

When E. Durkheim Meets L. Tolstoy: Contrasting Two Conceptions of Discipline as Moral Education

Ya-Chieh Yang Ming-Cheng Duh*

Abstract

In his work *Moral Education*, the sociologist Emile Durkheim emphasized the spirit of discipline as the first element of morality, followed by attachment to social groups and then individual autonomy or self-determination. He extended this conception to the practice of schooling and suggested that the exertion of authority is indispensable for moral education. The novelist and anarchist Leo Tolstoy, however, highlighted freedom as the goal of moral pursuit. In Tolstoy's view, any intended exertion of discipline is fruitless or even harmful. Rousseau's influence on both theories is evident

* Ya-Chieh Yang (Corresponding Author), Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Education,
Taipei Municipal University of Education

e-mail: nicesire@yahoo.com.tw

Ming-Cheng Duh, Associated Professor, the Graduate Institute of Children's
Literature, National Taitung University

e-mail: mingduh@nttu.edu.tw

Manuscript received: Aug. 22, 2012; Modified: Nov. 13, 2012

Accepted: Nov. 19, 2012

with Tolstoy as successor and Durkheim as critic of his romantic idealism. For Tolstoy, the need for discipline is inherent in human nature because of its accordance with the quest for freedom. Yet for Durkheim, discipline should be involved as part of the pedagogical process to serve as a foundation for the consequential autonomy. The authors of this article argue that they are two sides of one coin that may complement, rather than contradict each other. Their differences are largely embedded in the contexts of their respective periods and the corresponding attitudes toward public schooling. The major texts engaged with to assert the above argument include Durkheim's *Moral Education*, and *The Evolution of Educational Thought*, as well as Tolstoy's *What is Art?* and *On Education*.

Keywords: autonomy, discipline, E. Durkheim, moral education, L. Tolstoy

當涂爾幹遇見托爾斯泰：對照以規 訓作為道德教育的兩種概念

楊雅捷、杜明城*

摘要

社會學家涂爾幹在其《道德教育》一書裡強調規訓是道德的首要元素，依照邏輯順序則為對社會群體的依附與個人的自律、自主。他將這概念延伸到學校的實踐，進而主張權威是道德教育所不可或缺。小說家托爾斯泰則凸顯自由作為追求道德的目的，並認為規訓不僅將徒勞無功且有害。盧梭對兩者的影響皆很明顯，托爾斯泰是其浪漫唯心論的繼承者，而涂爾幹則是其批評者。托爾斯泰認為規律的需要根植於人性，與自由的追求相呼應；而涂爾幹則認為需要將規訓納入教育過程，以作為自律的基礎。本文作者主張兩者其實是一體之兩面，其差異源自於其所代表的時代及相應的對國家主導學校教育的態度。

關鍵詞：自律、規訓、涂爾幹、道德教育、托爾斯泰

* 楊雅捷（通訊作者），台北市立教育大學教育系博士候選人
電子信箱：nicesire@yahoo.com.tw
杜明城，國立台東大學兒童文學研究所副教授
電子信箱：mingduh@nttu.edu.tw
投稿日期：2012 年 08 月 22 日；修正日期：2012 年 11 月 13 日；
採用日期：2012 年 11 月 19 日

Prelude

Discipline is the core of moral education. As E. Durkheim revealed in the opening pages of *Moral Education*, the spirit of discipline is the first element of morality. Issues of discipline are also central concerns to schoolteachers. Courses like “Behavior modification” or “Classroom management” in teacher preparation curriculum reflect the anxiety and perplexity of teachers who have to deal with it in everyday classroom practice. Discipline usually implies to the exercise of authority to maintain order. Seldom have teachers asked where the authority derives or should be derived, and if is order necessary for discipline because it is always and almost taken for granted. Discipline inevitably relates to individual freedom. But is discipline contradictory to freedom, or complementary to it? Each concept naturally leads to a necessity for definition. Discipline, for instance, in *Longman (1991) Dictionary*, is a) training and instruction that corrects, moulds or perfects the mental faculties or moral character; b) punishment. Thus discipline is usually related to punishment. For Durkheim, “crime is normal so that punishment is essential to separate normative behavior from what is considered deviant” (Alexander, 2003: 216). A classic statement on discipline can be extracted from Foucault’s (1977: 128-129) *Discipline and Punish* in which “the obedient subject, the individual subjected to habits, rules, orders, an authority that is exercised continually around him and upon him, and which he must allow to function automatically in him.” Therefore, discipline is reinforced by the application of surveillance so that the subject feels monitored. It might be more comprehensible to use “case book” of

morality to exemplify what does it mean by discipline. For instance, W. Bennett, in *The Book of Virtues: A Treasury of Great Moral Stories*, which much reflects American attitude toward morality, enlists self-discipline as the first virtue, followed by compassion, responsibility, friendship, work, courage, perseverance, honesty, loyalty, and faith. Bennett (1993: 21) indicates that “in self-discipline one makes a ‘disciple’ of oneself. One is one’s own teacher, trainer, coach, and ‘disciplinarian.’ It is an odd sort of relationship, paradoxical in its own way, and many of us don’t handle it very well.” On the other hand, freedom is: a) the absence of necessity or constraint in choice or action; b) liberation from slavery or restraint or from the power of another; c) the quality or state of being exempt or released, usually from something onerous. Thus we find freedom is usually conceived in negative terms which enable individuals unaffected from external, authoritarian power. For Durkheim, punishment usually consists of the deprivation of freedom. The article seeks to distinguish what discipline, as it is related to freedom, means to Durkheim and Tolstoy with a view to bridging two educational greats for the pedagogy of morality.

It can hardly imagine that the sociologist Durkheim ever met the novelist Tolstoy. It was not because Tolstoy (1828-1910) is much older than Durkheim (1858-1917). Nor geographical barrier has precluded their encounter because Tolstoy traveled widely in his life time. Thomas Mann (1984), in his *Goethe and Tolstoy* which detailed the lineage between these two great writers, vividly portrayed the then enthusiastic young novelist who visited a German school and collected materials from students for reference of his future educational endeavor. At first impression, they have nothing in common. Durkheim is one of the eminent founders in sociology

and long considered among the greatest social scientists. Tolstoy, on the other hand, is undoubtedly one of the best writers of all time. Yet their sharp difference appears more on the temperament which may result in somewhat opposite directions of social philosophy. As commonly agreed, Durkheim enlightened decades of functionalism in sociology and anthropology which connoted much conservative ideology. But Tolstoy, as evidenced from his literary works, can be ranked among W. Godwin, F. Ferrer, M. Stirner, and E. Goldman as a radical anarchist (Spring, 1983: 444-454). Where Durkheim's thesis was considered as social determinism, Tolstoy's sympathy towards lower class suggested tremendous social transformation and was prescient to Russian revolution. Moreover, while Tolstoy was a renowned heir of Rousseau's romanticism, Durkheim was a critic of it. Although both thinkers were active in the 19th century, Tolstoy was very critical of industrial civilization and hailed an idealized yet diminishing agrarian life, while Durkheim was aware of the advent of "organic solidarity" and rationally described it with little nostalgia toward former society.

Indeed, both social thinkers did have one great thing in common, that is, their contribution to education. Durkheim was the first sociologist to assume the lectureship of pedagogue at Bordeaux where he regularly addressed to groups of primary schoolteachers about educational issues ranging from highly theoretical to merely practical (Lukes, 1973: 109). His influential works in pedagogy, *Education and Society* (1956), *Moral Education* (1961), and *The Evolution of Educational Thought* (1977) are still widely read into 21st century. Collins (1994) called Durkheimian tradition as the core and the most famous tradition in sociology. It has also become a mainstream in educational thinking with variants in macro and micro sociological

representations (Blackledge & Hunt, 1985). Tolstoy's life represented a typical characteristic of Bildungsroman, or educational novel, in which the protagonist always strives for personal enlightenment. Mann (1984) compared two great elements of pedagogy and autobiography in Tolstoy's life works to those of Rousseau and Goethe. His social ideal reflected in all his literary works through life from *Childhood*, *Boyhood*, *Youth*, *War and Peace*, *Anna Karerina*, *Resurrection* to fairy tales. He created his peasant school at Yasnaya Polyana in 1860, which echoed Rousseau's *Emile* and was precedent to A. S. Nell's *Summerhill*. His educational thought was summed up in Wiener's English translation *Tolstoy on Education* (Tolstoy, 1967). In contrast to the writing style, Durkheim tried to present his ideas with academic accuracy, yet Tolstoy wrote in literary elegance with personal tone. It is difficult to divide Tolstoy's educational thoughts into various philosophical categories. For him, real art must be moralistic and therefore it is futile to attribute *What is Art* as a work of aesthetics or ethics. Education for reading cannot be separated from social interaction in the classroom, which resembles perspectives of pragmatism and symbolic interactionism that value of process over countable result. Above all, their resemblance on moral education was expressed on their concern on freedom and discipline, which is the theme this article seeks to explore.

Durkheim's Interpretation of Morality

Durkheim is often misconceived as a conservative social thinker because of his theoretical implication towards social determinism and his influence on functionalism. However, it is merely an oversimplification to

attribute his theory as one of consensus or conflict sociology. His concern on society leaned more on stability rather than on change. He delineated the transition of society from “mechanic solidarity” to “organic solidarity,” as was represented in the social division of labor in a matter-of-fact tone. He may be clarified as a functionalist whose method amply applies organic analogy. His “social determinism,” though implies that society precedes individual, reveals a tendency of society to retain order if it has ever experienced turbulence. As noted earlier, Collins (1994) distinguished a Durkheimian tradition of sociology to illustrate how his works encompass both macro and micro level of analysis. In analyzing suicide, he distinguished three kinds of “egoistic”, “altruistic”, and “anomic”. The type of labor division and suicide was a reflection of societal change. He was apt to categorize phenomena and succinctly linked each category with profound analysis. In *The Evolution of Educational Thought*, Durkheim indicated:

Educational transformations are always the result and symptom of the social transformations in terms of which they are to be explained. For a people to feel at any given moment the need to change its educational system, it is necessary that new ideas and needs have emerged for which the all system is no longer adequate. But these needs and ideas do not arise spontaneously; if they suddenly come to the forefront of human consciousness after having ignored for centuries, it is necessarily the case that in the intervening period there has been a change of which they are an expression. (Durkheim, 1977: 194)

This passage evidently reveals the analytical character of Durkheim’s

sociological method. As he dealt with educational transformations, he viewed it as a part of organic whole of societal change, be it a result or symptom. Educational reform thus derives from the fact that the old practice is no longer adequate for the ever changing society. The once dormant theory becomes widely receptive only because it is up to the esprit of time. For instance, filial piety was the core of moral education in our previous kinship system. The exemplary stories in the school primer to hail such cultural value have long become ridiculous when the traditional family diminishes. But the linkage of such change needs to be delineated in analytical manner. *The Evolution of Educational Thought* exemplifies why Durkheim cannot be treated simply as a concrete, rather than, analytical, thinker. Durkheim demonstrated to us the dynamic interplay between society and educational institutions in historical stages from early church through 19th century. He indicated that the moral system of his time was dominated by the cult of individual person which was quite unknown to Greeks and Romans. Likewise, the ideas of fatherland, patriotism, honor, humanity, work or courage meant quite different than classical period (Durkheim, 1977). But as Lukes (1973) summarized in *Emile Durkheim: His Life and Works*, Durkheim's conception on education was rested on his main sociological thinking. His major works *Social Division of Labor in Society*, *On Suicide*, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, *Montesquieu and Rousseau: Forerunners of Sociology* and *The Elementary Forms of The Religious Life* collectively constructed and corresponded his educational discourse. Accordingly, his educational works can be viewed as the application of his general theory of sociology. The aim of education is to constitute a system of socialization. He wrote in the period of growing secularization in which the state's

enforcement over national public school became commonplace. Therefore:

It was crucial to provide a rational, not a symbolic or allegorical, explanation of the nature of morality; one could then discern what moral rules and ideals were latent in and appropriate to the contemporary social situation. What was required was a reform of educational methods in the light of sociological inquiry that would discover within the old moral and religious system “moral force hidden beneath forms which concealed their true nature.” (Lukes, 1973: 113)

It would be false to treat his method as static. For him, any institutional change must follow by social change, not another way around. Accordingly, all educational reform, mild or radical, can be understood as an effort to replace the previous practice which appears as no longer adequate. But it would be misled to perceive his theory as simple social determinism. Collins (1994) indicated that Durkheimian tradition consists of macro as well as micro element. The former is represented on functionalism that views society as a coherent whole with right wing political implication. The latter is demonstrated in his core concept of ritual which stirs group sentiment through interaction with positive power for conflict. For Durkheim, society and its morality do not rested on conscious or rational foundation, but are produced by symbolic and irrational ritual interaction.

In *The Evolution of Educational Thought*, Durkheim offered us an interpretation why in the period of Renaissance classical literature became prevalent in curriculum and why individualized instruction became common. Not only did content and method of education changed followed by organic

transformation of society, but the conception of morality. He viewed morality as fluid that alters over time. In the introductory chapter of *Moral Education*, Durkheim reminded that:

...the educator who would undertake to rationalize education without preparing that development, and directing it, would fail in one aspect of his task, that's why he cannot confine himself to commenting upon the old morality of our father. He must, in addition, help the younger generations to become conscious of new ideal toward which they tend confusedly. To orient them in that direction it is not enough to conserve the past, he must prepare the future. (Durkheim, 1956: 12-13)

It would be absurd to deal with morality without discussing about human nature. Durkheim's theory of morality echoed the concept of nature from Rousseau. His interpretation of *Emile* refuted a common viewpoint that Rousseau's thought may cause excessive individualism and anarchy. Quite contrarily, Rousseau took nature as a guide and a model for educator. The problem is thus to reconcile "natural" and "human" education. According to Lukes, "Rousseau's central aim was to prevent the limitless growth of unsatisfied desire, spurred on by imagination" and "...seeking to create 'civil man in the image of natural man' by instilling 'sentiments of discipline, equilibrium and moral order.'" (Lukes, 1973: 127-128) Durkheim's reading of Rousseau provided us a clue that suggests common feature between him and Tolstoy. They are both intellectual offspring of Rousseau and each conceives about nature, discipline, order and morality with their idiosyncratic character.

Unlike Bennett who listed ten identifiable virtues to be cultivated on children, Durkheim didn't specify those contents but instead exhibited three elements of morality to be fulfilled in logical orders: first, the spirit of discipline; second, attachment to social group by the individuals; and third, the self determination or autonomy demanded by modern morality. Accordingly, the concept of discipline derives from two linked aspects of human inclination, said, preference for regularity and moral authority which constitute the fundamental elements of morality. For Durkheim, discipline may enhance the development of personality, not inhibit to it, because through it the individuals learn to rein desires and set limits on appetites. Therefore, "rule" and 'liberty' are far from exclusive or antithetical terms. The latter is only possible by virtue of the former" (Durkheim, 1961: 54).

Why attachment to social groups is essential to morality? Morality does not derive from social vacuum. Our awareness of being moral must be based on and enhanced by social rituals. The need for self-discipline does not serve for individual purpose, because "behavior, whatever it may be, directed exclusively toward personal ends of the actor does not have moral value" (Durkheim, 1961: 57) and "moral goals, then, are those of the object of which is society. To act morally is to act in terms of the collective interest." (Durkheim, 1961: 59) It is clear for Durkheim then morality must be constructed collectively and for the purpose of groups. The formation of morality is through the procession of collective conscious. In French, conscious implies to the dual meaning of consciousness and conscience. Therefore, sense of morality must derive from the awareness of being a part of group, community or society which produces an obligation to which the individual belongs. Attachment to the social group thus becomes

necessary for the man to be moral. To propose the characteristics of this element, Durkheim went further to a social psychology by indicating that “because men live together rather than separately, individual mind act upon one another; and as a result of the relationship thus established, there appears ideas and feelings that never characterized these mind in isolation.” (Durkheim, 1961: 62) Again, for Durkheim (1961), the expression of attachment to social group is synonymous to altruism. He viewed altruism is not something mysterious or extraordinary. On the contrary, it is inherent in human nature like its counterpart egoism. The aim of moral education is then to develop altruism and minimize egoism in child.

Such statement is very similar to micro theorist like Mead (1993) who perceived the social formation of mind and personality as function of interaction. True education can only be realized through such social process. Both Durkheim and Mead suggested the primacy of “collective psychology” or “social psychology” for pedagogue. In analyzing the third element, autonomy or self determination, Durkheim applied Kant’s dichotomy of the will of reason and senses to conclude that “autonomy is the products of reasoned will, heteronomy the products of senses”(Durkheim, 1961: 109). It is yet not enough to respect discipline and to be committed to a group if we are to act morally. Autonomy is the presentation of understanding of the nature of morality. The autonomous social actors become aware of the reasons of their conducts which are not out of social restraint, but by willed determination. As an individual achieves to this stage, autonomy becomes rational choice for common good. To conceive Durkheim’s theory in historical perspective, we see how individuality corresponds to the definition of morality of his time. In a society characterized as “organic solidarity,”

the formation of morality becomes more sophisticated. It is not so visibly a collectively sanctioned conduct as in the society of “mechanic solidarity” that characterized lesser social division of labor where morality is more consensual. Durkheim’s solution for a morality in the industrial age was to highlight the internalized value of autonomy that allows each individual to obey the collectively derived social rules to achieve freedom.

But how do we implement Durkheim’s moral theory to educational settings? He suggested that school must build on children’s susceptibility to develop the spirit of discipline. By entrusting themselves into school interaction, children acquire the rule easily. But the discipline should not be too detailed or too embracing because it would cause them so dependent on external rules that he could not develop the self-discipline required in modern society. Durkheim (1961: 183) suggested the necessity of punishment, albeit not physical one because “one of the chief aim of moral education is to inspire in the child a feeling for the dignity of man. Corporal punishment is a continual offense to this sentiment. In this respect, then, it has a demoralizing effect.” According to Blackledge and Hunt (1985: 20), Durkheim suggested “a sliding scale of punishment going from individual reproach, to showing disapproval before the class, to communicating with the parents, and finally suspension from the school. At each stage, the teacher should explain why the punishment is being applied.” Social rituals must be at work to strengthen morality in that collective punishment and reward, then, can be applied regularly to inspire the sentiment of group attachment. Each class has its own “personality” and the teacher must develop its unity and solidarity. Finally, Durkheim felt that the children need to know the reason for acting morally. The best way to develop this understanding is through studying science. By

studying society in scientific way, children can be led freely and willingly to accept the morality of their society. It seems that Durkheim, like his predecessors A. Comte, H. Spencer or his contemporaries S. Freud, shared the same sentiment toward positivistic science of their time. Yet the reason for Durkheim (1961) to postulate it is because science then was accused of amorality. It will become antithetical to claim autonomy or self determination based on rationality. He insisted that moral behavior is natural and empirical, other than transcendental beyond our experience. Therefore moral science is necessary to guide our social actions.

Tolstoy: The Reluctant Fox and Moralist

In his notable study of Tolstoy *Fox and Hedgehog*, Berlin (1953) compared two types of literary artists in among Russian writers. He said:

There exists a great chasm between those, on the one side, who relate everything in single central vision, one system less or more coherent or articulate, in terms of which they understand, think and feel—a single, universal organizing principle in terms of which alone all that they are and say has significance—and, on the other side, those who pursue many ends, often unrelated and even contradictory, connected, if at all, only in some de facto way, for some psychological or physiological cause, related by no moral or aesthetic principle... (Berlin, 1953: 22)

Berlin called the first one who knows only one big thing hedgehog, and the second one who knows many things fox. He then categorized

some greatest writers Dante, Plato, Pascal, Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, Ibsen and Proust as hedgehogs, and Shakespeare, Aristotle, Montaigne, Goethe, Pushkin, Balzac, Joyce as foxes. But Berlin felt there can hardly an immediate answer to attribute Tolstoy to either category. He then provided us a hypothesis, rather than an answer, that:

Tolstoy was by nature a fox, but believed in being a hedgehog; that his gifts and achievements are one thing, and his beliefs, and consequently his ideals have led him, and those whom his genius for persuasion has taken in, into a systematic misinterpretation of what he or others were doing or should be doing. (Berlin, 1953: 24)

Berlin's words succinctly grasp the versatility, complexity and contradiction of Tolstoy's art and personality behind the vein of his lucid writing. He excelled in most forms of literature: novel, fiction, theater, fairytale, but he refuted the accomplishment on the ground that his writings are too artistic and thus artificial. It is true that Tolstoy always tried to answer a big question, the question of life itself, and acted according what he believed. He constantly doubted about himself and rejected the fame accorded with his literary achievement. All of these can be concluded as an existentialist's quest about the eternal meaning of life in which morality is central for reflection. There is little doubt that Tolstoy is a moralist. Moralistic reflection was permeated in virtually all of his works, be it voluminous historical novel *War and Peace*, middle length fiction *The Death of Ivan Illich*, *Kretzer Sonata* or tiny fairy tale like *Three Crows*. His anarchist's ideal of peasant utopia appears in a longer fairytale *Ivan The*

Fool, which is also moralistic. Actually all his pieces constituted a morally coherent whole. It is impossible to single out a particular issue from his works without taking morality into consideration. The most evident example can be found in *What is Art* which is considered more a moral treatise rather than an aesthetic one. His discourse on education and experiment accompanying with the conviction are not exceptional. His collected essays, compiled and translated by L. Wiener, *Tolstoy on Education*, were largely based on his first hand experience at Yasnaya Polyana. Thomas Mann related to his educational devotion “as an amateur pedagogue” and that:

He pursued no other career for years on end; he threw himself into this activity with the whole force of his native passion and wrestled with the problem of the Russian elementary school, theoretically and practically, to the point of exhaustion. (Mann, 1984: 226)

Among the great educational thinkers such as Plato, Locke, Rousseau, Tolstoy was the only writer who not only drew educational ideal in paper. B. Russell and R. Tagore also ran experimental schools, but it seemed that neither had ever thrown themselves with such passion. His pedagogical theory can be best exemplified in “Are the peasant children to learn from us? Or, are we to learn from the peasant children?” and “The school at Yasnaya Polyana, 1862.” The former provides a unique insight on language learning as well as literary reading and writing. In Vygotsky’s (1962) *Thought and Language*, we can find Tolstoy’s influence on the notable psychologist. He quoted from “Are the peasant children to learn from us? Or, are we to learn from the peasant children?”, *Childhood, Boyhood and Youth*, and

Ana Karerina to interpret Tolstoy's theory of language learning (Vygotsky, 1962: 83) and "psychology of understanding" (Vygotsky, 1962: 140). We found from Vygotsky's insistence on children's acquisitive inclination as the indispensable factor of social interaction in learning the influence of Tolstoy's educational writing.

"The school at Yasnaya Polyana, 1862" is a journal kept from the multi-years classroom observation. We can read it in great joy and treat it as well-composed school ethnography with literary flavor. In addition, from these two pieces and others, we find how Tolstoy conceived the meaning of discipline and how he placed freedom as the core of educational practice.

Tolstoy's basic educational attitude was expressed in "Education and culture" where he evidently claimed his distrust of formal institution of schooling. Tolstoy was so sensitive to foresee the potential threat of schooling to freedom at the time when compulsory education has not become a universal reality. He said:

...that education as a premeditated formation of men according to certain patterns is sterile, unlawful, and impossible.... There are no right of education. (Tolstoy, 1967: 111)

He viewed culture and education as antagonistic to each other. For him, culture is free, and therefore, legal and just. Education is compulsory, and therefore, is illegal and unjust. Again, we can easily sense his anarchistic idiosyncrasy from the passage where he accused "education" as "sterile," "unlawful," and "impossible." Anarchists generally insist that society ruled by government cannot be orderly and quite contrarily that government

creates and perpetuates disorder. They tend to venerate freedom as highest value. State is the source of all evils. Therefore, state control education must be destructive to individual autonomy. Probably his use of terms needs more clarification. Culture here denotes learning from life which is natural, unintentional without fixed ends. In his essay “On popular education,” Tolstoy perceived German schools “present themselves to him as an institution in which they are deprived of their chief pleasure and youthful needs, of free motion: Gehorsam (obedience) and Ruhe (quiet) are the chief condition; where he needs a permission to go out for a minute; where every misdeed is punished with a ruler or by the continuation of study, — the more cruel condition for the child” (Tolstoy, 1967: 12). What he called “unconscious school” is much more powerful than the one by compulsion. The content of school becomes meaningless when a nation has progressed in universal schooling and real education has passed away from school to life (Tolstoy, 1967). What he meant by education in this essay is more equivalent to schooling. And the real education:

...is not the house in which the instruction is given, not the teachers, not the pupils, not a certain tendency of instruction, but in the general sense, the conscious activity of him who gives culture upon those who receive it, that is one part of culture, in whatever way this activity may find its expression. (Tolstoy, 1967: 143)

We are deeply impressed, while reading these lines, to see Tolstoy as a predecessor of present-day de-schooling movement like I. Illich who stirred a wide discussion when published his *The De-schooling Society* in early

1970s. They opposed formal schooling in different ground. Tolstoy would abolish school based on his romanticism which opposed anything against human nature. Illich, on the other hand, concerned more about the efficacy of schooling. Tolstoy opposed formal education on the ground that it impinges our free will. Contrarily, he elevated the informal systems like museum, theater, library and / or public lectures. He then established the peasant school to experiment such pedagogical conviction. Non-interference is the guiding principle for the school that grants:

...the person under culture the full freedom to avail himself of the teaching which answers his need, which he wants, and to avail himself of it to the extent to which he needs and wants it, and to avoid the teaching which he does not need and want. (Tolstoy, 1967: 143)

Accordingly, no definite course, programme, code or examination was required at Yasnaya Polyana School. We naturally become suspicious about what direction the pupils were possibly led. How can we maintain reasonable order to assure the progress of instruction? Or maybe the conventional sense of instruction is even unnecessary. Such anarchist's perspective must have imbedded on an indefinite belief on the goodness of freedom. Recalling our definition of freedom at the beginning, it is "an absence of restraint of any kind." Tolstoy implemented this principle in the following way:

Not only do they carry nothing in their hands, but they have nothing to carry even in their heads. They are not obliged to remember any lesson, —nothing that they were doing the day before. They are not vexed by

the thought of the impending lesson. They bring with them nothing but their impressionable natures and their convictions that today it will be as jolly in school as it was yesterday. They do not think of their class until they have begun. (Tolstoy, 1967: 229)

Such long lists of non-requirements must seem to contemporary students an educational utopia. It is very much akin to certain experiment schools in our time such as Summerhill, only more radical, more revolutionary. Or this anarchist perspective in education may remind us existentialist view of the humanist psychologist Rogers (1969) who proclaimed to do away with any kind of teaching, grading, credit or degree which mark the conclusion of learning. Rogers insisted that the proper role of teacher is facilitator for learning. And there should be no fixed end for learning. He and Tolstoy are quite alike in this aspect. School is a place to learn. Doesn't it sound paradoxical if Tolstoy was to emancipate school, why he established one? He is so moralistic, but his concerns about discipline were virtually absent from his writings. Does discipline bear no relation to morality?

Tolstoy declined the use of punishment to the young after an incident that made him feel ashamed of doing so. But he didn't provide us a theory of discipline after that. Instead, he told us that "I convinced myself that there were secrets of soul, hidden from us, upon which only life can act, and not moral precepts and punishment" (Tolstoy, 1967: 240). It is somewhat mysterious rather than a sensible explanation for us to perceive how he would solve the quandary. There is difference in the thinking style between Durkheim and Tolstoy. The former is much more scientific-minded who would never allow himself to fall into mysticism like the latter. But "Tolstoy's

style is loose, literary, non-logical. It is often sentimental, ironical, (and) sarcastic. It is riddled with paradoxes, if not contradictions” (Archambault, 1967: VIII). Durkheim too opposed punishment, but when it becomes necessary he suggested ritualistic steps to avoid feeling of revenge and make it acceptable in the society that values individual dignity. Instead Tolstoy maintained that:

Our world of children—of simple, independent men—must remain pure from self-deception and the criminal faith in the legality of punishment, free from that self-deception and belief that the feeling of revenge becomes just the moment you call it punishment. (Tolstoy, 1967: 241)

But how the order can be maintained for a class without prescribed content of instruction and punishment? It didn't bother the novelist at all because he thought disorder is natural. In Tolstoy, we find no prescribed content to teach. Though he demonstrated to us the process he collaborated a story with kids, he didn't propose any pedagogical method. Actually Tolstoy (1967) himself maintained that the only method for is experiment and the only criterion is freedom. If we intend to sum up his concrete pedagogical methods, we must learn it from what he performed to the pupils but not what he had to say. For instance, Tolstoy didn't emphasize any “individualized instruction” in educational essays, but he practiced it in every aspect. Cohen (1981) called him one of the first educators to call for such method because Tolstoy believed no fixed method for all children. We find here Tolstoy's thorough confidence on children's nature for harmony. His conviction to freedom is comparable to a belief. He attributed this character equally to

children and peasants and allowed extreme permissiveness in his class. As Berlin (1953: 250) indicated that Tolstoy viewed “the child is closer to the ideal harmony than the grown man, and the simple peasant than the torn, ‘alienated’, morally and spiritually unanchored and self-destructive parasites who form the civilized elite.” And “if one can help children and peasants, it is only by making it easier for them to advance freely along with their own instinctive path. To direct is to spoil. Men are good and need only freedom to realize their goodness” (Berlin, 1953: 256). This familiar voice perfectly echoes Rousseau’s romantic idealism in which simplicity and innocence were hailed as highest value. The least corrupted children and peasants represent models of morality. School is simply a site of fake learning. Outside the open air, he observed, pupils and teachers establish new relationship of greater liberty, greater simplicity and greater confidence. Again, contrary to our reasoned anticipation, Tolstoy found that disorder does not last long in such non-interference school context. It will calm down naturally and grow into a much better and more permanent order that it has previously created (Tolstoy, 1967).

As mentioned earlier, it is difficult to distinguish Tolstoy’s aesthetics and ethics. For him beauty and morality all spring from nature. Art is the “spiritual organ of human life, and it cannot be destroyed” (Tolstoy, 1995: 148). He abhorred anything artificial or compulsory. He criticized teacher’s egoism in selecting convenient instruction methods and postulated that “the more convenient the method is for the teacher, the more it is inconvenient for the pupils. Only that manner of instruction is correct with which the pupils are satisfied” (Tolstoy, 1967: 264). He applied this conviction of “negative principle” in instructing reading and writing and concluded:

God knows in what manner that kind of reading assumes any definite shape in his mind, but he thus gets used to forms of the letters, to the process of syllable combinations, to the pronunciation of words, and even to understanding what he reads, and I have had occasion to convince myself by actual experience that our insistence that the pupil should understand what how reads only retards the result. (Tolstoy, 1967: 267)

“Are the peasant children to learn from us? Or, are we to learn from the peasant children?” is another Tolstoy’s significant essay with profound insight for teaching writing. Contemporary educational philosopher Lipman (1993: 183) commented that “his stress on the relationship between speaking, thinking and writing in a communal environment in which children are encouraged to discuss ideas and feelings freely and build on each other’s thoughts was uncannily ahead of his time.” Although this essay was mainly related to the teaching of story writing, Tolstoy’s hidden intention was to reveal his belief that grown-ups are inferior to children in creative writing. Children’s temperament varies, some are sensitive and some are more logical-minded. In this case, they can collaborate in the mixture of the opposite personality traits to create a story that outperforms the great novelist himself. As Tolstoy recorded the episode of the process of pupil’s composition, his intrinsic sentiment of morality represented by romantic ideal of innocence of childhood loomed large.

Tolstoy and Durkheim's Meaning of Discipline in Contrast

Tolstoy and Durkheim excelled themselves in literature and sociology. Their influence on educational thinking is also ample. Their differences in achievement, temperament, social philosophy and style seem more remarkable than the similarities. However, they both devoted considerable endeavor apart from their literary and sociological career. They also concentrated such central themes of discipline, autonomy and freedom in education. By far I have delineated in both thinkers what were considered related to the subject of discipline. Six contrastive points can be concluded on their arguments about the relationship between discipline, freedom and morality.

a) Tolstoy and Durkheim viewed the well being of society from opposite angles. While Tolstoy was manifestly a disciple of Rousseau's romantic idealism, Durkheim was a critic of him. It leads to a great discrepancy on their start points on the discourse about discipline and order. Tolstoy represented an eighteenth century's spirit of Enlightenment with Rousseau and Goethe as his peer. Education for him is synonymous to the moral and intellectual awareness taken life as a journey. Therefore he viewed education as a function from within. Durkheim, on the other hand, sought to propose a moral theory that can function to prevent anomie in the emerging industrial society of the nineteenth century. He saw the state control education as inevitable because of the rise of nationalism. For Durkheim, consensus is necessary for the society to function. Discipline must be established

collectively to secure order, and it is the foundation for group attachment and autonomy. While for Tolstoy, children's need for order is almost instinctual and discipline is not necessary to impose from without. Further he viewed authoritarian discipline is detrimental for order.

b) Sociologically speaking, Tolstoy is rather a pragmatic empiricist, who constructs his theory (or anti-theory) of art and morality in terms of social interaction of feeling. Durkheim, on the other hand, is a high priest of functionalism which concentrates the investigation of whole than parts. Therefore, Tolstoy placed the priority of individual over society, and contrarily, Durkheim society over individual. It is not that Durkheim ignored the significance of interaction. But his concern always led to the social need for integration. Though the micro aspect of ritual theory is similar to aspects of symbolic interactionism, it is more instrumental for comprehending how a society is consolidated through collective sentiments. Contrastively, Tolstoy would view process as an end in itself. In this sense, we can credit Tolstoy as a forerunner of "progressive education". Here we would clarify the dual meaning of the word progress because it is often confusing through translation. In the first sense, progress means inclination toward more desirable condition. In the second sense, it is very similar to the word process. For example, W. Bunyan's novel *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Progressive education is usually applied to contrast traditional education. For Tolstoy, education must be implemented in the process. Therefore, discipline or autonomy spontaneously arises from the interaction between individuals. For Durkheim, elements of morality can be internalized by the ostensible interaction among social members. But for Tolstoy, morality is inherent to be evoked through interaction.

c) Durkheim should not be understood sheer from the viewpoint of functionalism. Durkheimian tradition involves another micro aspect which stresses the ritual process of social formation and meaning construction. Therefore he is also a social psychologist to perceive ritualistic interaction as critical mechanism that actively cements social elements. For these, he can be also credited as a liberal or radical in political implication. Collins (1994) even ranks him along with K. Marx and M. Weber in conflict sociology. Though it would be arbitrary to attribute Tolstoy in any theoretical school, his description in his educational experiments resembled much like the founder of American symbolic interactionist Mead (similar to Durkheim) who delineated social process and treated as essential to achieve real education. But his emphasis on culture transcended himself beyond a micro social thinker. In this aspect, they resembled each other in viewing the construction of morality for the children as a process.

d) Durkheim's theory implies the normalcy and necessity of crime in society (Collins, 1982). It means society will regain order after certain periods of disorder or chaos. It can be referred to the micro society of school. For Tolstoy, likewise, disorder won't last long. It is even a necessary and healthy condition for more solid and permanent order. The external disorder is useful and should not to be replaced by anything else, and chaos is only temporary, whatever strange this perspective may seem to the teacher. However, Durkheim didn't leave the order to be automatically recovered. Like in religion, it must be strengthen through rituals. Therefore, in educational settings, discipline has to be constructed by consensual activities. Durkheim openly advocated that discipline as the first element of morality and detailed the meaning of it. Tolstoy rarely used the term discipline as if

the problem is nonexistent. Tolstoy reflected himself a typical anarchist to perceive discipline and autonomy are just there if we don't exercise power on them. Conversely, Durkheim viewed discipline as social nature rather than human nature in that we internalize from social life. For Tolstoy, discipline is the representation of freedom and an inherent part of morality, while for Durkheim, discipline precedes freedom and morality is the realization of discipline and autonomy by means of attachment to the group an individual belongs.

e) Tolstoy suggested that order and autonomy eventually enhance each other as he observed in non-compulsory school where “the more the pupils become educated, the fitter they become for order, and the more strongly they themselves feel the need for order” (Tolstoy, 1967: 234). For him, order and autonomy grow reciprocally. State intervention may ruin autonomy and freedom. But for Durkheim, who placed autonomy as the third but the most important element of morality, suggested discipline is the condition for autonomy. As the children achieve autonomy or self-determination, they also reach a high stage of moral rationality by will. Though Tolstoy, like Durkheim, hailed science as proper subject of education, his discourse was, unlike Durkheim, rather metaphysical. Where Durkheim provided us an analysis of the linkage of moral elements, Tolstoy only speculated it.

f) For some, punishment is synonymous to discipline. Both Durkheim and Tolstoy opposed to the application of punishment. But for Durkheim, when punishment becomes inevitable, it must be administered in “sliding scales.” Corporal punishment should be prohibited because it derives from the idea of revenge in the society characterized as “mechanic solidarity” which is no longer appropriate to that of “organic solidarity” which values

dignity of individual. Tolstoy viewed punishment as a feeling for revenge. To shame an individual publicly will encourage the inclination for his misconduct. It can only deteriorate the morality of the children if they are labeled of being punished.

Final Words

In *Experience and Education*, John Dewey indicated:

Even the theoretical anarchist, whose philosophy commits him to the idea that state or government control is an unmitigated evil, believes that with abolition of the political state other forms of control to operate: indeed, his opposition to governmental regulation springs from his belief that other and to him more normal modes of control would operate with abolition of the state. (Dewey, 1938: 52)

This statement succinctly suggests how the social philosophers project their ideal in distinctive perspectives and how they view the role a state should play. If state is abolished, order must be maintained by a more desirable one. Human need for order may be embedded in our nature. Morality and discipline thus can hand in hand enhance each other, though the way to accomplish it and further facilitate freedom must be commensurate to social and cultural condition. The discussion above may reveal a fact that Durkheim and Tolstoy are two sides of one coin. They constitute a whole of our understanding of education for morality.

When Durkheim meets Tolstoy, what would they discourse with each

other about moral education? It would be extremely interesting to imagine what a liberal reformer and social scientist may spark in thinking while dialoguing with a revolutionary anarchist and literary fox. I postulate that they would agree morality is the primary end of education and order is the core of discipline. They would nod to each other that autonomy is the end for discipline to achieve; only that Durkheim would insist it reaches step by step in logical sequence and Tolstoy would assert that they function to enhance each other. But there may be one thing they become contradictory, that is, the role of state in education. Durkheim initiated his pedagogical lectures without querying the legitimacy of state, but Tolstoy from the very beginning of his educational writing opposed the state-control education and claimed it illegal and thus, immoral. Regardless of their temperament and scientific/metaphysical orientation, this is the principal departure which made them seem so different.

Reference

- Alexander, J. (2003). *The meaning of social life*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Archambault, R. D. (1967). Introduction. In L. Wiener, (Trans.), *Tolstoy on education* (p. VIII). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1967)
- Bennett, W. (1993). *The book of virtues: A treasury of great moral stories*. New York: Touchstone.
- Berlin, I. (1953). *The hedgehog and the fox*. London: Orion Books.
- Blackledge, D. & Hunt, B. (1985). *Sociological interpretations of education*.

London: Croom Helm.

- Cohen, A. (1981). The educational philosophy of Tolstoy. *Oxford Review of Education*, 7(3), 241-251.
- Collins, R. (1982). *Sociological insight: An introduction to non-obvious sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Collins, R. (1994). *Four sociological traditions*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: MacMillan.
- Durkheim, E. (1956). *Education and sociology*. New York: Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1961). *Moral education: A study in the theory & application of the sociology of education*. New York: Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1977). *The evolution of educational thought*. London: Routledge, Kegan Paul.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Lipman, M. (Ed.) (1993). *Thinking children and education*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.
- Longman. (1991). *Longman dictionary of the English language*. (2nd ed.). Harlow, Essex, England: Longman.
- Lukes, S. (1973). *Emile Durkheim: His life and work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Mead, G. H. (1993). Language as thinking. In Lipman (Ed.), *Thinking children and education*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.
- Mann, T. (1984). *Thomas Mann's "Goethe and Tolstoy: Notes and Sources."* (A. Scott & C. Koelb, Trans.). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press. (Original work published 1984)

- Rogers, C. (1969). *Freedom to learn*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.
- Spring, J. (1983). Educational anarchists: A dissenting tradition. In William O'Neill (Ed.), *Rethinking education*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.
- Tolstoy, L. (1967). *Tolstoy on education*. (L. Wiener, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1967)
- Tolstoy, L. (1995). *What is art?* New York: Penguin Books.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.