

---

## **Diverse Pedagogical and Organizational Activities**

---

Albina M. Imamutdinova<sup>1</sup>

***Abstract:***

*The study of the history of national historical science is one of the most important tasks for the further productive development of modern scientific knowledge. This is primarily due to the study of the scientific heritage of historians, the disclosure of the essence of their worldview, views and concepts by rethinking of the experience of previous generations of scientists.*

*The historian, his "life-marks" and the creative path as well as his ideals together with the sociocultural environment influence on the formation of the picture showing the experience of previous generations.*

*The article deals with the pedagogical and organizational activities and the interests by Vladimir Mikhailovich Khvostov, which were quite diverse; V.M. Khvostov's life path, the characteristic and evolution of his approach and views on the regularity of pedagogical processes, the issues of pedagogy and education in general, the problems of education and purposeful development of the younger generation, which is reflected in his research, teaching and organizational activity.*

***Keywords:*** *History, Historiography, Pedagogy, Education, Development, Upbringing, The USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences.*

---

<sup>1</sup>*Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies, Kazan Federal University, Russia, ami.kpfu@gmail.com*

## **1. Introduction**

A prominent organizer and a theoretician in the field of pedagogical sciences, the academician Vladimir Mikhailovich Khvostov played a prominent role in the development of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences - the All-Union Center of educational thought. As its first president, he paid much attention to the development and the improvement of humanitarian education system at school, considering all the tasks and requirements imposed by the practice of communist construction in our country.

In the reports and the presentations at various scientific meetings and conferences, he repeatedly stressed the paramount importance of social humanities in the preparation of not only an educated young men and women, and also in the development of political literacy of young people.

Attaching a great importance to the development of teaching science, the scientific creative development of the basic problems concerning Marxist-Leninist educational theory, the issues of didactics and methodology concerning the teaching of special subjects, V.M. Khvostov wrote that without a deep scientific development of the main problems, without a firmly based scientific conviction the pedagogical science cannot fulfill the requirements to the social humanities i.e. to give an accurate basis for the political leadership of the respective sphere of social life. Fighting with hostile views in this field, he pointed out that the study of philosophical idealism influence to the bourgeois educational thought, the principal reasoned critique of bourgeois philosophical theories of de-ideologization, pragmatism, neo-positivism, existentialism, neo-Thomism are necessary to unite the efforts of the teachers from the socialist countries, their close cooperation, the joint development of the most important problems of scientific and pedagogical personnel training. According to V.M. Khvostov, socialist pedagogy has great opportunities, based on the unity and commonality of the goals and tasks that are used to educate and form a new man, a fighter for socialism and communism.

## **2. Methodology**

The basis of the work is represented by the approaches based on the principles of scientific objectivity and historicism, due to which the following was ensured: on the one hand, the study of scientific views and activities by V.M. Khvostov as a phenomenon, generated and conditioned by the objective historical conditions of Russian society development and the state of historical science, on the other - the analysis of ideas and, in general, the scientific worldview of the scholar as the process which has an internal dialectic of development, as well as the assessment of the objective influence of the scholar's performance on the state and development of scientific life. The main methods of research were the general scientific methods (analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction), and specifically-historical ones.

The historical-genetic method allowed to recreate Vladimir Khvostov's creative portrait in the chronological framework of the period under study - the twentieth century (1930-1970-ies); the historical-comparative method was used to distinguish the new elements that V.M. Khvostov brought in the study of national and universal history; chronological, historical-biographical methods, the methods of historiographical and source analysis were also used.

The basic principles of the study were the principle of historicism and objectivity to assess the contribution by V.M. Khvostov in the study the history of foreign policy of Russia and the USSR and international relations, in the teaching of social sciences, in the activities of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences during the period under study.

### **3. Results**

In 1966 the system of public education of the country was replenished by another major scientific institution - the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the USSR. The first president of the new academy, his actual founder was the Academician Vladimir Mikhailovich Khvostov.

Antonina Georgievna Khripkova, the vice president of the APN USSR, notes that it is surprising that V.M. Khvostov being very busy with other matters, had done so much within his position in four years.

Vladimir Mikhailovich began with the fact that he, together with his closest assistants, began to work out the main lines of the Academy activities. The best pedagogical forces of the whole country were involved in the work. The modest building in Bolshaya Polyanka, where the presidium was located, began to receive the proposals of venerable scientists, teachers, business leaders and parents. Several letters were received from schoolchildren (Shofman, 1979).

The staff of the presidium worked clearly. Already at this initial stage the Academy staff felt the style of their leader. Deliberation, scale, concentration on the most essential, intolerance to pretenses and "diplomatic" waiting, stirred and involved even the laziest ones into the working whirlpool (Khvostova, 2006, p. 248).

On November 29, 1967, Vladimir Mikhailovich made a speech at the Presidium of the APN on the report by A.I. Markushevich "About the training of scientific personnel".

V.M. Khvostov stated that during the years 1959-1961 the Higher Attestation Commission rejected 8% of candidate and 6% of doctoral dissertations, and the % of the rejected dissertations in pedagogical sciences was the highest one. According to Vladimir Khvostov a candidate for pedagogy, should have personal pedagogical

experience in school; he must master in perfection the science, the teaching methodology of which was described in his thesis at school (Khvostova, 2006).

According to Vladimir Mikhailovich Khvostov's opinion, one of the main drawbacks of dissertations on pedagogy in the past was the lack of foreign literature accounting, and, consequently, of foreign experience, including the experience of the socialist countries. He also argued that there was no system of expert training in the field of pedagogy in 1967. Since the establishment of academic degrees only 130 doctoral dissertations and more than 4,000 candidate dissertations were defended until 1962; the % of doctoral dissertations is significantly lower than in most other sciences.

The President of the Pedagogical Science Academy believed that dissertations on the methodology of the subject should be tested in the collectives of 3-4 city schools prior to defense, and among the opponents there should be a scientist of a special discipline whose teaching methods are described in a defended dissertational work. In HAC, dissertations on methods should be subjected to expertise not only in the pedagogical commission, but also in the commission on the specialty (Khvostov, 1941).

The Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On the main activities of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences" (February 1969) the main tasks of the Academy were listed:

- the research on the leading areas of pedagogy, the methods of teaching subjects at a secondary school, psychology, age physiology, defectology and other sciences that develop the problems of public education and upbringing of children and youth;
- the identification of new opportunities for education, upbringing and training improvement, the preparation of scientific and practical recommendations for their use in the system of public education;
- the development of problems on the improvement of teacher training system and content and the participation in the works on scientific and pedagogical skills of teacher improvement.

Besides, the Academy was entrusted with:

- the coordination of scientific works in the field of pedagogy, general and pedagogical psychology;
- the age physiology on a national scale;
- the assistance in the development of pedagogical sciences within the Union republics;
- the organization of scientific information on pedagogy and school matters in the USSR and abroad;
- the distribution of pedagogical knowledge among the people.

The successful solution of these tasks depended on many factors, but primarily on the proper arrangement of available and the training of new scientific personnel, the

---

strengthening of research center material base, and the further approximation of the pedagogical theory to the daily practice of a school. The attention of the Academy management was focused on these key problems. To increase efficiency and prevent possible impersonality, each of the vice-presidents received a certain set of problems and necessary powers for supervision.

As we have mentioned already, the Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On the main activities of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences" assigned the coordination of scientific research in the field of pedagogical sciences throughout the country to the Academy. At the presidium of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, the Council for the coordination of scientific research in the Field of the USSR Pedagogical Sciences was established, which was chaired by V.M. Khvostov. The council consisted of the presidium members and the director of the Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, the representatives of ministries and departments, the heads of the Research Institute of Pedagogy (schools of union republics) and prominent scientists. In his speech at the first session of the council, V.M. Khvostov formulated the main tasks in the field of pedagogical research coordination. One of the main things is the concentration of scientific forces, the distraction for minor, random or already studied topics (Manfred, 1976, p. 17).

Subsequently, during the analysis of the plans for scientific research, the acquaintance with the work of individual institutions, the drawing up of recommendations, the chairman of the council closely and meticulously observed the novelty and the relevance of the studies being planned and carried out, demanded decisive measures against small-scale and dispersal of scientific forces. At the first session and then repeatedly V.M. Khvostov spoke about the need for a comprehensive research organization as an important task, while considering that the Coordination Council should provide methodological assistance to research teams. The Council must ensure the progressive development of pedagogical science through the long-term planning of scientific research.

In 1970, to implement this idea, the first document was developed that focused all the country pedagogical institutions on the study of the most pressing problems - "The main directions of research in pedagogical sciences for 1971-1975". At their development, a special attention was paid by V.M. Khvostov to the allocation of new or previously insufficiently developed problems - the methodological ones, the development of the world outlook, legal education and upbringing, connected with the change in the content of education, the transition of an elementary school to three-year study, the pedagogical and psychological foundations of higher pedagogical education, vocational education, etc. (Khvostov, 1942a).

The next important task, mentioned at the session of the Coordination Council, is the introduction of scientific work results into the practice of schools and other educational institutions. V.M. Khvostov noted that the percentage of completed

work use in practice is still extremely low. The Coordinating Council should attract authoritative forces to review and resolve the whole range of issues related to the introduction of research results into practice (Khvostov, 1943a).

V.M. Khvostov proposed to draw up a consolidated plan for scientific research on a nationwide scale as the primary and permanent task. As A.G. Khripkov states, Vladimir Mikhailovich drew attention to the need for active inclusion in the orbit of the coordination activities of universities and those institutions that are not the part of the USSR Ministry of Education system.

In 1970, during the discussion of Coordinating Council operation by the USSR APN Presidium, V.M. Khvostov stressed the need to deepen the content of his work. He believed that it was necessary to move on to the effective methods of organization, content and the quality of pedagogical research improvement, from a passive coordination to an active one. The instruction found its concrete embodiment in the following: firstly, the council (at its sessions and through problematic councils) began to engage in the essence of the ongoing research, bringing to the broad and competent discussion the stage and final results of the most important of them; secondly, the control functions of the all-Union and republican coordination councils increased; Thirdly, the council began to influence actively and with sufficient effectiveness the development of five-year and annual plans for scientific research (Polyakov, 1997).

In the 1970-ies, the Council for the Coordination of Scientific Research in the Field of Pedagogical Sciences in the USSR, an authoritative body in the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, operates actively as the headquarters for scientific and pedagogical research nationwide. To a large extent, the current successful coordinating activity of the Academy was determined by the ideas and the leadership of the first chairman of the Coordinating Council, Vladimir Mikhailovich Khvostov.

During the first weeks of his stay at the academy, V.M. Khvostov drew attention to the fact that there are very few specialists of higher qualification in pedagogy as compared with other sciences. At the initiative by Vladimir Mikhailovich, the measures were developed to prepare doctoral dissertations and expand postgraduate study in pedagogy (Khvostov, 1936).

According to A.G. Khripkova, V.M. Khvostov was not limited to the present day in his work, he was able and loved to work for the future. Any affair, a large or a small one, was necessarily considered by him in the future. Vladimir Mikhailovich was one of those who clearly saw that the success of the Soviet school transition to a new content of education is inconceivable without the qualitative changes in a teacher's work (Khvostov, 1939).

V.M. Khvostov established a specialized research institute of general problems on education. Clearly understanding that it is impossible to solve all school problems

only by training, no matter how well it is organized, Vladimir Mikhailovich devoted a lot of attention to upbringing in a single pedagogical process.

A man of high culture, one may say, of a scientific culture, thinking broadly and boldly, V.M. Khvostov was a strong supporter of all types of vocational education. His arguments in this matter can serve as an example of dialectic laws application to the analysis of the most complex social and pedagogical phenomena. The comprehensive development of an individual is not only a pedagogical task. Vladimir Mikhailovich believed that the younger generation should be included in production labor as soon as possible.

V.M. Khvostov saw a real way of training and labor combination, a powerful lever for economic recovery, and the key to a comprehensive personality problem solution in the development of vocational education.

Vladimir Mikhailovich attached a great importance to the connections of pedagogy with other sciences, with art and literature. On his initiative, the composition of the full members and the corresponding members of the Academy was significantly supplemented by representatives of such sciences as mathematics, biology, chemistry, physics, philosophy, psychology, and physiology. Writers, composers and artists came to the academy.

It was instructive that Vladimir Mikhailovich was very skillful and found a common language with any specialist easily at general meetings. Whoever spoke in a debate, the composer D.B. Kabalevsky, the writer S.V. Mikhalkov or the mathematician A.N. Kolmogorov, Vladimir Mikhailovich always found something profoundly common in their speeches and translated this general into the language of magnificent pedagogical logic.

Paying attention to everyone, Vladimir Mikhailovich was especially friendly with writers. He believed that their profession is probably the closest one to a teacher's work, and to historian studies. He closely followed all the perpetrators of children's and youth literature, looked through all the youth periodicals, instantly reacted to the slightest false note in them or to a critical remark to the academy. He discussed the most delicate, the most difficult problems of moral upbringing of children with S.V. Mikhalkov, L.A. Kassil, M.G. Bragin and other writers.

Together with the writers and the military V.M. Khvostov prepared the All-Union Conference on the problems of military-patriotic education carefully, and it aroused a great public resonance.

A.G. Khripkova noted that Vladimir Mikhailovich was very fond of and appreciated the meetings with teachers. He prepared especially a lot for the speeches at these meetings.

#### **4. Discussion**

In the strengthening of the ties between scientists, teachers and a school, with its practical work, V.M. Khvostov saw some of the most important reserves of scientific study effectiveness increase in the field of pedagogy. Many of these relations forms were conceived and proceeded under the guidance and with the direct participation of the Academy President.

A special mention should be made for All-Union Readings, the inclusion of practical workers in public education in the research work of the Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, the expeditions of academics to certain regions, AREAS and republics to analyze the experience and assistance in education and training problem solution, the creation of a broad network of basic experimental schools at the Academy institutes.

The first All-Union pedagogical readings were held in 1968. A little later, Vladimir Mikhailovich delivered his report "On the tasks of pedagogical science" at the congress of the trade union of educators: "Pedagogical readings" showed a great abundance of creative forces, scientific creative forces in our ranks and the ranks of educators. Without exaggeration, I will say that the comrade teachers, the participants in the "Pedagogical Readings", have enriched our pedagogical thought very seriously.

The quantitative scope of the performed event will be clear to you if I say that around 6,000 reports have been received from around the world by the Academy, mainly from practicing teachers. About 9 thousand people took part in the work of the sections - there were 14 of them. Although the most part was represented by Muscovites. More than a few thousand people took part in the plenary sessions. About half of them are the comrades from all the republics of the Soviet Union. Pedagogical science is obliged to help a teacher to educate and teach children and adolescents. But at the same time, our Soviet teacher is not just an object of service on the part of pedagogical science by no means. The "Pedagogical Readings" held on January 8, 1968 clearly demonstrated that our teaching is an active creative force for the development of pedagogy as a science" (Polyakov, 1999, p. 56).

Indeed, 2,800 reports were heard and discussed at the plenary and sectional reading sessions. In 1969, the preparation for the Second All-Union Pedagogical Readings dedicated to the centenary of V.I. Lenin birth took place. V.M. Khvostov closely followed this work, which triggered a mass movement of teachers for the raising of education level and the upbringing at schools, for the introduction of a deep and a solid knowledge, for the formation of a scientific-materialistic worldview, communist convictions and ideals among young people (Khvostov, 1940).

During district, regional and republican readings hundreds of thousands of teachers were involved in the discussion of topical issues of teaching and educational work.

About three thousand reports presented from the Union republics were included in the program of the All-Union readings. They took place in March 1970 in Leningrad. Characteristic for VM. The attitude towards the schoolteacher and his view on the importance of pedagogical readings were clearly shown in the opening speech at the Second All-Union Pedagogical Readings: "A Soviet teacher is a convinced Leninist, a mentor and a friend of the youth and an active public figure. He is characterized by enthusiasm, a creative attitude to his work. A vivid testimony to this is an active participation of hundreds of thousands of teachers in pedagogical readings that took place in all union republics". The President emphasized that "The all-union readings are one of the most effective forms of study and generalization of advanced pedagogical experience, the means of strengthening the ties of pedagogical science with school practice.

The experience of a teacher enters and enriches science through the participation in pedagogical readings. Pedagogical readings for a teacher are the school of his scientific growth, the means of familiarizing with scientific research. There is no doubt that the All-Union Leninist pedagogical readings will help us to study and popularize the best pedagogical experience, to bring science closer to practice, to reveal scientific talents in the ranks of teaching. But at the same time, readings will help focus attention on the main tasks that have not been solved yet, namely, in the drawing of attention to the problems that await solution - the meaning of the jubilee dates was seen by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin" (Khvostov, 1942b).

At the direction from V.M. Khvostov the experience of holding the First and Second All-Union pedagogical readings was thoroughly analyzed by the Research Institute Councils and the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, and the provisions of the All-Union Pedagogical Readings were developed, which reinforced their positive traditional features.

Giving a great importance to the moral participation of teachers in scientific research, V.M. Khvostov proposed the establishment of an institute of non-staff employees in scientific research institutes (1969) - the scientific correspondents of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences (Nigmatullin, 2007). The attention of the president to the work of scientific correspondents greatly contributed to the growth of their number (430 people by 1974) and the replenishment of the Academy staff at the expense of school practitioners.

Among the expeditions of the members and the employees of the USSR APN, it is worth mentioning the large-scale work carried out in several areas of the Byelorussian SSR. For three years a large group of researchers, including prominent scientists, analyzed comprehensively the state of educational work, provided concrete assistance to schools and public education authorities. The expedition ended with the discussion of the results at the joint meeting of the USSR APN presidium and the collegium of the BSSR Ministry of Education in Minsk. At the

initiative of V.M. Khvostov the final materials of the expedition were discussed in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Byelorussia (Khvostov, 1976).

Vladimir Mikhailovich Khvostov was one of the initiators of the joint experimental work of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, the Moscow City Department of Public Education, the Institute for the Improvement of Teachers and Moscow schools on the problem of the "Modern Lesson" and on some problems of communist education. In this work, teachers from 135 schools of the capital, the researchers from 11 research institutes of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and the methodologists from the Institute for Teacher Improvement took part. The president invariably took an active part in the joint meetings of the USSR APN presidium and the board of Mosgorono, which annually summarized the results of the experimental work plan fulfillment. He also closely watched that the materials of the joint experiment were drawn up timely and brought to the attention of the widest circle of school employees.

The results of the first two years of the joint experimental work (1969-1970, 1970-1971 academic years) were summarized in more than 50 reports of teachers and scholars at the citywide conference, in the collections "The Modern Lesson", in 22 articles on the pages of the pedagogical press. These materials are actively used by teachers and have a certain positive impact on many aspects of school teaching and upbringing. In subsequent years, the Moscow experience in joint experimental work organization has spread in many republics and regions, where, following the example of the Academy, the research institutes of pedagogy (schools) of the Union republics and pedagogical institutes began to create a broad experimental base of pedagogical research (Dunaevsky, 1974).

The daily close attention to everything related with the strengthening of the ties between science and practice, scientists and teachers, the initiative and organizational work by Vladimir Mikhailovich Khvostov left a notable mark in the development of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences.

Of all Vladimir Mikhailovich's qualities, perhaps the leading one was the feeling of something new. He became the president when the school experienced significant changes in connection with the transition to a new content of the educational system. Vladimir Mikhailovich faced with such problems as the drafting of the program, the reliance on the didactic and methodological principles of the educational process, the use of educational work reserves and so on daily. At the meetings of the presidium, he did not miss a slightest opportunity to find out one or another detail in the restructuring of a school. He was especially worried about the problem of the natural-mathematical and humanitarian cycles of the school curriculum correlation.

Having worked as the president for six months, figuring out the situation, Vladimir Mikhailovich took a kind of review of modern pedagogical ideas and concepts. This review consisted in the fact that the authors of this or that concept came to V.M.

Khvostov's office and spoke in detail about their scientific innovations. The president never hurried with assessments and conclusions. At any rate, he did not express his opinion publicly, so as not to give cause for possible abuse of his authority. However, scientists, whose views seemed to him promising, immediately began to notice a tangible support. So, it was the case with L.V. Zankov, D.B. Elkonin, V.V. Davydov, V.D. Nebylitsyn, A.A. Markosyan, A.V. Zaporozhets, T.A. Vlasova and others. And in these, and in other cases, the intuition of a great scientist never deceived Vladimir Mikhailovich (Khvostov, 1969).

However, while advocating for the expansion of fundamental theoretical research, V.M. Khvostov with the same categorical emphasis talked on the importance of modern implementation of theoretical research results in school practice. He raised the question of a special scientific organization creation that would deal exclusively with the selection of pedagogical novelties and facilitate their rapid actual development.

The realization of effective pedagogical technology was put by Vladimir Mikhailovich Khvostov on a par with the very development of this technology. He often returned to the following idea in a narrow circle: "The development of a school is restrained not by a lack of ideas - we are rich in them. Most likely, we are hampered by inability, and sometimes even unwillingness to shift an idea into a sound technique and to offer this method to teachers. In my opinion, both practitioners and theoreticians who try to implement ideas in the daily work of a school successfully should be encouraged like the best rationalizers are encouraged to work" (Khvostov, 1943b).

One of the ways in the propagation of the new, in the speedy practical mastering of valuable scientific ideas was seen by V.M. Khvostov in the development of scientific and pedagogical information service. The constant employment of business, the eternal tension of thought, did not constitute a time for a joke, for a distraction by some easy conversation. Hence the seriousness and even severity, the intolerance to ranting (Khvostov, 1961). But there was another person - a sensitive, a caring, an attentive one. The scale of thought, the unity of words and actions, exactingness, an inexhaustible ability for work somehow organically and beautifully combined in the personality of this man with principled party spirit. He frowned, as A.G. Khripkova recalls, if someone from the rostrum was getting off with a loud phrase. He never suffered such a disadvantage. But if it came about something important, principled, he could show what it meant - a correct understanding of the party's duty.

Party discipline, said the vice-president of the APN USSR, was an absolute law for him. He followed it not only in big state affairs, but in every everyday situation. At one of the party meetings, Vladimir Mikhailovich and his referent were next to the presidium table. The meeting was commissioned by the referent. Either from inexperience, or from embarrassment, the referent quickly exhausted the list of

speakers in the debate and, as chess players say, without finding a better continuation, handed over a note asking Vladimir Mikhailovich to speak. A.G. Khripkova remembered that he was the one who got used to a certain order and he wrote on the margins the following: "Is this a directive?". The referent did not lose his head and answered the following within the same note below: "This is the request of the chairman of the meeting". And again, the note returned to the referent. The following was written in large letters from one corner to the other: "I agree"! But the speech was not planned by Vladimir Mikhailovich, he probably thought about something else, but he probably considered it impossible to neglect the request of the chairman (Khvostov, 1943c).

It is important to note what words end A.G. Khripkova's article in memory of V.M. Khvostov, the USSR vice-president of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences: "So he was this man. A communist. The most prominent scientist. A brilliant organizer".

Given such a conscientious work by Vladimir Mikhailovich, he was repeatedly thanked (Manfred, 1976, p. 37). The Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences preserved the originals of gratitude letters, among them: the gratitude on June 19, 1965 for the merits in the development of Soviet historical science, as well as in the training of scientific and pedagogical personnel in connection with the 60th anniversary of the birth of MSU professor Vladimir Mikhaylovich Khvostov from V. Stoletov (the Minister of Higher and Secondary Special Education of the RSFSR); rewarding the Order of the Red Banner of Labor (the decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet) for the merits in the development of historical science (A. Mikoyan, M. Georgadze) on June 28, 1965; the gratitude (the order of the Rector of the Moscow State University named after M.V. Lomonosov № 635 issued on 29.06.1965) for the great contribution to the development of university historical education from I.G. Petrovsky (Khvostov, 1958).

## **5. Conclusions**

The pedagogical and administrative activity of the scientist is extensive and versatile. Vladimir Khvostov taught at the Industrial and Pedagogical Institute named after K. Liebknecht, at the Smolensk Pedagogical Institute, at the Moscow Institute of History, Philosophy and Literature named after N.G. Chernyshevsky, at the Moscow State University named after M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University. V.M. Khvostov was the head of the Central Committee department of the CPSU (b.), the director of the Higher Diplomatic School, the head of the Archives Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the member of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the responsible adviser to the CPSU Central Committee, the Director of the Institute of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the President of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences.

## **6. Summary**

Based on the archival materials of the personal fund devoted to Vladimir Mikhailovich Khvostov, who are in the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, many biographical aspects of the scholar have been revealed. Conditionally, we can distinguish four periods in his life: 1905-1926 - the formation of the personality and the worldview by Vladimir Mikhailovich Khvostov; 1926-1938 - the first stage of scientific creativity: the specialization in research on the history of international relations, the defense of the doctoral dissertation; 1939-1955 - the activity of a scientist during and after the Great Patriotic War; 1960-1972 - the work at the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, an active international activity.

Vladimir Mikhailovich Khvostov was not only a great historian and a scholar, but also a skillful and qualified organizer of pedagogical science, the head of pedagogical (historical) education.

Having analyzed the milestones and the biographical path for the full characterization of the scientific and pedagogical activity by V.M. Khvostov it is necessary to define and characterize the main directions and the results of research work.

## 7. Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

## References:

- Dunaevsky, V.A. 1974. Soviet historiography of the new history of Western countries (1917-1941). Moscow, Education.
- Khvostov, V.M. 1936. Colonial politics and the national liberation movement of 1789-1870. In: V.M. Khvostov (ed.). A new story in the materials and documents, 3-329.
- Khvostov, V.M. 1939. The First World War of Imperialism. In Great Soviet Encyclopedia, Vol. 44, 509-758, Moscow, OGIZ, RSFSR.
- Khvostov, V.M. 1940. The First World War of Imperialism: a tutorial. Moscow, The Military-Political Academy named after V.I. Lenin.
- Khvostov, V.M. 1941. How the German imperialists once "persuaded" to their own doom. 1st ed., Moscow, OGIZ, Gospolitizdat.
- Khvostov, V.M. 1942a. How the German imperialists once "persuaded" to their own doom. 2nd. ed., Moscow, OGIZ, Gospolitizdat.
- Khvostov, V.M. 1942b. Pyrrhic victories of German imperialism. Moscow, The agitator and propagandist of the Red Army.
- Khvostov, V.M. 1943a. How did German imperialism develop? Moscow, Gospolitizdat.
- Khvostov, V.M. 1943b. The defeat of the Germans near Rostov in November 1941: Short essay. Moscow, Military Publishing House of the People's Commissariat of Defense.
- Khvostov, V.M. 1943c. Russia and German aggression in the days of the European crisis of 1887. Moscow, Gospolitizdat.

- Khvostov, V.M. 1958. 40 years of struggle for peace. Moscow, Gospoliitizdat.
- Khvostov, V.M. 1961. 40 years of the Italian Communist Party. Moscow: The Higher Party School and the Academy of Social Sciences under the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.
- Khvostov, V.M. 1969. Fifty years of Soviet-German relations. In V.M. Khvostov (ed.). Yearbook of German History. Moscow, Science.
- Khvostov, V.M. 1976. Problems of the history of foreign policy of the USSR and international relations: Selected works. Moscow, Science.
- Khvostova, K.V. 2006. The 100th anniversary of Academician V.M. Khvostov. In K.V. Khvostova and Ju.M. Korshunov (eds.), *New and recent history*, Vol. 1, 247-250.
- Manfred, A.Z. 1976. The issues of the history of the USSR foreign policy and international relations. In *Collection for the memory of Academician Vladimir Mikhailovich Khvostov*, 3-400. Moscow, Science.
- Nigmatullin, R.Sh. 2007. Graduates of the historical faculty of the Kazan State Pedagogical Institute (1918-1945). In M.V. Nechkina, (ed.), *Essays on history and historical science of the USSR*, 14-17, Kazan, Institute of History named after Sh. Mardzhani of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan (TGGPU).
- Polyakov, Yu.A. 1997. *Coryphaeus of the domestic historical science: the memoirs*. Moscow, URAO publishing house.
- Polyakov, Yu.A. 1999. *Historical science: Notes about scientists*. Moscow, Science.
- Shofman, A.S (ed.). 1979. *Mikhail Mikhailovich Khvostov*. Kazan, Publishing house of Kazan University.