

Text 1. Introduction to a thorough discussion on anti-authoritarian upbringing.

Text 1. Introduction to a thorough discussion on anti-authoritarian education.	1
1.1. Ambiguous	1
1.2. Conclusion of this ambiguity:	5
1.3. The authoritarian/submissive couple.	8
1.4. Decision:	8
1.5. Marxism and authoritarianism.	9
1.6. Parenting wisdom.	13

1.1. Ambiguous

Education is an ambiguous word: one interprets it one way, another. Here we assume the intuitive concept, which can be sketched as the transmission of culture as a means of formation. 'Authoritarian' carries an emotional connotation: inflexibly authoritative, let us say. 'Anti-authoritarian' is then the refusal to undergo such a thing, indeed, to practice it oneself. So much for the general meanings. Now for the specific meanings, which add well-defined contents to the previous ones . How to summarize them?

- 'Anti-authoritarian upbringing' is eliminating excess domination by means of an upbringing that promotes self-determination (i.e., determining oneself by means of oneself: so that it should actually say 'self-determine oneself' ('self' is the subject the first time, the object the second time)).

- The whole question now is: what is meant by 'self-determination' and 'excessive rule'? Answer: those terms come from the fusion of the student movement and collective education.

Collective ('collectivity', commune, colony (the latter easily pejorative!)) means a group of like-minded people working together (or even living together) on a socialist task, but in such a way that only a small number of members make up the group.

Examples are: the Soviet type (NK Krupskaya , AS Makarenko , who advocated 'communes', colonies for neglected children), the Israeli kibbutz (with an Eastern European character), the Summerhill school (AS Neill: direct democracy in schools). 'Student movement(s)' means a movement supported

by (senior) students, expressing itself in contestation (dispute through protest actions regarding university and school-related issues, but also non-university and non-school issues (educational reform, international politics)), driven by a sub- and anti-cultural refusal ('the great refusal' of established society and the 'Herrschaft', the (excessive) rule that prevails within it, all this on a global level.

'Subculture': a part of an encompassing culture; 'anticulture': a part of a (super)culture that rises up against the established culture. 'Underground', Beat, Hippie, New Left.

The student movement takes hold around 1955; the spectacular phase begins around 1965 (especially 1968); the dispersal phase follows from 1970 onwards.

The New Left constitutes the ideology, the doctrine that binds the group as such and that is neo-Marxist (especially the Frankfurt School) Rousseau, Kant, Feuerbach, the Left-Hegelians, Marx, Freud, Heidegger – behold the inspirators of the thought movement. Herbert Marcuse, Max Horkheimer, Erich Fromm and Theodor Adorno, in particular, are the theorists. For them, Marxism is considered the flowering of the Enlightenment (Locke, Hume: English; Voltaire, Rousseau: French; Wolff, Kant: German; in England rather scientific, in France rather social revolutionary, in Germany rather profound-speculative): the emancipated individual who emancipates himself from dogmatism and superfluous authority, suffering from feelings of guilt, takes center stage.

Marxism is the fusion of English economics and French socialism, but grounded in German philosophy, namely on a dialectical basis. 'Dialectics' here is a conception of reality and humanity that places becoming and development at the center, but in such a way that (not a planning providence, but rather) an indeterminate power coming into itself (in Hegel 'God', in Marx 'matter') governs movement, in the form of speech, counter- and dialogue.

Moreover, Neo-Marxism engages in cultural criticism and social (depth) psychology—in which Freud's psychoanalysis is applied socially—and is rather anarchistically oriented.

Berlin 1968: "the Action Council zur Liberation of Women" "decision to use vacant shops (laden, läden) for child-education communes. Behold the formal beginning of anti-authoritarian education. Since then, anti-authoritarian

education has become a buzzword. Consequence: ambiguity ! That ambiguity can be summarized in two key words: the non-directive nature, the permissive nature.

Claartje Hülsenbeck , Jan Louman , Anton Oskamp , **Het rode boekje voor scholieren**, Utrecht/Antwerp, Bruna, 1970, is typical of many a “page for the permissive view, with 'permission(s)'”—admissions for much more than the archaic, authority-bound , tradition-oriented societies allowed: action, sex (solo, duo; homosexual, heterosexual, bisexual !), recreational drugs (drug use), conscientious objection and/or protest service, Dolle Mina ('Boss in your own belly' ladies!), are on the agenda.

For example, 'There must be condom vending machines at school. “(97). “If the school does not want that, one of you can “start” a shop selling such things.' (97) Or: “In our society, small children have little opportunity to play sex games with one another” (91)! The “concept of 'action' actually encompasses 'sex, drug use, conscientious objection, Dolle Mina-ism '. All this is justified by pointing to money (greed), inequality, competition, authority (at home, at school and work, in old age) and fascism in 'established' society. And 'authority' is defined as the division of roles between 'speakers': at home: father, mother, uncle/aunt, neighbors; school: headmaster, director, teachers; work: boss, supervisor, director; old age; doctors, staff members, caregivers) and silent ones (home: children; school: pupils; work: employees; old age: the elderly). This (simplistic, yet written in black and white) duality defines 'authority', 'rule'.

In the field of adult education, a non-directive tendency is found, for example, in the so-called training groups (T-groups); the Freudian (1895) free run, allowing thoughts, ideas, feelings, etc., was conceived by Kurt Lewin (1946) on a group basis and soon practiced both verbally (by speaking freely) and non-verbally (acting), sometimes intended for industrial-commercial purposes (in enterprises), and at other times playfully (' encounter ' growth groups).

All this is justified by the following proposition: 'authenticity' (that something, a feeling for example, is truly (authentic) 'mine' (' Je.meinig.keit ', as Heidegger would say), that something is je meines)) is diminished, indeed, killed, and mutilated into hypocrisy by self-control based on moral rules of conduct.

The Apollonian ideal of self-control is replaced here by the Dionysian

indulgence—to use Friedrich Nietzsche's word pair. Or, with H. Marcuse : the Logos (which he understands in his own way: a one-sided (uni- or one-dimensional) emphasis on performance, efficiency, rational order) is replaced by Eros (understood as spontaneous life, creativity, society, self-enjoyment). One sees that the duality of 'rationalism/romanticism' is at work here. Ultimately, there is not much difference between permissives and non-directives. The transitions are fluid. Both tendencies call into question archaic and classical morality. 'Morality' is constantly distorted into hypocrisy ('One preaches what one does not believe oneself'); one carries out, consciously, what one does not believe, unconsciously or subconsciously. Through this caricaturization of (established) morality—there is actually no other than an established one, unless it is the utopian one! - by taking this as a starting point, one adopts a tactically (= rhetorically) strong position that can function as demagoguery, especially among young people and also among uprooted adults who seek a 'foothold' and suffocate in high-industrial society and its 'rule'. Those caricatures, which apparently contain a dose of truth (and a nevralgic one at that), have made even many teachers, authority figures, and priests insecure.

Anti-authoritarian education is somehow "socialist". 'Socialism' is a buzzword and therefore ambiguous. But let us choose one classification, however improvable it may be: ' Socialism' (= collectivism) is an economic system with two objectives.

(i) ownership of the means of production (factories, land, etc.) must come into the hands of some form of 'community';

(ii) the regulation of the entire economic system must come into the hands of some 'community' (production and distribution, be withdrawn from the so-called 'free market economy' and become a 'guided' economy).

Communism goes further: except for the means of production (see (i) above), all goods are communicatively ('socialized') according to their ownership and use, while their management is placed in the hands of some community.

Socialism is therefore a moderate communism, or communism is a radical socialism. That is why the terms are so easily interchanged, especially among people who do not think with strict logic. We just said: “in the hands of some community or other”. Indeed, there are variations there: what is 'community', after all? That word, too, is ambiguous. Here is a classification:

a/ Marxism (' Social democracy ', 'scientific socialism' are two other names)

understands 'community' to mean the society of citizens headed by a democratically elected government (the so-called political democracy will eventually disappear and make way for an economic and social democracy);

b/ State socialism (étatisme) understands 'community' to mean the classical (political) state; it therefore aims to remain a political democracy; the second point, a guided economy, is on the agenda; the first point, the transfer of property to the 'community', does not fundamentally belong to state socialism; conclusion: communalization (socialization) here means stateification;

- a variant at the time was agrarian or field socialism, which goes somewhat further, namely by wanting to nationalize soil and land ownership ;

- State socialism is fundamentally a reduced or partial socialism because it only essentially posits point (ii) planned economy;

c/ Anarchism understands 'community' not as the society of "Citizens" (social democracy or Marxism), nor as the state government (state society), but as groups of workers, in principle independent of society and the state, which come into existence either territorially (e.g. municipal) or economically (e.g. the working population):

- a variant is syndicalism, which understands the trade union by 'workers' group' and thus demands that the syndicates become the owners of the means of production and the leaders of the economy.

1.2. Conclusion of this ambiguity :

'Community' is either society (the super- or overarching collection of citizens; hence socialization), the state (stateification), or workers' group(s) (grouping, syndicalization).

The anti- authoritarians reject both the feudal system (large landowners control property and the so-called free market) and the capitalist system (the predominantly industrial bourgeoisie dominates property and the free market, even in its neo -capitalist form, characterized by the accumulation of capital and power in trusts, multinationals , etc. , and by state intervention for their benefit) as well as the fascist system (without a parliament). military-backed one-party dominance combined with both feudalism and capitalism). Hence, Eastern European communism is abhorred because of the Stalinist terror of one party and its dictatorship and dogmatism, just as much as US and European market capitalism (resp. - neo-capitalism), in order to build a planetary, state- and communism-free socialism (non-totalitarian).

If one asks "Where is socialism to be found now?", we answer, with *J.F. Revel*, **La tentation totalitaire **, **Paris**, Laffont , 1976, that in fact a truly socialist society exists nowhere, but only fragments, whether or not fascinated (by communism)—by the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, and with major disadvantages from more than one point of view.

- The student movement, the New Left, gauchism (to be distinguished from *la gauche* , the left), has remained much more true to itself in the USA (because there, people do not want to eliminate the disadvantages of economic (and social and political) freedom—which, for the time being, always works out to the benefit of the strongest and the smartest—by destroying that freedom itself (which the totalitarians of the left and right have always advocated), but by sanitizing it in its effects and consequences); in Europe, however, gauchism was practically immediately absorbed by Trotskyism, Stalinism, and Maoism.

- Amada BV is Maoist (Kris Merckx, especially the ideologist Ludo Hartens). Bringing the masses to communism is the task, by preparing the revolution (and only the revolution, conceived violently) among the workers, with the workers, and partially realizing it as the only means to rid the world of (neo-)capitalism, fascism, and Russian Stalinism. Albania and China are the prime examples. These are not imperialist countries (superpowers) like the Soviet Union, where capitalism was restored through the concentration of economic power—with internal oppression and external aggression as consequences. A socialist regime based on the total arming of the working class—that is the goal. The hard lesson of history is that violence, and only violence—but socialist-justified violence—is the weapon for liberation from oppression by the small handful of exploiters of big capital. Mao states that, in order to build a non-violent planetary society, only violence is effective, because capital will not yield except to violence. Thugs, private militias, intimidation—all of this is justified as a means to the greater end.

- The medical collective in Hoboken (Merckx, Leyers) is well known, a cell of Maoism. Cf. Clarté . Leyers could not endure it because he embraced Marxism as merely an intellectual perfection of itself (theory!), not as revolutionary praxis (with all the sacrifices that entails).

- As regards the communes, reference is made to *J.van Ussel* , *intro, Het Communeboek* , Utrecht/Antwerp, 1970. "Why do so many communes disappear? Partly for the same reason that marriages fail: poor preparation, the cohabitation of people who have too many problems to be suitable for a

more or less harmonious life with others, a lack of partnership compatibility, and overly high expectations. Also, in some communes, the same thing is noticeable as in marriages, namely that people sink into a state of lethargy, that it is one or a few members who have to do everything, while the others let things rot. (...) Making a commune succeed is also more difficult.

Marriage is preceded by several preparatory phases: getting acquainted, agreeing to marry, the engagement, and the solemn beginning. This forces those involved to reflect on what they are undertaking. Furthermore, in marriage, everything is more or less fixed in norms, rules, and customs, whereas a commune runs the risk of sinking into anomie (= absence of laws), into a quagmire of unrealistic ideal conceptions. (...) We do know, however, that communes with a religious affiliation function better than communes based on political and economic ideals. It is also striking that communes with a clear leader type fare well after the non-compliant members have left and as long as the leader fulfills his function. On the other hand, all communes with a leader ceased to exist as soon as this figure had disappeared.” (pp. 26/27)

- In our country, students live in communes to combat loneliness and the cost of living. Graduates and workers also do so for similar reasons, as well as to achieve a division of labor (babysitting, extracurricular schoolwork, environmental maintenance and repair work).

Geographically, they did shift: from larger cities to smaller ones, with political and religious motives supplementing the previous ones. One need only think of so-called revivalism, such as the Young Jesus, and Pentecostal Christians (Catholic version: charismatic movement). Monastic reformers also wish to follow this path (because the traditional monastery is waning).

- Aristotle says (Eth. Nik.: 6) that people do not seek the good in itself but the realizable good ('praktos') agathos search. Even Plato realized that his Platonopolis remained a utopia without the real conditions for realization. Let us apply this ancient wisdom to the current commune craze: it is utopian as long as it is not established; it is subject to all human flaws as soon as it is established! Above all: without rules of conscience and without authority, they will be just as unlivable and unrealizable as anything that existed as a form of society in the past. Well then, Dionysian life is by definition a life free of rules of conscience and free of authority. Will the Dionysian democrat succeed in establishing a community properly—non-directively, indeed, permissively? We wait and see! Defining the commune as a living community without formal authority relations is possible as a utopia; realizing it is something else.

1.3. The authoritarian/submissive couple.

Central to anti-authoritarian education is, of course, this system ! Prejudiced appreciation for dominion, authority, power, and strength; a simplistic view that black-white divides humanity into good and evil, overestimation of oneself and contempt for others who are different; above all, the division of humanity into the strong (who are good) and the weak (who are bad) on the social ladder (superiority, subordination)—behold the authoritarian personality! Persistent readiness to attack the weak, a competitive spirit , a strict sense of order, traditionalism, conventionalism , a will to punish those with a different temperament —behold a few further characteristics.

- Authoritarian upbringing breeds the neurotic tripartite nature, according to Caruso , of fear, aggression, and guilt,

It is certain that neurosis is threefold: neurasthenia, which stands or falls with the (un)conscious awareness that one ought to play a role that exceeds one's capabilities, indeed, exhausts them (fatigue, exhaustion neurosis).

- Alternatively, two further neuroses graft themselves onto this basic neurosis:

- (i)** psycheasthenia , which revolves around a role one cannot handle, does not dare to, or does not want to play , based on self-doubt and doubt about one's own right to play that role (insecurity , anxiety, and authority neurosis , which alternates between excessive pangs of conscience and rebelliousness against rules of conscience and authority figures);

- (ii)** the hysteria, which revolves around the high, too high, role that one cannot handle, does not dare to take on, but which one nevertheless plays through substitute actions that pretend to be able to handle, to dare to take on the role: hence the many fake, theatrical, contrived eccentric happenings that hysterics inflict on those around them, out of a need for attention and affection.

1.4. Decision:

The second, the psychasthenic neurosis, creates the submissive man in his disorder. The anti- authoritarians claim that

- (i)** familialism (with its paternalism or tendency towards over-fathering and over-mothering) and

- (ii)** capitalism (with its need for trained, purely functional role-players who carry out what is dictated) which cultivate neurosis. Hence their onslaught against family and business as the established order conceives them. And

against the school that is structured in a paternalistic-capitalist way: that school cultivates only weak, indeed, psychasthenic personalities, crammed full of fear (fear of anxiety), guilt, aggression, -in a word 'subjects' ¹ .

1.5. Marxism and authoritarianism.

The fusion of Freudian Dionysianism , which lives without rules or authority and seeks to establish communes in a non-directive and permissive manner, with Marxist dialectics is a problem: are water and fire fusionable ? *Fr. Stark , Herbert Marcuse / Karl Popper, Social Revolution / Social Reform (A Confrontation)*, Baarn, Wereldvenster, 1971, 34v.

“Socrates says somewhere (...) 'I know that I know nothing, and even that barely (...) Socrates also said that a politician or statesman ought to be wise. He meant it like this: A politician ought, even more than other people, to be aware of his ignorance. For he has taken upon himself a heavy responsibility!' (...)

I agree with Socrates. And here I can best formulate my main reproach against all modern Marxists as follows: the Marxists think they know a great deal. They lack intellectual modesty. They flaunt their knowledge and impressive terminology. This reproach does not apply to Marx or Engels. They were great, original thinkers with new ideas that were sometimes difficult to formulate. (...)

“But I accuse the modern revolutionary Marxists of constructing great arguments and of intent on impressing us with few ideas and many words. Nothing is so alien to them as intellectual modesty. They have, therefore, not gone to learn from Socrates, nor from Kant, but from Hegel.” Thus Karl Popper, the critical rationalist, who claims that even the natural sciences (with their tremendous successes) do not consist of a firm and certain knowledge but of daring hypotheses (oc 35).

In other words, our Marxists are mostly eloquent and ideologists, but very little scientific in the critical sense of the word. It is precisely for this reason that they are so successful with the largely uncritical masses.

- Marxist self-assurance has in the Catholic, post-conciliar In the midst, among priests, intellectuals, religious teachers, etc., major breaches have been made: the church has come to feel uncertain, a 'searching church', 'on the way'! That is modesty, but also weakness! Our Catholic community is no longer capable of taking a stand! Everywhere there is a multitude of

tendencies: doubt about one's own identity, about one's own role and calling in this shaken world, discouragement, hesitation. The self-assurance of the modern secularized intellectual, such as the Marxist, contrasts sharply with that Catholic doubt regarding identity, role, and function!

- "There exists, at various levels, throughout the West, an unmanageable moral crisis. Since no If a single traditional institution can put an end to this crisis, countless people are starting to look to other institutions. After all, all the messing around with 'black magic' coincides with the fashion of Zen Buddhism, of 'consciousness expansion' through LSD under the guidance of Timothy Leary (...), of extreme political engagement, and of anti-authoritarian upbringing.

The increasing popularity of already existing sects, such as Jehovah's Witnesses, Anthroposophists, all Walden-like experiments of a certain duration, and the Mormon Church, points in the same direction (...). Note well: this says nothing about the potential intrinsic value of each of these marginal groups. It is merely stated here that marginal groups appear to offer a last foothold to countless people who can no longer accept the established churches, institutions, and moral authorities. It seems as if the term 'anti-authoritarian,' frequently used in education, encapsulates just about all these phenomena: people are searching for a new authority, for a sign of meaning in a time of supreme confusion and despair. But now, an attitude is also beginning to emerge in humanist and academic circles that is unacceptable to the victims of the moral crisis: an anti-authoritarian stance that admits it, too, holds only a limited vision.

One can rightly applaud this on humanist and academic-scientific grounds; but one must not forget that the mass of our fellow citizens is not ready for an anti-authoritarian attitude, that they interpret the humanist loss of face negatively, just as, for example, in Belgium, they likewise view the loss of face of our moral authority par excellence, the Catholic Church, negatively and then often latch onto a irreconcilable rigidity, such as our 'Concerned Parents'. If 'anti-authoritarian' means abandoning every guiding norm, then the anti-authoritarian movement leaves the coast clear for every (fascistoid) demagogue, a phenomenon we can easily observe in the so-called political 'debate on abortion'. (*Thus L. Geerts, Garlos) Castaneda : sorcerer by profession* , in Streven, 41;6 (March 1974), 577/578).

Leninism is Marxism, but interpreted militarily. Wage earners want a redistribution of income on a just basis, but not a materialistic-collectivist

revolution on a planetary scale. That is why Lenin (1870/1924) rethought and reforged Marxism strategically and tactically. Violence, particularly classical warfare, A(tom) - B(acteriological) - C(hemic) warfare and—that is Lenin's invention—psychological warfare (perfected by Stalin, Mao, Castro; also by Hitler), are the means! Leninism is secretly undermining the opponent in his will to defend himself! Making the people distrust their authorities by making them suspect, behold 'the' means! Chiang Kai-shek ('corrupt regime'), Salazar, Caetano (dictatorship), Diem ('corrupt', 'sold' to the USA), Nixon ('corrupt': Watergate), Thieu ('corrupt'), France (torture in Algeria), Dubcek ('revisionism'), Chile ('illegal coup'), NATO ('constant danger of war').

We do not claim that all the cases listed are spotless—there is no spotless established power, not even, and especially not, the Leninist one—: we underscore the rhetoric (the persuasion techniques that are 'anti-authoritarian', but which, as tools of manipulation, exacerbate the moral crisis in our midst).

- In a second phase, this becomes polarization ('dialectization', as Hegelian jargon puts it): antagonisms (irreconcilable oppositions) are fanned! In the church (integrists/progressives), in the army (fascist/left-wing officers), at the universities (Marxist/moderate students), in the trade unions (revolutionary/apolitical unions).

For example, it is surprising that in Catholic circles the so-called solidarist path is buried under Marxist rhetoric. No conservatism (the traditional order), no liberalism (system of competition), no Marxism (class struggle), no nationalism (ethnic and nationalistic fanaticism), no National Socialism (racism), but rather personalism (humanity as a solid community of persons) was the fundamental tenet of Catholicism as a social system. The name 'Solidarism' originated in France (1852), with Pierre Leroux as a way to oppose Marxist socialism.

The Christian social system is:

(1) a private economic system insofar as this title distinguishes it from communist socialism;

(2) a labor system that regards the working man as the principal cause of national prosperity, - frees itself from any mercantilist or physiocratic one-sidedness;

(3) a solidarist labour system based on private economic principles in contrast to the individualistic 'system of natural liberty'. Thus Beinrich Pesch, *Das christlich-soziale System der Volkswirtschaft*, at the beginning of this

century.

- "Why has our church abandoned its sense of social identity to such an extent to engage in Marxist analysis of the facts and immediately renounce itself? The solidarist message, enriched by recent insights, nevertheless still offers a nuanced and sound social doctrine, in accordance with the essence of the church. - Leonor Ossa , " Die Revolution - das ist ein Buh and ein "Free Man " , Hamburg, Furche , 1973). Dealing with Latin America, even the Council of Chalcedon, which was called Jesus both God and Man, believes it must raze to the ground in order to make social justice prevail in Latin America! Jesus is man!

Only a purely human thought of Jesus can function as a liberator of the Central and South American masses, the Fear of an invisible world, filled with uncanny powers, such as the Sacred Heart of Jesus, an arsenal of folk saints, prevents maturity (individuation) and is a remnant of the Oedipal phase and prevents Marxist analysis. - Let it be that religion In specific forms, it was and still is animistic-magical; nevertheless, the belief in the Heavenly God (Urmonotheism) lies within it, and that has always functioned as a social corrective. But the Marxist does not see this, working as he is with simplistic fundamental concepts of the history of religion.

Yes, our religious doctrine and theology have allowed religion to be snatched from them! 'Religion' is—artificially, moreover—set against 'faith': faith is secularized religion, that of belief in Heavenly God, of sacramental awareness, of an ethical code on a sacred foundation, of religion 'liberated' from ecclesiastical authority! This is passed on to our youth—not as one of the many opinions normal in our pluralistic society, but as a new truth. With all the consequences that entails: God, or the Trinity as creator, the divine plan of the world, sacred history, the Incarnation, redemption through and in resurrection, the Decalogue... all of that is "called into question". People no longer teach; they ask, "Does religion still make sense for us, the secularized?" Young people are then expected to cope with concrete tasks with those question marks. Is neurosis still far off then? Beings without identity are doomed to neurotization!

Intellectually, our religion—which has nevertheless proven its role as yeast in pagan dough for centuries—is degraded as irresponsible for the forum of modern reason (Kant, Hume); morally, it is invalidated as socially oppressive opium of (or for) the people (Marx, Kant); emotionally, it is cast out of suspicion as the infantilization of the individual (Freud).

Central to this is the contrast between 'almighty and all-knowing Supreme Being / powerless and ignorant man'. Submissiveness is the cardinal virtue: it oppresses socially, it mutilates psychologically. This is conveyed to the youth in a simplistic manner, without nuance! It is, in fact, atheism in its threefold critique! In doing so, one forgets, for example, that magic, especially black magic, created an authoritarian religion, but not the belief in the Heavenly God, the core of all religion (worthy of the name).

-When will our Catholic theologians, teachers... dare to proclaim this again and offer a refutation? Where has the religious identity of our church fled? Does our Catholic identity have no place in a pluralistic society? Does 'understanding' for 'this earth' consist of blindly accepting what those who think differently, those of different faiths, say (often without serious arguments, often not based on half-truths)?

1.6. Parenting wisdom.

Strasser defines the educational relationship as the synthesis of leading (Führen) and allowing to grow (Wachsenlassen), rooted in pre-scientific educational practice. No 'fatalism', no 'transzendental'. 'Freedom' ('transzendental' = all-encompassing), but the fusion of the two, says Herbart, defines education. That is Catholic pedagogical-andragogical identity. The educator is providing assistance (subsidiarius), says the Middle-century scholastic way of thinking; he is not a substitute for the child or the adult who... is to be nurtured. Anti-authoritarian education reminds us of the one-sided view of things by correcting our synthesis. – Or as G. Snyders , **Pédagogie progressiste**, 1971, presents it dialectically: the role of the educator, armed with the tone and examples, with the norms, with authority, with sanctions if necessary, – yes, but also with an eye for the individuality of the child, with a sense of his self-activity, his initiative, his participation and interest. Fusion of classical and new education, but no norms or authority-hostile Dionysian frenzy! – Why not address the anti-authoritarians with this elementary synthesis? In a pluralistic context, they are surely not the unique wisdom, but merely one opinion!

The criticisms of anti-authoritarian education will come to light as time advances and the establishment of anti-authoritarian education reveals to us the actual results—instead of the utopia, together with its ideology (i.e., the pseudo-scientific description)—of the ideology. Thus, one learns that a certain RC Robertiello, a psychiatrist in New York, intensely engaged with patients of about twenty years old, concludes that the failure syndrome is becoming the

striking characteristic of the products of the new (and already non-directive, indeed, permissive) upbringing. Likeable beings, sweet, uninhibited, socially adept with the opposite sex, etc.!

But, once outgrown the parental home, thrown into the harsh, cutthroat American business world or even into higher institutions, they prove remarkably defenseless: they feel powerless, doomed to failure.

- The reason, according to R., is the non-playful character of the real world for people raised in a playful manner. Not deadened, not accustomed to boundaries, they inflict wounds on the harsh 'real' life (Freud's so-called reality principle!).

- As a therapy, Dr. Robertiello emphasizes two fundamental points:

(i) the intimate, physical and human contact of the mother with the child (Native American mothers carry their children tied to their backs for up to two years; - this gives the little Native Americans security and a sense of safety, so that fear becomes practically impossible in that very earliest childhood, and immediately forms the basis of neurosis; our 'modern' mothers often leave them alone or in the hands of strangers with the consequences thereof);

(ii) from the second or third year onwards, the mother must gradually and carefully let go of her child, physically and psychologically, but in such a way that he learns to carry out the will of the mother (or father), if necessary by means of an express authoritative command and/or prohibition; this is to prevent a false, playful image of reality from growing in the immature, naive mind of the child; he must perform tasks as early as possible and, from the age of ten, learn to earn pocket money through his own work, in order to learn to have his own image during the teenage years (hairstyle, room with teenage decoration, choice of clothing, footwear but with his own (sufficient) pocket money); except for the 'right' to bad friends (especially between twelve and eighteen), Dr. R. considers the teenager incapable of resisting corruption through association with the wrong friends; (if necessary, the parent must respond with very strict measures, he says) and also to tobacco use (which must be strictly prohibited). That sounds in accordance with the educational wisdom of all ages. If the account of Robertiello's views is correct, then this is a first critique of a factual nature of anti-authoritarian education as a Dionysian democracy, as a playful democracy.

1.7. Sophistics

Particularly fascinating is the comparative study of contemporary anti-authoritarian education regarding Greek Sophistics. This movement grew out

of the great crisis of ancient Greek religion and pre-Socratic philosophy. In this regard, we refer to the Ionic concept of matter, and nominalism as Parmenides saw it. This Parmenidean nominalism entails the conviction that the inherent nature of concrete things is merely a label, a 'nomen', an agreed-upon name in relation to the mystical unity of the world. Also the Heraclitean Mobilism contributed to that crisis. It implies that everything is unstable and exhibits pure changeability. Furthermore, ancient Greek philosophy, with Democritus, features materialism and hedonism, a morality of pleasure. All these views were based on a certain skepticism, a tendency to doubt everything that is higher and sacred and that which the ancient tradition had known for centuries. This skeptical attitude bears a striking resemblance to what has developed among us from the Enlightenment of the 17th and 18th centuries to the present day.

Opposed to them stood the Pythagoreans, Socrates (albeit hesitantly and half-heartedly), Aristotle, the Stoics (also hesitantly and half-heartedly), the late antique theosophies (Neo-Pythagorean, Neo-Platonic but then pantheistic); the Church also took a position against skepticism, but Biblical (Yahweh and Trinity belief, respectively). On that basis grew Patristics, and later Scholasticism.

The post-conciliar crisis can be sketched as a subtle sophistication of Catholicism. Will the Church overcome the crisis now as well? Stat sacrum, dum volvitur orbis : the sacred stands, the world perishes!

A. T'Jampens
1970