēšanai

Vadītāja: profesore Dr. paed. Iveta Ķestere _____
paraksts un datums

Darbs iesniegts Pedagoģijas nodaļā
MetodiķE _____
vārds, uzvārds, paraksts, datums

Darbs aizstāvēts promocijas darba pārbaudījumu komisija sēlē

Datums un protokola numurs: _____

Vērtējums: _____

Komisija sekretāre/s: _____
paraksts