

werden immerhin 83 Seiten gewidmet. Zu den 70er und 80er Jahren wären nach wie vor mehr Informationen durchaus wünschenswert, aber man darf die Schwierigkeiten einer solchen Zusammenstellung nicht unterschätzen. Sowohl die Primär- als auch die Sekundärliteratur aus der Tschechoslowakei ist für diesen Zeitabschnitt bei uns sehr schwer zu beschaffen, und im Westen ist zu diesem Thema bis 1986 nur wenig geschrieben worden. Měšťan bedient sich einer anderen Methode als Kosková und verzichtet auf lange werkanalytische Ausführungen. Dazu läßt ihm die Fülle des faktographischen Materials keine Möglichkeit. Somit fällt seiner „Geschichte“ vorwiegend die Funktion eines kommentierenden Nachschlagewerkes zu. Aber dank der beachtlichen Erzähldynamik und prägnanten Formulierung kann sie auch wie eine der üblichen monographischen Beschreibung gelesen werden. Gegenüber der deutschsprachigen Fassung hat die tschechische zusätzlich noch den Vorteil, mit knapp fünfundzwanzig Mark eine wirklich preisgünstige Alternative für die sprachkundigen Kaufinteressenten zu sein.

Regensburg

Vladimír Ulrich

*Pavlík, Ondrej: Mravná výchova v socialistickej spoločnosti [Moral Education in a Socialist Society].*

2. Aufl., Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, Preßburg 1985, 481 S.

In their determinist theory of dialectical and historical materialism Marx and Engels have understandably neglected ethics, a philosophical discipline they considered to be part of the "ideological superstructure", primarily conditioned by the evolution of the economic basis, the relations of production and the pertinent class structure.

Today socialist states use Marx, Engels and Lenin as their philosophical and political legitimation. They cannot efficiently operate without their own ideological instruments. One of the tools they need, is their own ethics and pedagogy, preferably of a quasi-Marxist character. This is where Slovak Academician Ondrej Pavlík comes in on the Czechoslovak scene.

In the first part of his book the author deals with the aim, content and place of moral education. Not unexpectedly he maintains that ethics – previously a discipline of a speculative nature – became a science with the advent of Marx and Engels, whose work was further developed by Lenin. The aim of ethics and of pedagogical efforts is, according to Pavlík, determined by the obtaining state of evolution of society. Today, ethics and morals must aim toward the construction of a communist society as outlined by the founding fathers of Marxism.

The author considers the class aspect most important. An attentive reader soon discovers that his criterion for class in morals is identical with whatever serves the Soviet-controlled camp and the objectives postulated by the rulers of the pertinent "socialist" state.

In discussing the moral qualities postulated by his kind of Marxist ethics, Pavlík makes use of simple terminological trickery. Thus, for instance, the praiseworthy trait of courage is positively evaluated in the era of primitive communism and later, as

"proletarian courage" in societies of the type propagated by the author. There courage is based on the Marxist scientific *Weltanschauung*, on "revolutionary" love for the people, for one's nation, for progress and for the ideals of communism. In contrast, courage in a capitalist society reverts to domination, egotism, cruelty and tyranny; or it is paid courage without genuine moral feeling, turning into adventurism, superficial mannerism, self-seeking affectation or boastfulness (p. 262 ff.). To take another example, decent behavior as a social trait is praiseworthy in a socialist society while, in bourgeois surroundings, it tends to become empty, pretentious, bombastic and hypocritical (p. 245). Similarly, the traits of humaneness, self-reliance or sexual morality acquire new meanings after the old class barriers have been shattered by a "socialist" revolution.

Incidentally, a word on Pavlík's sexual and family morals might be in order here. Earlier, when communists had been in opposition, they had tended to be freethinkers and even libertines both in theory and in actual behavior. In comparison, Pavlík preaches prudery and restrictionism. He opposes what he terms sexual amorality, eroticism and Freudism. Premature sexual relationships are harmful and should be restrained. Boys and girls should not be informed about pertinent physiological facts by their parents, because they will discover them their own way. If necessary, they should be enlightened by physicians. Marriages should not be entered into too soon, and certainly not on the basis of sexual urge. The aim of marriage is to educate the offspring and mutual support. It is hardly surprising that Pavlík as a spokesman of real-socialism in power is not far from clerical morality.

The second part of the volume consists of treatises written by Pavlík in the 1960's and 1970's. Of some interest is a questionnaire on personal habits and traits, the Inventory, which was presented to a fairly representative sample of students of varying age groups in Slovakia. The rather intimate questions range from personal habits such as cleanliness and orderliness to queries about "socialist patriotism and internationalism", trust in the communist party, love for one's nation and a positive attitude to the Soviet Union as the primary socialist state (pp. 361-383).

The author discusses this poll quite a lot, without publishing its results. This is hardly a great loss, however, because the questions are openly suggestive. To ensure political acceptability, the positive qualities, habits and traits are listed under "a", in each section, while negative attributes are found under "b". Rather than being a questionnaire, the Inventory is a list of desirable and undesirable moral and political characteristics.

Obviously, in a book of nearly 500 pages there are conclusions with which western moral philosophers and pedagogical experts may largely agree. But even there the rendition is warped by permanent references to the founding fathers of Marx-Leninism and, in particular, by Pavlík's obsession with the progressive Marxist dogma and its periodization of history. The propagandist nature of his arguments is much too evident.