

Sirkka Ahonen - Jukka Rantala

HISTORY EDUCATION IN "THE SECOND REPUBLIC"

c. 1944 - 1950

History education is easily made into a servant of politics. Positive myths as well as negative enemy images can be conveyed through manipulated presentations of history. When a big change in politics eventually happens, the false "truths" of history lose their purposefulness and their foundations. History education then lands in a crisis.

Such a crisis happened at the end of the World War II among the losers of the war. Germany is the most striking example. Karin Herbst has in her study of German history education (1977) described, what happened to history, when the myths of the Third Republic were no more valid. The ideologically oriented history was rejected. The occupation officials banned history at school altogether. Teachers felt insecure and many refused to resume any teaching of history, before some unanimosity concerning its goals would be reached.

However, history returned to school already in a year's time. Apparently there was a need for it, though no unanimosity had been achieved of what kind of knowledge it should be. There were at least two views to the issue. The occupation officials, together with a group of teachers called "re-educators" wanted to educate the German mind towards democracy and humanity through history. Accordingly history should be first of all political education founded on

agreed common values. (Herbst 1977)

The majority of history teachers, however, refused to agree with "re-educators". The only thing they any more trusted, was a critical mind. That should be fostered through history lessons. The teachers wanted to avoid ready-made interpretations in their teaching, but instead to let their students to study evidence and learn to handle it critically. "Documents instead textbooks" was established as a popular educational tradition.

Finland was, like Germany, a loser in the World War II. Nationalism had run high before and during the war. Finland was a young nation-state, and the Hegelian idealism had been the core of the official mentality. In 1944 the ideas of infallible state and of war as a test of nationhood had to be questioned. Finland made a separate peace, in order to avoid occupation and survive as an independent state. The peace treaty included paragraphs, which interfered with the internal affairs and to a minor extent even challenged the sovereignty of Finland as a state. The new system is currently called "the second republic".

"The Second Republic"

The constitution as such was not altered in Finland. In that senses the term "the second republic" is unfounded. One can also ask, whether the mentality - ways of thinking - changed enough for the term to be valid. The findings in this article about the changes in history teaching are meant to contribute to answer this question.

Political structures of the society changed to a certain extent. The political Left increased its support in the election 1945. The extreme Left, which had been banned by anti-Communist laws since 1930, and now re-emerged as the People's Democratic Union, gained 49 seats out of 200, and together with social democrats it nearly beat the political Right by together 99 seats. The extreme Left from 1946 to 1948 controlled the key posts of the Premier and the Minister of the Internal Affairs, as well as some administrative key posts, e.g. that of the chief of the National Board of Education. The remarkable role of the Communists caused feelings of uncertainty and fear among the political Right. They culminated in 1948, when the Agreement of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Aid was signed. There were even rumours, most likely unfounded ones, of a Communist coup in the country.

A Control Commission, consisting of Soviets and Britts, was set according to the Armistice Treaty in 1944 to control the accomplishment of the Treaty. All "Fascist organisations" had to be abolished. A War Guilt trial was conducted. The presence of the Control Commission was another reason for political anxieties in the country.

In the administration minor purges were made. Rumours went around of the secret police to spy on citizens. In schools located in urban workers' areas teachers could fear that parents might spy on them (Ahonen 1986).

"Purge the history education!"

In December 1944 a Communist member of Parliament, Väinö Meltti,

attacked school education. He made his speech in the context of a plenum which was discussing the annual budget, but seemed to hit an acute theme; a lively debate followed.

Meltti labelled the majority of Finnish teachers ultra-conservative and demanded the democratisation of the school system "from the top to the bottom". Finally he mentioned the text-books:

"Also the school books, especially the history books, have to be thoroughly revised. I shall mention only one example from this area. I have studied the History of Finland for the Grammar School by Mantere & Sarva, edition 1943. Our history during the period of independence is presented with an explicit russophobic and and capitalistic bias." (Protocols of the Parliament in 1944, 954-5)

In the discussion E. Honka, a social-democratic member of parliament, rejected the accusations of incompetence of the education system. He referred to the young men who had fought the war and called them a testimony of good education. On the other hand A. Bryggari, another Communist member of Parliament, agreed with Meltti and blamed the rote-learning of the Swedish military history of the 17th century as irrelevant education at school.

Both Meltti and Bryggari were rather concerned about the contents of teaching than of the method of it. They did not touch the method of teaching or speak for the training of critical skills at school.

In less than two weeks time a drastic measure was taken by the administration. On the 21st of December 1944 an expert committee was set by the Paasikivi (National coalition) government with an

assignment to revise all the text books used in schools. Whether the governmental measure was due to the parliament discussion or perhaps to a suggestion possibly made by the Control Commission, cannot be proved, as the archive of the Commission, located in Moscow, is not yet open for researchers. (Rantala 1988).

One can, however, point out, that the Control Commission during its stay in Finland from 1944 to 1947 never suggested any re-education program for Finland, in the way the occupation officials did in Germany.

The Revision of the Textbooks

The Expert Committee consisted of three members: L. Arvi P. Pöijärvi, who so far was the chief of the National Board of Education, Dr. Yrjö Ruutu, and Prof. Karl Bruhn. The secretary was Arne Waronen, MA. Yrjö Ruutu was a member of the People's Democratic Union, whereas the rest of the Committee were non-socialist.

The Committee came together 8 times from January to March in 1944. Six first meetings were used to discuss the textbooks, two last ones to sum up the results. The work had to be done in haste, as the re-writing of the texts was to happen before the next new school term (Anon. 1945).

The committee organised the work so that each member revised certain books and presented the dubious points to a plenary session, where decisions concerning them were made.

The committee was assigned to revise the textbooks used in elementary and grammar schools as well as in teachers' colleges in regard to whether "there was faulty information about foreign countries" or "anything which could harm Finland's relations to foreign countries" in the books (Anon. 1945, 1-2). In its actual work the committee paid attention also to the image the books portrayed of the internal developments in Finland. As the criteria of banning a text the committee used *subjectivity, an anti-Russian or a pro-German bias or one-sided criticism of socialism* (Ahonen 1986, 20).

The Revision Committee states in its final document:

"The committee has worked out an overall idea of all present text-books, and made herself better acquainted with history, social studies, geography and mother tongue text-books as well as with the Finnish textbooks of Swedish-speaking schools, i.e. books that are supposed to convey to the pupils an idea of the conditions and developments in foreign countries". (Anon. 1945).

The most prominent and common textbooks were included (Rouhiainen 1979). The history books were subjected to the most numerous corrections. The final document of the Revision Committee stated, that the most ancient historical topics could be considered to have been objectively treated in the books, whereas the virtually non-investigated history of the most modern times was being presented as subjectively and with such a bias as not to be adequate in a school-book. Such dubious points were to spotted especially in the chapters handling the Finnish fight for independence, the Peace of Dorpat, the wars between Finland and Soviet Union, the Estonian fight for independence, the developments in the Soviet Union as well as the

recent developments in Central Europe.

The Committee submitted the aggressive and inappropriate texts for revision. Examples of such texts are as follows:

"The standard of our nation... was degraded due to a contact with Russian soldiers" (Hainari - Laitakari: History for Elementary Schools II)

"...Bolshevism was the most dangerous enemy since the Chenghis-Khan" (Harkola-Juva: Suomen historia lukioluokkia varten)

"Then followed in Russia an awful period of chaos and terror, which so far has not ended (Heporauta: Suomen kansan vaiheet muun maailman tapahtumien yhteydessä).

The presentations of the events during 1917 - 1918 were in some texts considered to be too harsh or one-sided. Such presentations were suggested to be softened.

In one case the Committee pointed at the literature references. The references in the "Historian oppikirja lukioluokkia varten II" (a book for the Finnish Gymnasium) were found to be propagandistic. As a rule the Committee concentrated on the actual texts.

The revision proposals concerning the geography textbooks were mostly pointed at the territorial changes due to the Armistice Treaty of Moscow. The new situation required that the geography of Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia and Eastern Carelia would be studied in the connection of Soviet Union. Also the geographical information concerning the Central Europe had to be checked.

Only few texts in the books used in mother tongue education were subjected to corrections. Some out-of-date information about the ethnic groups related to Finns was spotted. A few stories and poems were to be changed to new ones. (Examples of those in Finnish are "Pikku-Elli, kolttatyttö Petsamosta", "Valamo ja matkailijat", "Karjalan maa" and "Vepsän rand".)

The textbooks of religion, philosophy, foreign languages, biology, mathematics, sciences, social studies and economics were considered by the Revision Committee not to raise any serious criticisms.

The Committee categorised the examined books into three groups: books to be abandoned, books to be corrected and eventually books that could be used as such. Among the 30 examined history books there were 9 which had to be abandoned and 14 which had to be revised. Only one, History of Trade by Eino Kuusi was without any faults. (Anon. 1945).

As a whole, the revision of history books was rather cosmetic than truly critical. The structures of historical explanation or the approaches to historical interpretation or the choice of contents were not discussed. The haste the committee was subjected to might have affected the result of the work. As an example of the haste serves Karl Bruhn, who examined the 9 Swedish textbooks in 10 days. In such conditions revisions were only casual, and the deeper tendencies in the books were left untouched. (Rouhiainen 1974; Rantala 1988).

The fact that each book was examined by only one single member of the Committee might have contributed to a certain subjectivism in

the revision. This is shown in some texts which were not subjected to any corrections. On the other hand, the examiners represented various political views. (Rouhiainen 1979).

The scarcity of paper in the post-war Finland and some technical difficulties in the process of printing hindered the publishers from printing a sufficient amount of revised books for the new term in the autumn. The Ministry of Education had to allow the use of old books, even of the banned ones. In these conditions the teachers had to control, that the texts pointed out by the Revision Committee were covered by glued paper strips them (Rouhiainen 1974).

As the result of the revision the image of the Soviet Union was changed to meet the requirements of the new Finnish foreign politics. The role of Germany was deglorified and so were some recent Finnish aspirations. (Rantala 1988)

History Teachers' Reaction

The attack against history teaching by Meltti and Bryggari, members of Parliament, in the mid-winter 1944/45 was met by silence among history teachers. This can be partly due to the fact that history teachers had not organised themselves; the association of history teachers was about to be established in 1945 but was not yet there at the time of the crisis.

There are a couple of immediate reactions to be found; in the pedagogical journal "Kasvatusopillinen Aikakauskirja" J. V. Vainio wrote "About the Teaching of the History of the Fatherland" as follows:

"Should one leave the most elevating episodes (meaning the national struggle around 1900 and the wars of 1918 and 1939 - 1944) untold and alien to young people, and let them to be covered by dust in the archives, only from the fear that one might mix an element of subjectivity therein...

I happened to read in a paper a report of a talk given by a leftist minister, whose theme had been the Freedom Fight of 1918. According to the report the speaker had been just right in what he said. I honestly say, that I rather trust the teachers at school than the politicians...

Can we refuse to tell about the heroic deeds on the front or behind the front only because of the fear that we cannot be objective about the matter." (Wainio 1945)

Wainio does not directly refer to Meltti and Bryggari but to politicians in general. It seems that the leftist views concerning the sensitive issues of the Finnish history were in the post-war situation the first time openly discussed and eventually served as the objective truth. The nationalistic history was being challenged by a competing view.

There was no further discussion in the parliament about history education during "the dangerous years" 1944 - 1948". However, the political purges were reflected on the school. This is revealed by a single circular, sent by the National Board of Education in May 1945. According to the circular, the school authorities had been sent numerous letters where teachers had been blamed of imposing their political views on the pupils. Because of that, demands were made in the letters to sack such teachers. According to the circular, the Ministry

of Education had asked the National Board of Education to keep an eye on the situation. Therefore the National School Board in the circular asked the schools to work towards the elimination of anti-Sovietism. The circular said further:

"Beside educating citizens who would love their free and independent fatherland as much as before and sacrifice all they have got for her, the school has to be reminded that an education which is military, loaded with hate and looks down at other nations can lead our nation to destruction and disaster." (VA KHA Oppikouluosasto, Kiertokirje 1483, 1945).

This appeal for education towards international understanding touched history education, while it opposed the nationalistic views presented by many history teachers in the 20's and 30's (Ahonen 1986). Still the circular is only a single testimony of the state interfering with history teaching. The agendas of the National Board of Education do not contain any revealing letters of the kind mentioned in the circular. Neither do the inspectors' reports contain any notes of political complaints against teachers (Ahonen 1986).

The parliamentary debate in December 1944 did not provoke any initiative from the Ministry of Education to alter the history curricula of elementary or grammar schools. Both stayed as they were. The grammar school syllabus from 1941, which were nearly identical with the syllabus from 1932, stayed valid until 1963. The elementary school curriculum was changed in 1952. (Ahonen 1986).

The delay in the curricular development might have depended on the plans of a big school reform, which were fostered in 1944 - 1948. It looked more appropriate to change the frame first and the content

afterwords. When the big reform, which should have introduced the comprehensive school in Finland, failed in 1948 because of the clash between the social democrats and the communists, the curricula had to be developed within the old frame. That was not as stimulating as the curriculum planning in a totally new system would have been. Also the radical challenges of "the dangerous years" had towards 1950 disappeared.

Discussion around the Didactics

It was previously in this article mentioned, that in the German post-war situation a new emphasis on critical thinking in history studies was established. In Finland in the political attack against history education after the Armistice Treaty in December 1944 included only a passing remark on the method: A. Bryggari, MP, mentioned the "rote-learning".

In the context of the text-book revision, as well as in Wainio's defensive article (p. 7), and also in the circular by the National Board of Education (p. 8) the issue of subjective vs. objective history was raised. The issue was not, however, properly discussed; rather superficially the addresses quoted above implied, that "objective" meant something which was currently valid, whereas "subjective" meant the old nationalistic ideas. All of the addresses also implied that "objective" was a characteristic of the *product*, i.e. of the text written ready by an author and learned as it was by a student.

As a matter of fact, it is in the *process* of historical inquiry, where the root and the trunk of the objectivity lie. The method of inquiry

is decisive in regard to the verifiability of the knowledge. That is why the German didactical discussion hit the point when it grabbed the method of teaching, whereas in the Finnish discussion the reformistic ideas were left half way as the role of critical skills was not considered crucial.

One has to note, however, that outside the narrow sphere of history didactics, in the big school political debate of the time, the issue of method appeared now and then. The arguments were in some cases political, as in a parliamentary motion from the end of 1945, where a member of parliament blamed the school system for not meeting the requirements of democracy, as the system was both socially indifferent and methodwise old-fashioned (Eduskunnan sivistysvaliokunnan pöytäkirja 2.11.1945).

Some efforts to tackle the way of teaching and learning history were virtually made in the period 1944 - 1950. The most influential and interesting are articles by the future head of Helsinki Teachers College, **Martti Ruutu**, by the head teacher of history in the Normal School for Girls in Helsinki, **Veikko Kerkkonen**, and finally by the chief inspector of history in the National Board of Education, **Lauri Kaukamaa**. Before analysing their ideas, a survey of the historico-philosophical and the pedagogical ideas inherited from the previous decades and appearing in the post-war situation shall be made.

Background: Changing Conceptions of History and Education

Already in "the First Republic" in the 20's and 30's the idealistic and positivistic traditions clashed in the Finnish historiography. The

idealists were as a rule Hegelian and nationalistic; they interpreted the big historical deeds in terms of the agents's national consciousness and zeal. Subjectivity meant only powers of intuition for an idealist. The extreme idealists did not require any verifiability of an intuitive hypothesis. This view can be traced back to the voluntarism of the early years of the 20th century. Accordingly at a historians' and history teachers' meeting in 1914 Dr. G. Boldt fiercely defended a voluntaristic, political interpretation of history. The same conception of history was repeatedly manifested in writings during "the first republic". (Toinen kotimainen historiantutkijain ja historianopettajien kokous Helsingissä 8.-10.1.1914, 35; Oksala 1930, Biese 1933).

The opposite school of historical thought, positivism, was introduced into Finland by Gunnar Suolahti, who had been taught by Karl Lamprecht in Germany. Lamprecht's thesis was: history has to study collective social laws. The unit of inquiry by the positivists is more often a collective than an individual. The method was to collect collective data and make inductive inferences thereof. Suolahti taught at the University of Helsinki 1927 - 1933 and among his tutees were Eino Jutikkala and Heikki Waris. The positivist historians also dominated the Historical Association (Suolahti 1947).

It is to be noted that even Suolahti himself did not require history education at school to be critical or scientific. When giving his view of the proposal for a new school curriculum as the representative of the university, he stated that history education at school should enable a pupil to "build his view of life according to the enhancing example of great personalities" (Helsingin yliopisto, Historiallis-kielitieteellisen osaston pöytäkirja 18.11.1933).

After the war, which for many meant a collapse of nationalistic ideas, the positivistic conception of history could be anticipated to overtake the idealistic one. The landmark of this development was Pentti Renvall's work on the methodology of history. Renvall reacted already in 1945 publicly to the challenges of the post-war situation:

"The World War II, as it just ended, has in many respects changed things. The crisis is still on. It is not only political, but to a great extent also spiritual. We can see all values being questioned, and the time demands us to evaluate our relation to the course we are going..."

For a historian it is even more of a challenge than for the rest of us to find oneself in a big transition. His history should have represented continuity, but now the historian is forced to ask himself, whether that what history has meant for him is powerful enough to stand to face war and disaster" (Renvall 1945)

Renvall went on maintaining that history can provide general truths. It would be a fallacy, he says, to consider history only as an inquiry of the unique (Renvall 1945).

In his methodology, which came out in 1947, Renvall called his conception of history "scientific-objectivistic". This term became established among Finnish historians to mean a positivistic, non-Marxist view of history, and to imply a critical, inductive method. Renvall himself expected from the historical research more than just positive facts; he worked to reveal in the happening some structural entities, which would make sense of the individual events. (Renvall 1947).

Renvall's conception of history was discussed at the historians' and history teachers' conference in 1947. According to the report of the

discussion in *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, his methodological view was accepted, but e.g. Eino Jutikkala and Arvi Korhonen did not agree about the structural entities and their role in historical explanation.

In fact, looking at the reviews of historical research in the *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* and the file of the titles of pro gradu dissertation in the Institute of History at the Helsinki University in 1945 - 1950, one can suggest that the current idea of historiography implied taking a narrow topic and producing hard facts only on it. This way the new history teachers were educated in their subject. On the other hand, somewhat surprisingly, Arvi Korhonen introduced *Collingwood's* anti-positivist philosophy of history into the university curriculum. Thus the students were to some extent exposed to contradictory ideas.

The pedagogical tradition from the 20's and 30's, in regard to history teaching, is more homogenous than the historico-philosophical. The main stream can be called Herbartian. Two prominent history educators, O. Mantere and A.K.Ottelin introduced *J. F. Herbart's* ideas into Finnish history education through their successive dissertations in 1907 and 1908. Herbart saw history as a morally constructive educational activity. He called the meeting of the child with history "conversation", which implied an empathetic experience. Each lesson had to be such an experience. For that purpose the lesson had to have an ascending line which culminated into a moral lesson. (Mantere 1907, Ottelin 1908).

In a Herbartian teaching a narrative had a crucial role. Through a narrative a child's imagination was stimulated and he could reach an

empathy with a past person, identify with him and be affected by his moral example. "A narrative brings two souls together." Critical thinking was not expected. Mantere went as far as to warn teachers from confusing children by conducting academic investigations in the classroom. (Mantere 1907, Ottelin 1908; VA Mantereen kokoelma, Koulu: Esitelmä väitöskirjaa tarkastettaessa 21.5.1907).

In a young nation-state one of the main functions of education tends to be to strengthen the national identity. This is explicitly shown in the reports of the committees preparing new national curricula, both for the elementary school (1925) and for the grammar school (1933). The function of reinforcing the national feelings is perfectly fulfilled by the Herbartian method of education. Therefore it was only natural, that the pedagogical tradition stayed dominantly Herbartian throughout "the first republic".

Mikael Soininen, a supporter of Herbart, educated the elementary school teachers into Herbartianism. His influence was persistent in the elementary school pedagogics. The grammar school teacher candidates seem to have been introduced to Herbart's ideas in their pedagogical seminar sessions in the Normal Schools (VA KHA Opikouluosasto, Vuosikertomukset: Suomalainen Normaalilyseo 1900 - 1939, Svenska Normallyceum 1900 - 1935).

A combination of an idealistic conception of history and a Herbartian view of the method of education is present in articles written by teachers, as in the following example from the 30's, where the author criticises the proposal of the curriculum committee for a wrong emphasis:

"To be able to think politically - that would be a great aim for history teaching. This aim is rejected by the committee, who, staying alien to the real life and to the requirements of the harsh realities and uncertain future, considers it to be sufficient for history teaching "to develop historical (not political!) thinking in the pupils..." (Biese 1933, 51)

There were, however, alternatives to Herbartianism present in the 20's and 30's. Already in the 20's Albert Lilius, a prominent educationist, publicly worried for the Herbartian system, as it did not train formal thinking skills. He called for problem-oriented experimental teaching. At the history teachers' conference in 1925 K. R. Melander, the head teacher of the Normal School in Helsinki, reported: "Recently attempts have been made in schools to organise teaching according to the work school". He meant the ideas of *Kerschensteiner* and suggested that the pupils could be let to compare phenomena in history, and prepare talks on their own. At the same occasion Dr. Koskenjaakko maintained, that the work school could mean critical handling of historical evidence. (Historian tutkijain ja opettajien kolmas yleinen kokous tammikuun 7. - 10. päivinä 1925. Pöytäkirjat 24, 44).

The themes of the *Kerschensteinerian* work school and of the problem-oriented teaching were repeated in the public discussion and also in the teacher education, in the seminar sessions for the teacher candidates (Melander 1923, Tuokko 1936, Vehvilä 1937; VA KHA Oppikouluosasto, Vuosikertomukset, Suomalainen Normaalilyseo 1918-19, 1925 - 1933). Despite of these examples, Herbartianism stayed as the dominant tradition throughout "the first republic" and was well alive when the social situation changed in 1944.

Form or Substance? - Contrasting Views from 1945 - 1948

The discussion on the method of history teaching can be seen as two waves: the first was caused by the political challenge from the Parliament, by the addresses of Meltti and Bryggari, and the second one by Renvall's book and the historico-philosophical interest in 1947. The discussion was scarce, only 4 public addresses, but the ideas presented were well-argued enough to give testimony of a current true concern of the issue.

Wainio's defence of history against the challenge from the leftist politicians has been quoted previously (p. 7). From his text one can indirectly see, that objectivity vs. subjectivity had been discussed in the new political situation. Wainio, however, did not consider the issue of objectivity as a serious one. In this respect he was a true Herbartian: a pupil had to be allowed to meet the substance of history immediately, without critical concerns, and to be nourished by it.

Two years later Martti Ruutu, then a history teacher, later a prominent teacher educator, wrote a thoughtful response to the political accusations of rote-learning in history. He admitted the guilt and advocated a new kind of education, where historical thinking would be trained:

"....the common reflection in the classroom shall be focussed above all on the factors leading to historical events, on causes and effects, on the comparison of parallel and contrasting phenomena, on the psychological analysis of remarkable personalities and mass movements..." (Ruutu 1947)

Ruutu implicitly referred to the alternative tradition of the work

school and problem-oriented teaching from "the first republic" and presented it as a viable solution to the problem of objectivity in the new situation.

Ruutu went on combining the requirements of critical mind and citizenship morals as goals for history teaching. This can be seen as a half-hearted clinging to the Herbartian tradition, or just as individual reasoning of a thoughtful educationist, who did not want to convey an one-sided view of history. What Ruutu left out, was the evidential dimension; he was not concerned of a pupil's need to evidentially verify historical interpretations.

With the emergence of the research methods into professional discussion in 1947, the question of a document interpretation as a classroom activity naturally rose to the front. Is the formal knowledge of the nature of historical knowledge important in history? Should the children be made into mini-historians, instead of being educated into good citizens?

The critical work with history implies two main elements: the use of documents and the presence of contradictory information.

Martti Kerkkonen rejected documents in the classroom:

"The work of researcher with documents in order to obtain immediate information of a historical event is a totally different thing from a school pupil reading a document. For a pupil the document most often stays as a dead thing, and it is hard for him to catch the values implicit in a document...Therefore it is reasonable to refuse the idea of a pupil reading documents beside his textbook.....not even on the upper forms... (Kerkkonen 1948).

When tackling with the problem of objectivity Kerkkonen gets thoroughly confused:

"Historical information is value-loaded and objective in its nature, but it has to be received subjectively taking care that it does not lose its objective value." (ibid.)

Kerkkonen was faithful to the Herbartian idea of values being the ultimate goal of education and verification of information being not a basic need of a pupil. In this respect he was strongly opposed by Kaukamaa, who considered the criterion of verifiability to be as vital in the education as in scientific research. According to Kaukamaa, history which was served as ready-interpreted and value-loaded content was to be rejected. A pupil had to have a freedom to his own judgment (Kaukamaa 1948).

The issue of contradictory information again divided the two educationists. Can a pupil tolerate and handle contradictions? Kerkkonen now refers directly to Herbart and maintains, that "the progress of the political and the ethical freedom, as well as the growth of economic equality, are ideals which have their inspiration in history" (ibid.). Kerkkonen forgets, that in the previous decade history was used to support also the opposite values. He does not require any dealing with contradictory information, even though so many contradictions were present in the beginning of "the second republic" and people's minds most likely were struggling to get into terms with them.

Kaukamaa, in contrast, fears the manipulative possibilities of history education, thinking of the recent past:

"History belongs to the attitude-building subjects. The historical material is such that a teacher can in numerous contexts, either directly or secretly,...infiltrate the pupils' minds with his own political or ideological views." (ibid.)

As a solution Kaukamaa suggest a free choice for a pupil to decide how to see history. This choice requires different views to be available.

Kukamaa also wanted to avoid generalisations in history, as they were dubious to their truth. In this respect the two authors agreed; also Kerkkonen doubted the historicity of generalisations. He referred to the individualising method of history, but was vaguely interested also in Renvall's genetic explanations, which he saw as a way to reach an understanding of the connection of the past and of today. This again might suit a Herbartian teaching, where lessons of the past were applied to the present.

The addresses by Kerkkonen and Kaukamaa show, that the changing conception of history bothered history educators.

To Sum Up

School is not an island; the changes and crises in society are reflected at school. The crisis linked to the aftermath of the World War II made elements of the previous school education questionable. A big school debate about the structure of the educational system was conducted in 1944 - 1948, aiming at a radical reform but resulting in nothing, as a consequence of political rivalries. Under the shadow of the big

debate, as a minor theme, history education was discussed. The challenges for the history debate came from two directions, from a clash between the Leftist and Rightist views of history and from a change of paradigm within historiography.

The political challenge did not mount to what it was in Germany at the same time. The integrity of the school history was officially questioned only a couple of times, by a couple of members of Parliament and by the Ministry of Education. The Soviet-British Control Commission seems not to have wanted to "re-educate" Finns. The only administrative measure which was taken was the cosmetic revision of textbooks. The big lines of historical interpretation were not touched and therefore the books were not rewritten.

Only a minor public debate was sparked by the official interventions. A further debate was stimulated by the academic discussion on the theory of history, as the scientific-objectivist approach overtook the idealistic one. This debate was more substantial than the first political debate. The two debates came to a big extent out of the same root of political and social crisis and focussed on the same issues of objectivity of history and of the need to foster critical thinking at school. The leading history educators tackled between the opposite educational traditions.

The main result of the debate was to clear the field in terms of sorting out the main different traditions in history education. The Herbartian and the progressive tradition, both of which could be traced back to the earlier decades of "the first republic", were argued for and defended. Consciousness of alternatives in regard to

the conceptions of history and education was educated.

Looking further at the aftermath of the debate in 1944 - 1948, one can see both minor change and remarkable continuity. In the new curriculum for the elementary school in 1952, new "scientific" history was advocated, through aims the following ones:

"... to educate a child to treat information critically and to be careful in inferencing on them.
 ... It should be pointed out, that hasty analogies are dangerous and that an unbiased research in history has proved many myths to be unfounded." (Kansakoulun opetussuunnitelmakomitean mietintö 1952, 118-119).

Two new handbooks of history education were written for elementary school teachers. They can be characterised to represent continuity in educational thinking. Both advocate pure Herbartianism. Kuusi (1954) rejects the work school, as "history belongs to humanities". Heikinheimo (1955) states straightforward, that "the educators so far agree with Herbartian ideas" and that in a proper history lesson the teacher's performance is supposed to incite the imagination of the pupils. Heikinheimo's conception of history is idealistic; like the nationalists of "the first republic" he suggests, that at the Greek-Persian wars the significance of the victory of the West over East should be emphasized.

New challenges for history education were ahead. The views of the 20th century Finnish history changed drastically around 1960, and the big school debate started again, with question concerning the relevancy of education. For these later developments it was crucial that the positions and alternatives were laid out during the immediate post-war

crisis.

REFERENCES

Unprinted sources

- Valtionarkisto (Public Records) VA
 Kouluhallituksen arkisto (National Board of Education) KHA
 Oppikouluosasto (Grammar School Dept.)
 Kiertokirjeet (Circulars) 1945-1946
 Esityslistapöytäkirjat (Agendas) 1945-1946
 Tarkastuskertomukset (Inspectors' reports)
 1945-1946
 Oskari Mantereen kokoelma
 Eduskunnan arkisto (Parliamentary Records)
 Komiteamietinnöt 1945:5 (Oppikirjojen tarkastus-
 komitean mietintö (The Final Document of the
 Textbook Revision Committee)
 Sivistysvaliokunnan pöytäkirjat (Protocols of the
 Cultural Commission) 1944-1949
 Helsingin yliopisto (University of Helsinki)
 Historiallis-kielitieteellisen osaston pöytäkirja
 18.11.1933

Printed sources and references

- Ahonen, S. 1986. Toisen tasavallan historianopetus. Un unpublished paper at the Dept. of Teacher Education at the University of Helsinki
- Anon. 1914. Toinen kotimainen historianutkijain ja historianopettajien kokous Helsingissä 8.-10.1.1914. Porvoo 1914.
- Anon. 1925. Historiantutkijain ja opettajien kolmas yleinen kokous Helsingissä tammikuun 7.-10. päivinä 1925. Helsinki.
- Anon. 1945. Oppikirjojen tarkastustoimikunnan mietintö. Komiteamietintö 1945:5. Helsinki: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino
- Anon. 1952. Kansakoulun opetussuunnitelamkomitean mietintö. Komiteamietinnöt 1952:3. Helsinki: Valtion painatuskeskus.
- Biese, Y.M. 1933. Taistelu Oppikoulusta. Helsinki 1933.

- Heikinheimo, I. 1953. Historianopetus. Helsinki.
- Herbst, K. 1977. Didaktik des Geschichtsunterrichts zwischen Traditionalismus und Reformismus. Hannover 1977.
- Jutikkala, E. 1983. Katsaus Suomen historian tutkimukseen ja -kirjoi-
tukseen 1900-luvun ensipuoliskolla. Historiallinen Aikakauskirja
1983.
- Kaukamaa, L.I. 1948. Ajanvirtaukset ja historianopetus. Kasvatusopil-
linen Aikakauskirja 1948.
- Kerkkonen, V. 1948. Historian opetuksen probleemoja. Kasvatusopil-
linen Aikakauskirja 1948.
- Kuusi, S. 1954. Historian opetusoppi. Helsinki.
- Mantere, O. 1907. Historian opetuksesta. Helsinki
- Melander, K.R. 1923. Mitä nykyaikaiselta kansakoulun his-
torianopetukselta vaaditaan. Opettajain lehti.
- Oksala, O. 1930. Teesejä historianopetuksen johtavista periaatteista.
In: Suur-Suomen koulu. Jyväskylä.
- Ottelin, A.K. Herbartiansk historieundervisning. Helsingfors.
- Protocols of the Parliament (Eduskunnan pöytäkirjat) 1944 - 1950
- Rantala, J. 1988. 1930-, 1940- ja 1950-lukujen suomenkielisten kansa-
ja oppikoulujen historian oppikirjojen objektiivisuuden sel-
vittäminen. An unpublished pro gradu thesis at the Dept. of
Teacher Education at the University of Helsinki
- Renvall, P. 1945. Historiantutkimuksen tie. Historiallinen Aikakauskirja
1945.
- Renvall, P. 1965. Nykyajan historian tutkimus. Porvoo: WSOY
- Rouhiainen, P. 1974. Historian koulukirjat poliittisen mielipiteen
muodostajina maailmansotien välisenä aikana. Historiallinen
Aikakauskirja 4/1974, 298-313.

- Rouhiainen, P. 1979 Taitelu historian kouluopetuksen sisällöstä Suomessa sortovuosista vuoteen 1945. An unpublished licenciate thesis in the Faculty of Political Science at the University of Helsinki
- Ruutu, M. 1947. Historianopetus ja reaalikoe. Kasvatusopillinen aikakauskirja
- Suolahti, E. 1947. Gunnar Suolahti. Helsinki: WSOY
- Tuokko, M. 1936. Toiminnallisuuden periaate historianopetuksessa. Opettaja 1936.
- Wainio, J.O. 1945. Isänmaan historia opetuksessa. Kasvatusopillinen aikakauskirja 1945.
- Vehvilä, S. 1937 Historianopetuksen havainnollisuudesta. Kasvatusopillinen Aikakauskirja