

EWA BARNAŚ-BARAN

The University of Rzeszow. Faculty of Pedagogy

ORCID – 0000-0001-8084-6150

INITIATORS OF CHANGE IN THE UPBRINGING
AND EDUCATION OF CHILDREN
IN „RUCH PEDAGOGICZNY”
(„PEDAGOGICAL MOVEMENT”)
IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Abstract: The aim of the article was to investigate what profiles of education reformers were presented in „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”), what views and actions of these people were recollecting to teachers and promoted as a valuable example to follow. The content of the magazine’s individual yearbooks was analyzed from its creation in 1912 to 1939. Qualitative analysis of the source material was used. It was discovered that „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”), published information (articles, chronicle notes) popularizing education and educational traditions. It emphasized the relationship between tradition and innovative assumptions in the field of education and upbringing. Showing the profiles of selected representatives from antiquity to modern times, the need to engage in changes, their implementation, and promotion among other teachers was stressed. A creative, active and patriotic attitude was popularized. Most of the articles were devoted to Poles, especially teachers. They were also written about people who were not directly connected to education, but strongly supported the reforms of education and upbringing with their activities. At the beginning of the 20th century, interest in innovative trends in education and training increased. The discoveries of „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) show the teachers’ attention was mostly drawn to the necessity to learn more about pedagogical novelties, yet the pedagogical past was not forgotten. Attempts were made to show the achievements of different figures from the history of education and children’s upbringing, awakening the need for active participation in the changes, referring to the examples from the past.

Keywords: „Pedagogical Movement”, education and training reforms, outstanding pedagogical figures

INTRODUCTION

The changes that took place in upbringing and teaching in Poland in the years 1918–1939 were influenced by the actions of people involved in overcoming the problems of their national education system, popularizing innovative pedagogical achievements and of those who indicated the areas requiring reforms. The teacher was to be an important participant in the process of transformation, aimed at improving the quality of Polish education. The teacher's openness to new solutions was shaped by a number of factors that encouraged and mobilized, yet there were also others that made it difficult for the teacher to efficiently participate in changing the schooling reality. Undoubtedly, many years of the country's slavery, dependence on the foreign government, difficult social and economic situation of teachers and insufficient preparation for the teaching profession did not motivate them to be active. In the territory of the Austrian partition, hopes for change were aroused by the privileges of Galician autonomy granted in the 1860s, especially those concerning education. The undertaken work aimed to implement the school reforms in the following years showed how urgent and important it was to prepare teachers for them. The inclusion of a Galician teacher, especially the one working in the country school, into the active participation in the struggle for the development of education on the territories belonging to Poland, and after 1918 in free Poland, became one of the tasks of the leading educational activists. The source of modern views was the New Upbringing current and a group of its supporters struggling to introduce changes in three areas: the school reform, the education of the new teaching staff, and the building of a modern school model (Krochmalska-Gawrosińska 2011, p. 11). In Galicia the initiator of the creative school and advocate of thorough preparation of the teachers for their profession was Henryk Rowid (1877–1944). In order to support his struggle to raise the level of the teachers' awareness he used, among others, the pedagogical magazine of which he was the first editor (Weissbrot-Koziarska 2018, p. 20). With the help of „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”), he made it easier for the teachers to learn about new ideas, especially in towns distant from larger centers of pedagogical culture. The monthly magazine „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) was published from 1912 in Cracow and after 1934 in Warsaw. As noted by Barbara Łuczyńska, the magazine became an advocate of the theory and practice of new teaching and upbringing methods (Łuczyńska 2000, p. 218; Ślęczka 2017, p. 89–90). Initially, it was an addition to „Głos Nauczycielstwa Ludowego” („The Voice of Country Schools' Teachers”), and after 1918 it became an independent magazine. The outbreak of the First and Second World Wars was the reason for breaking the magazine's publishing continuity. Its internal structure

included several parts: scientific articles, a review of pedagogical literature and journals with reviews, dissertations, and reviews of pedagogical literature, information about emerging journals, a chronicle of important events, meetings and conventions, pedagogical initiatives both in Poland and abroad. Its high level was maintained by successive editors.

In the years 1912–1933 it was Henryk Rowid, from 1934 Benedykt Kubski, Marian Odrzywolski, Maria Kowalewska and from 1937 to 1939 Albin Jakiel. The list of the magazine's workers included a long list of outstanding names, representatives of pedagogy, psychology, philosophy, sociology and other sciences (including Jan Władysław Dawid, Helena Orsza-Radlińska, Aniela Szycówna, Marian Falski, Maria Grzegorzewska, Jan Hulewicz, Maria Ramułtowa, Zofia Szybalska, Maria Laskowiczówna, Maria Grudzińska, Wanda Bobkowska, and many other figures). According to the first editor, serving the school meant working on its constant development and improvement. In this process, the teachers, educators, carers, and parents were to be supported by the magazine edited by them and its popularized content, which could be read about elsewhere but also heard about from other sources (Barnaś-Baran, Ausz 2018, pp. 25–26). The editorial staff's openness to Western pedagogical novelties did not close the way to bring closer the achievements of past eras. The relationship among the upbringing tradition, traditions in the education field, and the contemporary achievements in this area was not forgotten. In 1922 Henryk Rowid expressed the opinion that a break in the continuation and development of Polish educational traditions and the breaking of the connection with the pedagogical culture of Western countries contributed to the teachers' lack of interest in educational issues (Rowid 1922, p. 1). As Danuta Koźmian noted, Rowid was one of few representatives of the pedagogical environment in the Second Republic of Poland who stressed the importance of the education history and especially emphasized the process of building pedagogical theory and practice in the past (Koźmian 2000, p. 105). The article shows what profiles of the initiators of changes in the history of education, teaching, upbringing, and care were presented in „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) in the years 1912–1939, and what actions of these people were particularly important. Materials devoted to these outstanding figures were published in the section entitled „Articles” and they were usually one of several themes published there. The volume of the article ranged from a few to a dozen or so pages, it provided biographical information, analyzed innovative views on educational, upbringing and caring issues, implemented solutions, and included their evaluation. Among the analyzed articles, starting from 1912, the date of the magazine's creation, to 1939, when it was discontinued due to the outbreak of World War II, over forty scientific dissertations dealt with the history of upbringing and education. In this

group there were also articles dedicated to outstanding figures, usually published in the connection to the anniversaries of birth, death and memoirs. They were devoted to people involved in education, upbringing and care from antiquity to the latest history. This group also included figures not directly related to the teaching profession, whose merits in this field were important for the functioning of schools and care and educational institutions. Among them, there were not only representatives of Polish thought and pedagogical practice, but also the representatives of the European current.

THE ACTIVITY OF OUTSTANDING POLES CONNECTED
TO THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION AND UPBRINGING
IN „RUCH PEDAGOGICZNY” („PEDAGOGICAL MOVEMENT”)
IN THE YEARS 1912–1939

In Henryk Rowid's opinion, the issues of upbringing over the years were dealt with by the most eminent thinkers (Rowid 1920a, p. 5). Among them there were many eminent Poles, so he himself, as the editor of a magazine propagating important educational ideas, contributed to popularizing their achievements by preparing the majority of biographical articles published in the „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”). He was convinced that since 1918 Wielkopolska and Małopolska should „be covered by the network of Polish schools” (Rowid 1918, p. 3), in which the education of young people should take into account not only the latest achievements of pedagogy but also the pedagogical guidelines of prominent figures from previous epochs. He stated that the significance of the most eminent representatives of national pedagogy, including Konarski, Piramowicz, Popławski, Staszic, Kołłątaj, Śniadecki, Trentowski, Estkowski and Dawid, was based on their ability to extract real values from their educational output and apply them to Polish conditions. In 1920, he wrote that the initiators of the changes showed the way to follow towards the school of the future and towards the reform of the universal education (Rowid 1920c, pp. 94–95). Among the authors of the other studies there should be mentioned such figures, as Jan Hulewicz, Jan Muszkowski, Maria Leskowiczówna, and Anna Brossowa.

The journal published memoirs, written after the death of his editors, as well as the dissertations that were written in connection with subsequent anniversaries of death or birthdays of outstanding activists. They showed the figures of Poles who had an influence on the history of elementary education, promoted the postulate of promoting education among the lowest strata of society, dealt with the education of children, initiated help for the needy, and prepared the ground for

educational reforms in the subsequent epochs. Among them were representatives of the Church, laypeople, teachers, but also individuals not directly connected to education. In the analyzed period there were described the figures who fought for changes in thinking and taking action in upbringing and education from the 16th century to the 1930s. The information provided was to inspire action, evoke reflection and discussion among the readers of „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”), especially teachers. In this way, they were mobilized to change their attitude towards life, and stimulated to take creative action. The starting point was the liberation of the Galician teacher’s thought, the figure „brought up in seminars, fed by the rules of N.S.C. instructions [of the National School Council – author’s note] from the limitations of the official regulations’ framework” (Rowid 1912, p. 94). In 1912, the readers of „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) had the opportunity to learn about the activities of a priest called Piotr Skarga (1536–1612), a distinguished figure in the history of education, whose achievements were the subject of presentations and discussions at the meetings of teachers at the Warsaw Teachers’ Association. Maria Laskowiczówna, the organizer of Polish education in the Land of Lidzko, the teacher of Polish language, history, and pedagogy in private schools in Warsaw, concluded that the readers of the magazine could be interested in Henryk Bolceiwcz’s speech on the Polish Jesuit, the representative of the Counter-Reformation Father Piotr Skarga. Evaluating the speaker’s speech, she noticed that the facts of Skarga’s life were presented in an objective way, as he was presented as an outstanding 16th-century preacher and prose writer, a Christian sensitive to the misery of others and an organizer of the help for the poor. However, she did not agree with the Jesuit’s belief that only a Catholic could be a good Polish citizen. She stated that the creators of national literature and the 16th-century program to repair the Republic of Poland were mostly Protestants. She emphasized that the views proclaimed by Father Piotr Skarga and his merits could be considered significant only by the Jesuit order. In conclusion, she included her own assessment of the Order’s activity, writing that it implanted „fanaticism, lowering the mental and civic level of the youth entering it” (Laskowiczówna, 1912, p. 156). For many subsequent years, such an opinion about the activity of the Order’s representatives was maintained in the pedagogical literature. However, she did not agree with the Jesuit’s belief that only a Catholic could be a good Polish citizen. She stated that the creators of national literature and the 16th-century program to repair the Republic of Poland were mostly Protestants. She emphasized that the views proclaimed by Father Piotr Skarga and his merits could be considered significant only by the Jesuit order. In conclusion, she included her own assessment of the Order’s activity, writing that it implanted „fanaticism, lowering the mental and civic level of the youth

entering it" (Laskowiczówna, 1912, p. 156). For many subsequent years such an opinion about the activity of the Order's representatives was maintained in the pedagogical literature.

In „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) there were analyzed the reforms of elementary education undertaken in the 18th century and their continuation in the next epoch (Orsza 1912, p. 5, 71, 145). The centenary of the National Education Commission activity in 1912 included a selection of valuable sentences by Hugo Kołłątaj, its cooperator and the reformer of the education system (1750–1812). The above-mentioned sentences came from his works and letters. At the beginning of the 20th century, it was recollected that Hugo Kołłątaj described as a true miserable man a person who was not granted the right to educate by the society and that he presented as the misfortune of the nation „the inequality in education between the rich and the poor” (Thoughts of Hugo Kołłątaj 1912, p. 26). In this way, it was indicated that after almost a few hundreds of years, there remained a still unresolved task of guaranteeing access to schools for all people. It was repeated after Kołłątaj that a free nation is a nation that not only has the opportunity to learn, but also has teachers prepared to teach. The teachers should be distinguished by their ability to convey messages, stimulate students' cognitive interests, inquisitiveness, as well as to evoke reflection (Thoughts of Hugo Kołłątaj 1912, p. 29). It was emphasized in this way that the important factors determining the strength of the nation were: access to education and learning granted to all its members, the development of schools and the conducting of the teaching mission by the sufficiently trained people. The readers of „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) were encouraged to familiarize themselves with the achievements of people who fought for the Polish school during the time of national captivity. The aim was to trigger activity in teaching, which had been limited for many years, to stimulate pedagogical work, especially in the field of national pedagogy. The life, views, and achievements of Stanisław Jachowicz, Bronisław Trentowski and Ewaryst Estkowski were to make teachers in the twentieth century aware of the important role they had to play, how much influence they should have on their pupils, what difficulties they could have encountered, but also how to overcome them, just like these figures showed themselves. The editors of the magazine understood the importance of maintaining the local history of education, the significance of the pedagogical activity of Poles calling for a reform in education during the partitions, fighting for the preservation of their own identity, but also the editors tried to convince teachers that the struggle for change should be continued. The seventy-fifth anniversary of Stanisław Jachowicz's death (1796–1857) contributed in 1933 to the recollection of this distinguished nineteenth-century teacher in the history of children's literature and education. The author of the article devoted to

Jachowicz was Jan Muszkowski, an outstanding librarian, a pioneer in the field of librarian education. First of all, Muszkowski underlined the fact that Jachowicz was a teacher highly valued among his students and emphasized an important role he played in the field of popularizing a new kind of literature for children, similarly to Klementyna Tańska-Hoffmanowa. According to the author of the article, Jachowicz was the first writer in Poland able to communicate in a language that would directly touch the soul of the child. One of his achievements was also popularizing the value of the song in education and teaching (Muszkowski 1933/34, pp. 97–103). Respecting the human side in children, when writing for them, Jachowicz wanted it to be children to evaluate his work. When Jachowicz addressed them, Muszkowski stated, he did not have “an indulgent and slightly bored face, so typical to adults when facing the supposedly trivial issues of the childhood life”. In the education of children, he emphasized the role of the example, writing „Whoever teaches virtue by word, sows, – who teaches by means of the example, reaps fruit...” (Muszkowski 1933/34, p. 103). As an educator and a teacher he was noble, simple and modest, he believed in the need for changes and he was engaged in building a better reality for children. This way he motivated others to take action. As a benefactor, he established one of the earliest institutions for the care of an orphaned child that was abandoned in Warsaw. In 1832, he became a member of the Warsaw Charity Society, then the guardian of a school for boys, and in 1844 the superior of the orphan section. Being selfless and generous, he struggled with a lack of financial means to support himself and his family all his life (Muszkowski 1933/34, pp. 97–98, 101–102). The author of the article also stated that the experiment of high value was the journal „Dziennik dla dzieci” („Children’s Journal”) published by Jachowicz. It was a valuable attempt to draw children’s interest to current affairs, social and political events. Jachowicz, in the opinion of J. Muszkowski, was ahead of his time with his actions, as well as with his ability to capture educational tasks. As a summary of reflections on Jachowicz’s merits for the development of pedagogical practice, Muszkowski quoted the author of one of his most eminent students, Eleonora Ziemięcka. She compared his teaching to living psychology; in her opinion, the classes he ran and his written work caused others to „listen, think, and meditate” (Muszkowski 1933/34, p 103). On the fiftieth anniversary of Bronisław Trentowski’s death (1808–1869), H. Rowid published Trentowski’s Pedagogy Basis (Warsaw-Lviv 1920); and in the mid 1930s, in „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”), he recalled the figure of the founder of the original Polish pedagogical system. In his opinion, the sources of Trentowski’s pedagogical beliefs were built not only on scientific systems but also on Trentowski’s deep patriotism. He stressed that „Chowanna, i.e. the system of national pedagogy as the abilities to learn, to care for and edu-

cate, as a whole the education of our youth” (1842) was written for Poles, taking into account the circumstances prevailing in the schools at that time. Trentowski placed high demands on teachers in public schools and particularly appreciated the work of teachers working in country schools, who „educated the root of the nation” (Rowid 1934/5, p. 338). A universal, uniform and compulsory school was a necessary condition to maintain a better future. The proper functioning of schools should also be guaranteed by those who supervised them. Trentowski stated that the only visitors to schools should be progressive people. In order to prepare them for this function in a better way, the author of „Chowanny” recommended writing a separate pedagogy for them. In Trentowski’s opinion, both the teacher and the priest should be an example of proper behavior among the people. He even suggested that a priest should look after an orphan in the rectory and set an example to his parents when raising a child. Rowid, analyzing Trentowski’s pedagogical views, concluded that there were many reasons that determined the independence of his beliefs. The references to German reading supplemented and supported the planned and thoughtful concept of education. Both Jan Jakub Rousseau’s individualism and the German pedagogical atmosphere were the basis for undertaking the pedagogical problems and issues common in the land areas of Poland. Trentowski built the system of education on the philosophy and pedagogical practice and these were the sources that then constituted the expression of progress (Rowid 1934/5, p. 342).

In 1920, on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Ewaryst Estkowski (1820–1856), a country teacher in Wielkopolska, Henryk Rowid analyzed the importance of his views for the development of national educational thought (Rowid 1920b, p. 177). In his opinion, Estkowski was one of the nation’s most eminent representatives of philosophical thought. He did not create a new pedagogical system, but contributed to the development of national educational thought (Rowid 1920b, p. 167). Rowid also included the popularizing of works of Grzegorz Piramowicz, Bronisław Trentowski, Karol Libelt and August Cieszkowski as one of Estkowski’s superior achievements. His work was of great importance for the liberation of the Polish school and the educational thought from the influence of German pedagogy. This issue dealt especially with the schools of Wielkopolska. According to Estkowski, elementary schools were to become the basis for the creation of a uniform school organism (Rowid 1920b, pp. 169, 171). Rowid underlined the fact that both the curriculum of the elementary school provided by Estkowski as well as the teaching methods and the practical guidelines were still relevant in free Poland.

He reminded how important it was in working with a child to choose the right age for starting education and shaping the child’s independence. It was

necessary to include games and plays in the teaching process and to allocate sufficient time for trips and walks. Children should learn by getting to know their own country, surroundings, by listening to stories, fairy tales, by drawing and painting. In 1918, referring to Estkowski's ideas, Antonina Winiarzowa appealed to teachers to develop the national consciousness of children by allowing them to get to know their home country, its wealth and customs, and not necessarily resorting to teaching by means of „sabers, flags and confederates” (Winiarzowa 1918, p. 190). Nature should be explored at any time of the year, studying and visiting all the communities (Dyakowski 1918, p. 109). In 1920, Rowid alleged that the method of teaching, given by Estkowski 70 years ago, was still unknown in teacher seminars. Such a state of affairs was influenced by the inappropriate way in which Polish pedagogical thought was communicated there (Rowid, 1920b, p. 172, 173). It should also be mentioned that „Ruch Pedagogiczny” (“Pedagogical Movement”) also initiated actions commemorating Estkowski, such as the construction of a monument dedicated to him in 1924 or learning about the activities of the Ewaryst Estkowski's Pedagogical Society (Kronika pedagogiczna, “Chronicle of education”, 1924, p. 48).

„Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) informed readers about the achievements of these figures, who died not long ago and opened a new chapter in the history of pedagogy. They were united by their deep involvement in work, great knowledge and the ability to relate it to practice and apply it to their research. The articles *in memoriam* were devoted to Jan Władysław Dawid, Aniela Szycówna or Józef Joteyko. The initiator of Polish pedagogical research, distinguished for the development of research devoted to teachers was at the end of the XIX century and the beginning of XX century J.W. Dawid (1859–1914) – the pedagogue, psychologist and the author of pedagogical writings (Michalska 1995, p. 7–13). He not only developed the ideal model of the teachers' training but also created a tool and guidelines for their professional development. Henryk Rowid highly evaluated not only Dawid's scientific achievements but also praised the personality of the Master, writing that he was able to awake the hidden forces of a man and motivate a man to experience their life in full. He recollected how Dawid's audience were impressed with his lectures, how many questions were asked afterwards, but also how important it was that the teachers found “subtle understanding” in him (Rowid 1914, p. 1). In another memoir, written after Aniela Szycówna's death (1864–1921), a continuator of Jan Władysław David's research trend, Henryk Rowid wrote that an outstanding teacher and an outstanding pedagogical author passed away. She also cooperated with „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) allowing teachers to get closer to the latest achievements in scientific research devoted to the child, she was an editor of „Szkoła Powszechna” („The Common School”) from

1920 (Rowid 1921, p. 4; Michalski 2014, p. 37–43). Rowid reminded the public that Aniela Szycówna dealt with theoretical issues, but also with topics from the field of pedagogical practice. She dedicated her publications to people of goodwill who devoted themselves to raising school education to a higher level and improving the training methods of teachers. He pointed out that Szycówna not only worked for the development of pedagogical thought in Poland but also took special care to ensure that the nation, especially teachers, would not remain without knowledge about the achievements of other, free nations and initiated pedagogical research in the area of Poland. Szycówna was the representative of the Polish teaching environment at international educational congresses in Paris, Geneva and Brussels. Henryk Rowid described her as a „guardian of the national spirit at the times of captivity” (Rowid 1921, p. 4), stating that she was actively involved in the construction of the new school during the rebirth of Poland. She brought up thousands of teachers, among others, teaching them at Holiday Courses in Zakopane. In 1928, Maria Grzegorzewska (1866–1928) wrote an article on leaving of another eminent figure in Polish pedagogy, Józefa Joteyko (1866–1928), underlying the Professor’s ability to apply her extensive knowledge about human being to her research, deepening the contemporary knowledge about the proper human development cycle and her ability to implement it into practice. Her enormous scientific output, hard work on popularizing the world scientific achievements in Poland, lectures on pedology and experimental psychology, pedagogical psychology and experimental pedagogy in France and Poland placed her among the most outstanding representatives of Polish science (Grzegorzewska 1928, pp. 129–136). After her death, commemorative academies were held, in which numerous representatives of the teaching environment took part (Kronika Pedagogiczna, (Pedagogical Chronicle), 1928, p. 160, 316; 1929, p. 29).

Among the biographical articles, which discussed the achievements of important figures fighting for changes in education and teaching area of Polish children throughout history there were not only pedagogues, teachers, and educators, but also people not directly related to education. In 1928 Anna Brossowa reminded the readers of „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) about a figure known for his struggle for Polish independence, Tadeusz Kościuszko (1746–1817), the pupil of the Knights’ School in Warsaw. Brossowa drew the readers’ attention to the necessity to „promote and expand education” among Poles, proclaimed by him, so that they could serve their homeland as its defenders, but also as civil officers (Brossowa 1928, p. 227). Kościuszko’s views were influenced by Jan Henryk Pestalozzi, whom he met during his stay in Paris in 1802. Both Kościuszko and Pestalozzi were united by the need to improve the fate of the lowest strata of society and to include them in education system. Kościuszko was then invited to

visit the Pestalozzi Institute and in April 1816 Kościuszko visited the institute in Solera and a month later he was in Yverdon. He visited the Pestalozzi institute and even examined several students himself. As it was stated by Anna Brossowa, he discussed everything comprehensively with Pestalozzi and expressed his wish for a similar facility to be established in Poland. This wish was realized in the government school in Marymont, established in 1820, where the principles of Pestalozzi and the Swiss Fellenberg institutes were followed. The elementary school for poor country children was connected with this institute. Brossowa reported that in his will of 2nd April 1817 Kościuszko abolished serfdom in his estate Sieciechowice, obliging the peasants to make efforts to establish schools and spread education (Brossowa 1928, p. 230). In his letters to Duke Adam Czartoryski, Kościuszko appealed to the other owners of estates to establish schools for the manors. According to the author, the conviction he supported about the need to establish common and vocational schools preceded the era in which he lived. Kościuszko also expressed the view that the level of education for girls, then much neglected (Brossowa 1928, pp. 228–229), should be raised.

The difficulties that teachers and students had to overcome during the partitions could be learned about from Stefan Żeromski's works (1864–1925). According to Jan Hulewicz, the own learning experience of this eminent and outstanding Polish prose writer inspired him to include topics concerning education and teaching into the content of his works. Żeromski was being educated at the times of the fight for „the power over the souls of the young generation” in the schools of the Russian partition. When analyzing the pedagogical aspects of Żeromski's work, Jan Hulewicz stressed that he was concerned to show the school with the background of socio-economic relations. Its image was then more complete and the factors influencing the behavior of teachers and pupils were then shown in the right light. Hulewicz stated that in all Żeromski's writings school issues were particularly close to his heart (Hulewicz 1929, p. 131). The writer called for large-scale educational action. Showing the sad images of the Polish traditional school, such as the Cracow gymnasium, he softened these images with his other memories from the gymnasium in Zakopane. He did not preach any specific school reforming program but tried to point out its shortcomings, at the same time giving examples of proper pedagogical work. In Hulewicz's opinion, Żeromski passed from the school's apotheosis to showing the “grey labor of common school teachers” (Hulewicz 1929, p. 131). Stefan Żeromski did not confine himself only to raising school issues on the pages of his novels, but he also took an active part in educational work in the Lublin region.

BIOGRAPHIES OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF EUROPEAN PEDAGOGICAL THOUGHT AND PRACTICE
IN „RUCH PEDAGOGICZNY” („PEDAGOGICAL MOVEMENT”)
BETWEEN 1912 AND 1939

„Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) documented and discussed the achievements of outstanding representatives of both international and European pedagogical thought and practice. The works devoted to scientists, teachers, and thinkers who had influenced the formation of pedagogical thought and school practice from antiquity to the 20th century were published there. Among the authors there were, among others: Mikołaj Orłow, Wanda Bobkowska, Anna Brossowa or Sergiusz Hessen. They presented the development of pedagogical thought on the example of the views of Socrates, the Egg of Jakub Rousseau, Henryk Pestalozzi or Leo Tolstoy. Learning about the nature of a human and a child, understanding their individuality and needs was the timeless value that was expressed in previous eras, and, on the basis of it, there was built a new school in the 20th century.

When Nicholas Orlov presented in 1928 and 1931 the figure of the Athenian called Socrates (469–399), showing his way of teaching and how he stimulated his listeners to think, Orlov was convinced that it was necessary to use Socrates’ ingenious intuition and teach people how to think, but also to act in accordance with the knowledge and the notion they had created. Socrates created the foundations of scientific thinking, taught how to create judgments and invented the definition of a concept. Orlov stated that the Greek school before Socrates, as well as the medieval school and the school in the nineteenth century did not recognize the methods of creative work. In Orlov’s opinion, they were introduced by Socrates and then by the representatives of the New Education. (Orlov 1928, p. 168; Orlov 1931b, p. 49–50). Socrates’ educational goal was this that was called the formation of civil and moral will (Orlov 1931a, p. 7). Recalling Żeromski’s words, Orlov wrote that thanks to Socrates „a man became naked”. In his opinion, Pericles created the framework for democracy, and Socrates began to create an image for this framework (Orlov 1931c, p. 103). Orlov called the verdict issued on Socrates the verdict issued on creative school, and the power of this verdict, in his opinion, lasts until the modern times (Orlov, 1931d, p. 157).

In 1912 Aniela Szycówna wrote that the theoretical pedagogy was far ahead of school practice. She stated that at the beginning of the twentieth century, the demands made by the eminent representatives of reforms in education were still not implemented or carried out in the sphere of education (Szycówna 1912, p. 131). On the occasion of the 200th anniversary of Jan Jakub Rousseau’s birthday (1712–1778), in order to recall the important postulates of the representative on the concept

of natural education, „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) published the selection of his main assumptions. The main slogan of Rousseau, which in the 18th century denied the assumptions of the previous theory and practice of education and training, was recalled and it sounded: „People – be people! It is your first duty; be people at every state and age, be people to everything that is not unfamiliar to people [...]. Love children, be sympathetic to their games and their joys, love their charming being” (John Jacob Rousseau 1912, p. 131). It draws attention to the importance of accepting a child as it is, not evaluating the child in terms of its background, competences, abilities to acquire knowledge, or the way of spending free time and playing. According to Rousseau, it was possible to get access to a child, ideally by inviting it to take action. He was against forcing the child to learn by heart; the books could be only used to acquire the type of the knowledge of things that could not be experienced. One should learn more about this that could help in good behavior. In the following years, the readers were informed about the activities of the Rousseau Institute in Geneva that was founded in 1912, showing the creative way of using Rousseau’s indications (Kronika Pedagogiczna 1921 (Pedagogical Chronicle), p. 4).

In 1927, Wanda Bobkowska, an academic teacher and the historian of education, who headed the State Pedagogical College in Cracow after Henryk Rowid, focused on the life and activity of Jan Henryk Pestalozzi (1746–1827). Pestalozzi created the theoretical basis for the primary teaching methods and at the beginning of the nineteenth century defined new goals for country schools. Wanda Bobkowska reminded us that, in Pestalozzi’s opinion, education was a search for ways to make a selfish, lazy, greedy, cruel man, striving for comfort and abuse to obey social rules and regulations and to become an individual highly-valued by society and useful for their homeland (Bobkowska, 1927, p. 65). It could be achieved by universal education and the creation of a „joyful school” for those children who, without proper education and teaching, could become the outcasts of the society (Bobkowska 1927, p. 66). In her opinion, it was worth knowing Pestalozzi’s achievements, as he was active in the times similar to the contemporary ones and it was possible to benefit from these experiences. For Pestalozzi, the model for his pedagogical work was the behavior of the mother who subordinated herself to the child, as opposed to the teacher who subordinated the child and the teaching methods to themselves (Bobkowska 1927, p. 67). Pestalozzi regarded school play as a privilege of a child; the child developed its physical strength by bathing in the river, swimming, drill outside, dancing and singing of cheerful and patriotic songs. Even with small children, trips around the area were organized, minerals and plants were collected and geography and nature were taught. According to W. Bobkowska, the pattern of all those values that were expected from Polish

teachers in the Second Polish Republic could be found in Pestalozzi (Bobkowska 1927, p. 70). In the title of the article itself, the author indicated the connection between Pálozzi's views and the pedagogical trends of the time, and the magazine also informed the readers about the celebration of the 100-year anniversary of the death of this outstanding teacher (*Kronika pedagogiczna* 1927 (Pedagogical Chronicle), p. 191).

The readers could get acquainted with the views of figures whose individualistic concepts about education and pedagogical experiments became the foundation of individualistic pedagogy, focusing all activities of adults on a child. Individualism in pedagogy originated from Rousseau's pedagogical naturalism, while the views of Leo Tolstoy (1828–1910) were its extreme approach. Sergei Hessen (Hessen 1935/36, p. 105) pointed to the special place John Jacob Rousseau occupied in the history of pedagogy. In his opinion, the writer's life was a combination and interpenetration of three areas and spheres: his personality as a brilliant artist, a pedagogue-practitioner and a theorist of the school reform. He recalled the opinion of Tolstoy himself, who at the age of 77 stated that John Jacob Rousseau and the Bible had the greatest influence on his life. In his work, he held to the pedagogical ideal of educational freedom, i.e. not forcing the child to do anything that was in the adult culture and did not go along with the nature of the child. He believed that the harmony of truth, beauty and goodness was a goal to be pursued. He started from the point of the negation of pedagogical tradition and all theoretical pedagogy, and then he made a concrete criticism of his contemporary educational methods. According to Hessen, the value of such a stance was to build the foundations of the positive principles of the new pedagogy on this critical approach (Hessen 1935/36, p. 114). Unlike Rousseau, who believed that the main sin of culture came from intellectualism, Tolstoy believed that the biggest problem was that a person wanted to shift the burden of work to other people. The author pointed out that he did not stop, as Rousseau did, at writing a pedagogical romance, but he realized in his life the pedagogical postulates he proclaimed. He founded a school for peasant children in Jasna Polana and became a teacher there. Count Tolstoy's attempt to "go to the people", which in the following years became more frequent among the Russian intelligentsia, was, according to the author of the article, something unheard of in the pedagogy of the time (Hessen 1935/36, p. 106). Describing Tolstoy's school, he emphasized with appreciation that it did not isolate from its surroundings, but was as closely connected as possible with the real life of the people and its surrounding environment. It did not create the disguise of freedom but really gave it. For Tolstoy, the upbringing as the planned shaping of the human being according to certain patterns was pointless. In his opinion, the young generation always rebelled and was to continue to do it further against the „rape of upbringing” (Hessen 1935/36,

p. 107). Upbringing could not be justified, the *raison d'être* was only education. It was to be based on voluntary, mutual interaction of personalities. The school could become a meaningful factor in human development only if it gave the opportunity to acquire knowledge. Tolstoy, while denying upbringing, could not also recognize pedagogy as knowledge about upbringing. The best method, according to him, would be the lack of any permanent method. It was necessary to respond to emerging difficulties during the process of the student's learning. At this point, the author of the article noticed that it is no longer a method, but the art and talent. In his opinion, there were no equal personalities either, and such were to influence each other. He also quoted Tolstoy's assessment of his own achievements after 20 years of his work, experience, and reflection. He stated that he himself did not know what to teach, much less did the boys. A warning to those working at school could have been the infatuation of new principles and assumptions that Tolstoy experienced himself, but, on the other hand, it should be remembered that this situation allowed him, according to Sergei Hessen, to discover both the truth and the false ideal of educational freedom (Hessen 1935/36, p. 119). It was also experienced by Berthold Otto, Szacki or Maria Montessori, but they learned from his shortcomings and, thanks to him, also achieved their greatest success. According to Hessen, such a state should be experienced and passed through by everyone. Closing his deliberations, Hessen wrote that: „A pedagogue who has never succumbed to the charm of this ideal, who, having not thought it through to the end, already knows all its shortcomings coincidentally in advance, is not a proper pedagogue”. (Hessen 1935/36, p. 120).

In 1930 in „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) Grzegorz Jampoler (Jampoler 1930, pp. 149–155) wrote about the importance of gaining knowledge about the history of upbringing and education by the students. An important thing, in his opinion, in the approach to these issues was not only to show, but also to pedagogically evaluate the actions of the figures who were the initiators of changes in the contemporary system of education and training.

SUMMARY

„Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) emphasized the connection between the tradition in the field of education and contemporary action taken in this area. The editor Henryk Rowid, similarly to his successors, as well as the authors of the published articles, referred to the achievements of the previous generations: educators, institutions and schools, aiming at showing the continuity of Polish pedagogical culture (W dwudziestolecie Ruchu Pedagogicznego (In 20 Years of

Pedagogical Movement) 1932, p. 1; Mieszalski 2012, p. 6; Radziejewicz-Winnicki 2012, p. 12). The issues that are part of the history of education presented in „Ruch Pedagogiczny” („Pedagogical Movement”) were supposed to have the supporting and stimulating effect on those who took the effort of creating the new school in Poland. From the establishment of the journal in 1912 to 1939, more than forty articles were published in which the authors presented the achievements of previous generations in the field of education and upbringing from the pedagogical, psychological and philosophical perspective. This content did not constitute the main topic of deliberations but they continuously emphasized the connection between the past and the present. Biographical articles, which presented both the achievements of the selected person in the field of pedagogical theory and the practical dimension of his or her activity, constituted a certain part of it. They contained not only the analysis of the achievements and work of particular educators but they also presented the influence on their contemporary generation, the social perception of their activity, and above all, indicated if the person could be still a role model.

They were dedicated to the initiators of changes in education and teaching from antiquity to modern times. The achievements of teachers, pedagogues and tutors were presented but also of the people not directly related to education, yet fighting for school reforms and for that being the models of behavior for the readers. Among them there were figures fighting for changes in education and children's upbringing, especially during the period of the partitions and then in the reborn Poland, but these were also the initiators of changes in education and upbringing in Europe. By learning about the life of these people and following the difficulties they faced, the readers could relate and compare the learned facts to their own situation but, above all, strengthen themselves in the conviction that their own efforts could bring results. In the article presenting the chosen person, there were mentioned the facts from their life and the analyses of their pedagogical activity as well as their publications and the influence the person had on the other contemporary people at that time. The timeless dimension of pedagogical postulates was always very clearly emphasized there and there was given a clear message about the possibility of using these achievements by next generations of educators.

In this way, basing on educational and teaching traditions, the achievements of prominent figures and the model of pedagogical work were built. Their life and actions were to contribute to professional reflection and become a point of reference for one's own assessment and comparison to the fate of the pioneers of change. It was written about the ancient philosophers, representatives of the Enlightenment and positivism and the attention was also paid to the creators and implementers of the New Education. The valuable attitudes of different people, not only those

connected to teaching, education or moral improvement were presented, but also the actions of outstanding figures connected to the dissemination of patriotic values, involved in the fight for liberated Poland could serve as a model. Especially emphasized was the pedagogical content of their work by the use of such terms as “a teacher” or “a swordsman of education” or by selecting and analyzing views related to educational issues.

REFERENCES

- Barnaś-Baran E., M. Ausz, 2018, „*Ruch Pedagogiczny*” („*Pedagogical Movement*”) przykładem czasopisma popularyzującego przekaz radiowy treści pedagogicznych w latach 1918–1939. „*Edukacja. Technika. Informatyka. Kwartalnik Naukowy*”, nr 3/25, 25–32, DOI 10.15584/eti.2018.3.2. (Barnaś-Baran E., M. Ausz, 2018, „*Pedagogical Movement*” the example of the journal popularizing the pedagogical radio message in the years 1918–1939. „*Education. Technics. Informatics. Research Quarterly*”, no. 3/25, 25–32, DOI 10.15584/eti.2018.3.2).
- Bobkowska W., 1927, *Jan Henryk Pestalozzi, a dzisiejsze prądy pedagogiczne*. „*Ruch Pedagogiczny*” („*Pedagogical Movement*”) [dalej: „RP”], nr 3, 65–73. (Bobkowska W., 1927, *Jan Henryk Pestalozzi and Contemporary Pedagogical Currents*. „*Pedagogical Movement*” [further: „PM”], no. 3, 65–73).
- Brosowa A., 1928, *Kościuszko jako szermierz oświaty*. „RP”, nr 8, 225–231. (Brosowa A., 1928, *Kościuszko as the Swordsman of Education*. „PM”, no. 8, 225–231).
- Dyakowski B., 1918, *Metoda zbiorowisk w początkowym nauczaniu przyrody*. „RP”, nr 4, s. 109–117. (Dyakowski B., 1918, *The Method of Community in the Primary Teaching of Natural Sciences*. „PM”, no. 4, p. 109–117).
- Grzegorzewska M., 1928, *Po zgonie Profesor Józefy Joteyko*. „RP”, nr 5, 129–136. (Grzegorzewska M., 1928, *After the Death of the Professor Józefa Joteyko*. „PM”, no. 5, 129–136).
- Hessen S., 1935/36, *Tołstoj jako pedagog (Z powodu 25-lecia śmierci)*. „RP”, nr 4, 105–120. (Hessen S., 1935/36, *Tołstoj as an Educator. (To Commemorate his 25th death anniversary)*. „PM”, no. 4, 105–120).
- Hulewicz J., 1929, *Żeromski wobec zagadnień pedagogicznych*. „RP”, nr 5, 129–132. (Hulewicz J., 1929, *Żeromski Facing Pedagogical Issues*. „PM”, no. 5, 129–132).
- Jampoler G., 1930, *O stanowisko pedagogiczne w nauczaniu historii wychowania*. „RP”, nr 12, 149–155. (Jampoler G., 1930, *Pedagogical Stance in Teaching the History of Education*. „PM”, no. 12, 149–155).
- Jan Jakub Rousseau (1712–1912). *Myśli pedagogiczne wielkiego pedagoga i myśliciela z powodu 200 letniej rocznicy*, 1912. „RP”, nr 7, 129–131. (Jan Jakub Rousseau

- (1712–1912). *Pedagogical thoughts of the Great Educator and Thinker to Commemorate 200-year Anniversary*, 1912. „PM”, no. 7, 129–131).
- Koźmian D., 2000, *Henryk Rowid – współtwórca teorii „Nowego Wychowania” w Polsce międzywojennej*. W: A. Meissner, C. Majorek (red.), *Pedagogika Nowego Wychowania w Polsce u schyłku XIX i w pierwszej połowie XX wieku*. T. 14. Rzeszów, Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej, 105–117. (Koźmian D., 2000, *Henryk Rowid – the Co-creator of the „New Education” Theory in Interwar Poland*. In: A. Meissner, C. Majorek (ed.), *Pedagogy of New Education in Poland at the End of the 19th and the first half of the 20th Century*. V. 14. Rzeszów, Publishing House of the Higher School of Pedagogy, 105–117).
- Krochmalska-Gawrosińska E., 2011, *Henryk Rowid – twórca Państwowego Pedagogium w Krakowie*. W: J. Krukowski, B. Morawska-Nowak (red.), *Państwowe Pedagogium i Szkoła Ćwiczeń w Krakowie. Z tradycji kształcenia nauczycieli*. Kraków, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego, 11–20. (Krochmalska-Gawrosińska E., 2011, *Henryk Rowid – the creator of the National Pedagogical School in Cracow*. In: J. Krukowski, B. Morawska-Nowak (ed.), *The National Pedagogical School and the Practice School in Cracow. From the Tradition of Teachers’ Training*. Cracow, Scientific Publishing House of the Pedagogical University, 11–20).
- Pedagogical Chronicles, „PM” 1921, no. 4, p. 4; „PM” 1924; „PM”, no. 1–2, p. 48; „PM” 1927, p. 191 „PM” 1928, p. 160, 316; „PM” 1929, p. 29.
- Laskowiczówna M., 1912, *Odczyt o Ks. Skardze w warszawskim związku nauczycielskim*. „RP”, nr 8, 155–157. (Laskowiczówna M., 1912, *The Reading about Father Skarga in the Warsaw Teachers’ Association*. „PM”, no. 8, 155–157).
- Łuczyńska B., 2000, *Ideologia nowego wychowania na łamach „Ruchu Pedagogicznego” w niepodległej Polsce*. W: A. Meissner, C. Majorek (red.), *Pedagogika Nowego Wychowania w Polsce u schyłku XIX i w pierwszej połowie XX wieku*. T. 14. Rzeszów, Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej, 211–229. (Łuczyńska B., 2000, *The Ideology of the New Education in the „Pedagogical Movement” in Independent Poland*. In: A. Meissner, C. Majorek (ed.), *Pedagogy of New Education in Poland at the End of the 19th and the first half of the 20th Century*. V. 14. Rzeszów, Publishing House of the Higher School of Pedagogy, 211–229).
- Michalska I., 2014, *Jan Władysław Dawid (1859–1914): życie, główne kierunki pracy naukowej*. „RP”, nr 3, 7–13. (Michalska I., 2014, *Jan Władysław Dawid (1859–1914): Life, Main Directions of Scientific Work*. „PM”, no. 3, 7–13).
- Michalski G., 2014, *Kierunki działalności naukowo-pedagogicznej Anieli Szycówny i jej współpraca z „Ruchem Pedagogicznym”*. „RP”, nr 3, 37–43. (Michalski G., 2014, *The Directions of Pedagogical and Scientific Activity of Aniela Szycówna and Her Co-operation with the „Pedagogical Movement”*. „PM”, no. 3, 37–43).

- Mieszalski S., 2012, *O czasopiśmiennictwie pedagogicznym- kilka refleksji na 100-lecie „Ruchu Pedagogicznego”*. „RP”, nr 1, 6. (Mieszalski S., 2012, *About Pedagogical Journal Writing – a few Reflections for 100 years of „Pedagogical Movement”*. „PM”, no. 1, 6).
- Muszkowski J., 1933, „*Geniusz serca*” (Z powodu 75-letniej rocznicy śmierci Stanisława Jachowicza dn. 24 grudnia 1857 r.). „RP”, nr 3, 97–104. (Muszkowski J., 1933, „*Genius of the Heart*” (To commemorate the 75th anniversary of Stanisław Jachowicz’s death on 24th December 1857). „PM”, no. 3, 97–104).
- Mysli Hugona Kołłątaja o podstawach i zadaniach wychowania, 1912. „RP”, nr 2, 25–29. (*The Thoughts of Hugo Kołłątaj about the Attitudes and Tasks of Education*, 1912. „PM”, no. 2, 25–29).
- Orłow M., 1928, *Sokrates. Geneza szkoły twórczej*. „RP”, nr 6, 161–169. (Orłow M., 1928, *Socrates. The Origins of the Creative School*. „PM”, no. 6, 161–169).
- Orłow M., 1931a, *Szkoła twórcza Sokratesa*. „RP”, nr 1, 1–14. (Orłow M., 1931a, *Socrates’ Creative School*. „PM”, no. 1, 1–14).
- Orłow M., 1931b, *Szkoła twórcza Sokratesa*. „RP”, nr 2, 49–60. (Orłow M., 1931b, *Socrates’ Creative School*. „PM”, no. 2, 49–60).
- Orłow M., 1931c, *Szkoła twórcza Sokratesa*. „RP”, nr 3, 97–103. (Orłow M., 1931c, *Socrates’ Creative School*. „PM”, no. 3, 97–103).
- Orłow M., 1931d, *Szkoła twórcza Sokratesa*. „RP”, nr 4, 145–157. (Orłow M., 1931d, *Socrates’ Creative School*. „PM”, no. 4, 145–157).
- Orsza H., 1912, *Tradycje polskiego szkolnictwa elementarnego*. „RP” nr 1, 5–9; nr 4, 71–75; nr 8, 145–147. (Orsza H., 1912, *The Traditions of Polish Elementary Schooling*. „PM” no. 1, 5–9; no. 4, 71–75; no. 8, 145–147).
- Radzewicz-Winnicki A., 2012, *Sto lat „Ruchu Pedagogicznego”. Z okazji jubileuszu namysł nad współczesną rolą sędziwego i popularnego periodyka pedagogicznego*. „RP”, nr 1, 12. (Radzewicz-Winnicki A., 2012, *100 Years of „Pedagogical Movement”. Reflection on the Role of the Elderly and Popular Pedagogical Journal*. „PM”, no. 1, 12).
- Rowid H., 1912, *Rzut oka na rozwój pedagogii za granicą i w Polsce*. „RP”, nr 5, 93–96. (Rowid H., 1912, *The Glance on the Development of Pedagogy in Poland and Abroad*. „PM”, no. 5, 93–96).
- Rowid H., 1914, *Jan Władysław Dawid*. „RP”, nr 1–2, 1–9. (Rowid H., 1914, *Jan Władysław Dawid*. „PM”, no. 1–2, 1–9).
- Rowid H., 1918, *Nowa era wychowania narodowego*. „RP”, nr 1, 3. (Rowid H., 1918, *New Era of National Education*. „PM”, no. 1, 3).
- Rowid H., 1920a, *Podstawy pedagogiki Trentowskiego*. Warszawa-Lwów, Wydawnictwo Książnica Polska Towarzystwa Nauczycieli Szkół Wyższych. (Rowid H., 1920a, *The Basics of Trentowski’s Pedagogy*. Warsaw-Lwów, Książnica Polska Publishing House of the Society of Higher Education Teachers).

- Rowid H., 1920b, *Stanowisko Ewarysta Estkowskiego*. „RP”, nr 9–10, 165–177. (Rowid H., 1920b, *The Stance of Ewaryst Estkowski*. „PM”, no. 9–10, 165–177).
- Rowid H., 1920c, *Szkoła pracy w związku z rozwojem kultury i cywilizacji*. „RP”, nr 56, 94–95. (Rowid H., 1920c, *School of Work in Relation to the Development of Culture and Civilisation*. „PM”, no. 56, 94–95).
- Rowid H., 1921, *Aniela Szycówna 1869–1921*. „RP”, nr 1–3, 1–4. (Rowid H., 1921, *Aniela Szycówna 1869–1921*. „PM”, no. 1–3, 1–4).
- Rowid H., 1922, *Dziesięciolecie Ruchu Pedagogicznego*. „RP”, nr 1–2, 1. (Rowid H., 1922, *10 Years of Pedagogical Movement*. „PM”, no. 1–2, 1).
- Rowid H., 1934/1935, *Z badań nad źródłami pedagogiki Trentowskiego*. „RP”, nr 8, 335–342. (Rowid H., 1934/1935, *From the Research on Trentowski's Pedagogy Sources*. „PM”, no. 8, 335–342).
- Ślęczka R., 2017, *Mysł pedagogiczna prezentowana na łamach „Ruchu Pedagogicznego” w latach 1918–1939*, „Przegląd Historyczno-Oświatowy” nr 1–2, R. 60, 89–102, DOI 10.17460/2017.1_2.05. (Ślęczka R., 2017, *Pedagogical Thought Presented in the „Pedagogical Movement” in the years 1918–1939*, „Historical and Educational Review” no. 1–2, Ch. 60, 89–102, DOI 10.17460/2017.1_2.05).
- Szycówna A., 1912, *Nowe prądy w dziedzinie nauczania początkowego*. „RP”, nr 7, 131–138. (Szycówna A., 1912, *New Currents in Primary Education*. „PM”, no. 7, 131–138).
- W dwudziestolecie Ruchu Pedagogicznego 1912–1932*, 1932, „RP”, nr 1, 7. (*In 20 years of Pedagogical Movement 1912–1932*, 1932, „PM”, no. 1, 7).
- Weissbrot-Koziarska A., 2018, *Henryk Rowid założyciel i redaktor naczelny miesięcznika „Ruch Pedagogiczny”*. „RP”, nr 1, 19–26. (Weissbrot-Koziarska A., 2018, *Henryk Rowid, the Founder and Chief Editor of the „Pedagogical Movement” Monthly Magazine*. „PM”, no. 1, 19–26).
- Winiarzowa A., 1918, *Pierwsze lata polskiego dziecka*. „RP”, nr 8–10, 182–190. (Winiarzowa A., 1918, *First Years of the Polish Child*. „PM”, no. 8–10, 182–190).

INICJATORZY ZMIAN W WYCHOWANIU I KSZTAŁCENIU DZIECI
NA ŁAMACH „RUCHU PEDAGOGICZNEGO” W PIERWSZEJ POŁOWIE XX WIEKU

Streszczenie: Celem artykułu było zbadanie, jakie sylwetki reformatorów kształcenia i wychowania przedstawiano na łamach „Ruchu Pedagogicznego”, jakie poglądy i działania tych osób były przypomniane nauczycielom i propagowane, jako wartościowy przykład do naśladowania. Analizowano zawartość poszczególnych roczników czasopisma od jego powstania w 1912 roku do 1939 roku. Zastosowano jakościową analizę materiału źródłowego. Ustalono,

że na łamach „Ruchu Pedagogicznego” ukazywano sylwetki wybranych przedstawicieli od starożytności aż po czasy współczesne, podkreślano potrzebę zaangażowania się w zmiany, ich wdrażanie, a także ich propagowanie wśród innych nauczycieli. Upowszechniano postawę twórczą, aktywną, patriotyczną. Większość artykułów była poświęcona Polakom, zwłaszcza nauczycielom. Pisano również o postaciach, które nie były bezpośrednio związane ze szkolnictwem, ale swoją działalnością wspierały reformy kształcenia i wychowania. W związku z tym, że na początku XX wieku wzrosło zainteresowanie nowatorskimi prądami w kształceniu i wychowaniu, starano się prezentować je na łamach czasopisma, nie zapominając o osiągnięciach postaci z dziejów wychowania i kształcenia. Służyło to rozbudzeniu potrzeby czynnego udziału w zmianach, z wykorzystaniem doświadczeń z przeszłości.

Słowa kluczowe: „Ruch Pedagogiczny”, reformy wychowania i kształcenia, wybitne postaci pedagogów