

***1. Introduction to a thorough discussion of anti-authoritarian education (a.a.e.). (+/- 1970); (11 p.).***

Education is an ambiguous word: some understand it this way, others this way. We assume here the intuitive understanding, which can be outlined as transmission of culture as a means of formation, 'Authoritarian' has a color of mind: inflexible authority, let us say. 'Antiauthoritarian' is then the refusal to undergo such a thing, indeed to engage in it oneself. So much for the general meanings.

Now the specific meanings, which add to the previous well-defined contents. How to summarize them ?

- 'Antiauthoritarian parenting' is, by means of an education that fosters self-determination (i.e., determining oneself by means of oneself: so that it should actually read 'self-determining oneself' ('self' is the first time subject, the second time direct object)), to get rid of excess dominion.

- The whole question now is: what does one understand by "self-self-determination" and "excess 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 (living together if necessary) 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 (N.K. Kroepkaya, A.S. Makarenko, who advocated 'communes', colonies for neglected children), the Israeli kibbutz (Eastern European tinged), the Summerhill school (A.S. Neill: direct democracy at school). 'Student movement(s)' means movement, carried by (high) students, expressing itself in contestation (contestation by means of protest actions following university and school but also non-university and non-school bottlenecks (educational reform, international politics), carried by a sub- and anti-cultural refusal ('the great refusal' of the established society and the 'Herrschaft', the (surplus) rule, which reigns in it, all this on a global level.

'Subculture': a part of a comprehensive culture; 'anti-culture': a part of a (super)culture that stands up to established culture. 'Underground,' Beat, Hippie, New Left.

Around 1955 the student movement sets in; around 1965 the spectacular phase begins (especially 1968); from 1970 the dispersal phase follows.

The new left constitutes the ideology, i.e. the doctrine that binds the group as such and which is neo-Marxist (especially the Frankfurt School) Rousseau, Kant, Feuerbach, the left-Hegelians, Marx, Freüd, Heidegger, - these are the inspirers of the thought movement. Herbert Marcuse, Max Horkheimer, Erich Fromm, Theodor Adorno especially are the theorists. For them Marxism counts as the outgrowth of the

Enlightenment (Locke, Hume: Eng.; Voltaire, Rousseau: Fr.; Wolff, Kant: Dt; in England rather scientific, in France rather social-revolutionary, in Germany rather profoundly-speculative): the emancipated man who emancipates himself from dogmatism, surplus authority, suffering from guilt, is central.

Marxism is the fusion of English economics and French socialism, but German-philosophically underpinned, namely on a dialectical basis. 'Dialectics' here is a conception of reality and humanity which places genesis and development at the center but in such a way that (no planning providence but) an indeterminate self-realizing power (with Hegel 'god', with Marx 'matter' controls that movement, in speech-against-and dialogue form.

- Neomarxism also engages in cultural criticism, social (depth) psychology - applying Freud's psychoanalysis socialistically - and is rather anarchist in outlook.

Berlin 1968: "the Aktionsrat zur Befreiung der Frau" decides to use vacant stores (drawers, läden) for child-rearing communities. Behold the formal beginning of the a.a.o. Since then, a.a.o. has become a word of success. Result: ambiguity! This ambiguity can be summarized in two catchwords: the non-directive purport, the permissive purport.

*Claartje Hülsenbäck, Jan Louman, Anton Oskamp, Het rode boekje voor scholieren, (The red booklet for schoolchildren )Utrecht/ Antwerp, Bruna, 1970, is typical on many a "page for the permissive view, with 'permission(s)', permissions, for much more than the archaic, law-abiding, tradition-bound societies allowed: action, sex (solo, duo; gay hetero, bi-sex!), stimulants (drug use), conscientious objection and/or protest service, Dolle Mina ("Boss in your own bellies 'ladies!'), are on the program.*

E.g., "There must be condom vending machines at school. " (97). "If the school doesn't want that, one of you can 'start' a store in that sort of thing." (97) Or still, "In our society little children get little chance to play sex games with each other" (91)! The "concept of action" includes precisely "sex, drug use, conscientious objection, Dolle-Minaship. All this is justified by pointing to money (sigh), 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: principal, principal, teachers; work; boss, chief, director; old age; doctors, staffers, caregivers) and silencers' (at home: children; school: students; work: employees; old" day: elderly). This (simplistic, yet written in black and white) dichotomy defines "authority," "rule" .

Non-directive purport is found, at the andragogical level, e.g., in the so-called training groups (T-groups); the Freudian (1895) free run, allowed to thoughts, representations, feelings, etc., is conceived by Kurt Lewin (1946) group-wise and soon practiced both verbally (by speaking freely) and non-verbally (acting), sometimes meant

industrially-commercially (in enterprises), the other time playfully ('encounter'-growth groups).

All this is accounted for by the following thesis: the "authenticity" (that something, a feeling e.g., is really (authentically) "mine" ("Je.meinig.keit," Heidegger would say) that something is your meines)) is diminished, indeed, killed, by self-control based on moral rules of conduct, and mutilated into hypocrisy.

The Apollonian ideal of self-control is here replaced by the Dionysian indulgence,- to use Friedrich Nietzsche's word couplet. Or, with H. Marcuse: the Logos (which he understands in his way: one-sided (uni- or one-dimensional) emphasis on achievement, efficiency, rational order) replaced by the Eros (understood as spontaneous life, creativity, society, self-indulgence). One can see that the 'rationalism/romanticism' duality is at work here. In the end, there is not so much difference between permissives and non-directives. The transitions are fluid. Both strands challenge archaic and classical morality. 'Morality.' is always distorted into hypocrisy ('One preaches what one oneself does not think'); One performs, consciously, what one, un(der)consciously does not think'. By taking this caricaturing of (established) morality - there is really no other than an established one, unless the utopian one! - as a starting point, one takes up a tactically (=rhetorically) strong position that can work as demagogy, especially with young people and also with uprooted adults who seek a 'footing' and languish in high-industrial society and its 'rule'. These caricatures, which apparently contain a dose of truth (and then a nevralgic one), have made even many teachers, authority figures, priests insecure.

Anti-authoritarian education is "socialist" somewhere. "Socialism" is a success word and thus ambiguous. But let us choose one classification, however improvable: 'Socialism' (= collectivism) is an economic system with two goals

(i) the 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 should come into the hands of some 'community' (production and distribution, be taken out of the so-called ' free -market economy' and become 'command economy').

Communism goes further: apart from the means of production (see (i) above, all goods are indiscriminately communalized ("socialized") according to their possession and use while their management falls into the hands of some community.

So socialism is moderate communism or communism is radical socialism. This is why the terms are so easily confused, especially among people who do not think strictly logically. We have just said, "in the hands of some community." Indeed, there are variations there: after all, what is "community"? That word, too, is ambiguous. Behold a classification:

a/ Marxism ("Sozialdemokratie," "scientific socialism" are two other names) understands by "community" the society, of citizens of the state at the head of which is a democratically elected government (so-called political democracy will disappear with

time and give way to economic and social democracy);

**b/** state socialism (étatisme) understands by "community" the classical (political) state; thus, it wants to remain a political democracy; the second point, command economy, is on the program; the first point, transfer of property to "community" does not belong in principle to state socialism; conclusion: facilitation (socialization) is understood here;

- a variant at the time was agrarian or field socialism, which goes a little further, i.e. by wanting to understand soil and land ownership;

- state socialism is basically a reduced or partial socialism in that it only states point (ii) managed economy, substantially;

**c/** anarchism understands by "community" not the society of "Citizens" (social democracy or Marxism), nor the state government (state Soc.), but workers' groups, in principle independent of society and state, established either territorially (e.g. communal) or economically (e.g. the corporate population):

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

***Decision of this ambiguity:***

'community' is either society the super- or overarching collection of citizens; hence socialization) or state (understandings) or labor group(s) (grouping, unionization).

The anti-authoritarians reject both the feudal system (large landowners control property and so-called free market and the capitalist system (the mainly industrial bourgeoisie dominates property and free market also in the neo-capitalist form, characterized by accumulation of capital and power in trusts, multinationals etc. and by state intervention for their benefit) and the fascist system (parliamentless) army-backed one party domination concomitant with both feudalism and capitalism). Hence Eastern European communist is detested because of Stalinist terror of one party and its dictatorship and dogmatism, as much as USA and Euromarket 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 there is in fact nowhere a truly socialist society, but only fragments, whether or not fascized (by communism) - by the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, and with great disadvantages under 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 itself in the USA (because there they want to get rid of the disadvantages of economic (and social and political) freedom, which, for the time being, always benefits the strongest and the smartest, not by destroying that freedom itself (which the totalitarians of the left and the right always advocate), but by sanitizing

it, in its effects and consequences); in Europe, however, gauchism was practically immediately absorbed by Trotskyism, Stalinism and Maoism.

- Amada e.g. is Maoist (Kris Merckx, especially the ideologue Ludo Hartens). Bringing the masses to communism is the task, by, among the workers, with the workers, preparing and partially realizing the revolution (and only the revolution, and conceiving it violently) as the only means of eliminating (neo)capitalism, fascism and Russian Stalinism. Albania and China are the examples par excellence. These are not imperialist countries (superpowers) like the Soviet Union where, through the concentration of power on economics, capitalism was restored,-with the oppression inward and aggression outward as consequences. A socialist regime based on general arming of the working class,-this is the goal. The hard lesson of history is that violence and only violence, but socialist justified violence, is the weapon in the liberation from oppression by the small grip exploiters of big capital. Mao says that, to build a nonviolent planetary society, only violence is effective, in that capital will not give way except for violence. Gangs, private militias, intimidation, - all these are justified as means to the great end.

- One knows the doctors' collective at Hoboken (Merckx, Leyers), a cell of Maoism. Cf. Clarté. Leyers did not stick it out in that he took Marxism as mere intellectual perfection of himself (theory!), not as revolutionary praxis (with all its sacrifices).

- Regarding communes, reference should be made to *J.van Ussel, inl., Het Communeboek*, Utrecht/Antwerp, 1970. "Why do so many communes disappear? In part for the same reason as why marriages fail: poor preparation, people living together who have too many problems to be suitable for more or less harmonious cohabitation with others, lack of partner agreement and expectations that are too high. Also noticeable in some communes is the same as in marriages, namely, sinking 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 preliminary stages, the introduction, the agreement to marry together, the engagement and the solemn beginning. This forces those involved to think about what they are undertaking. Also, with 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 morass of other-worldly ideal representations.(...) However, we do know that communes with a religious affiliation function better than communes based on political and economic ideals. It is also noteworthy that communes with a clear leader type fared well after the non-follower members fell away and as long as the leader held office. On the other hand, all communes with a leader ceased to exist once this figure disappeared."(p. 26/27)

- With us, students go to live in commune to reduce loneliness and longevity. Graduates and working people also do it for similar reasons and also to accomplish division of labor (babysitting, school tutoring, environmental maintenance repair work).

Geographically they did move: from larger cities to smaller ones, political, religious motives come to complement the previous motives. One thinks of so-called revivalism (revival movement) as the Jesus Youth, Pentecostal Christians (Catholic version:

charismatic movement). Monastic revivalists also want to go this way (because the traditional monastery is waning).

- Aristotle says (Eth. Nik.: 6) that men seek not the good in itself but the realizable good ("prakton agathön"). Even Plato realized that his Platonopolis remained a utopia without the real conditions of realization. Do we apply this ancient wisdom to today's commune-rage: 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 not be viable, realizable any more than all that existed before as a form of society. Well, Dionysian life is by definition conscience-free and authority-free life. Will the Dionysian democrat make it true to properly establish community non-directively, yes, permissively? We wait and see! Defining the commune as a living community without formal authority is like utopia; realizing it is something else.

### ***The couple authoritarian/submissive.***

- Central, of course, in a.a.o. is this systechny! Prejudiced appreciation of dominion, authority, power, strength; simplistic understanding that white-black divides humanity into good and bad, self-aggrandizement and contempt of others who are different; above all, division of humanity into strong (who are good) and weak (who are bad) on the social ladder (upper, lower), - behold the authoritarian personality! Perpetual readiness to attack the weak, competitive will, strict sense of order, traditionalism, conventionalism, punitive will toward those who are different, - these are some further traits.

- Authoritarian upbringing breeds the neurotic triad, Caruso said, of fear, attack drive and guilt,

- Certainly neurosis is threefold: neurasthenia, which stands or falls with the (un)derconscious awareness that one should play a role that is beyond one's strengths, indeed, exhausts them (fatigue, exhaustion neurosis).

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

(i) the psychasthenia, which revolves around a role that one cannot take on, does not dare to take on, does not want to take on, on the grounds of doubting oneself about one's own right to play that role (insecurity, anxiety-fatigue, authority neurosis, which alternates between exaggerated fears of conscience and rebellion against conscience rules and authority figures);

(ii) the hysteria, which revolves around the high, too high role that one cannot take on, does not dare to take on, but which one nevertheless plays through substitution acts that pretend that one can take on the role, dare to take on the role: hence the many spurious, theatrical, sought-after extravagant happenings that hysterics deliver to their environment, out of need for attention and affection.

**Conclusion:** the second, the psychasthenic neurosis, creates the submissive man in his derangement. The anti-authoritarians claim that

(i) familialism (with its paternalism or over-fathering and mothering tendencies) and

(ii) capitalism (with its need for trained, purely functional role men who perform what is dictated) breeding neurosis. Hence their rush against family and business as the



establishment conceives them. And against the school that is paternalist-capitalist structured: that school breeds only weak, yes, psychasthenic personalities, crammed with fear(vallity), guilt, attack drive, -in a word "subjects"<sup>1</sup> .

**- *Marxism and authoritarianism.***

The fusion of Freudian Dionysics, living rule-less and authority-less, non-directive and permissive communes, with Marxist dialectics is a problem: are water and fire fusionable ? *Fr. Stark, Herbert Marcusc/ 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, even more than other people, should know about his ignorance. For he has taken on a heavy responsibility!'" (...)

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

But I accuse modern revolutionary Marxists of putting on great speeches and looking to impress us with few ideas and many words. Nothing is so alien to them as intellectual modesty. They are therefore not apprenticed to Socrates', nor to Kant, but to Hegel." Thus Karl Popper, the critical rationalist, who claims that even the natural sciences (with its tremendous successes) consist not of firm and certain knowledge but of bold hypotheses (o.c. 35).

In other words, our Marxists are mostly eloquent, ideologues, but very little scientific in the critical sense of that word. That is precisely why they are so successful with the mostly uncritical masses.

- Marxist self-confidence has struck big breaches in the Catholic, post-conciliar middle, among priests, intellectuals, religious teachers, etc.: the Church has come to feel insecure, "searching Church," "on the road"! This is modesty, but also weakness! Our Catholic community is no longer capable of taking a stand! Everywhere there are plural tendencies, doubt about one's own identity, about one's role and vocation in this shaken world, discouragement, hesitation. The self-assurance of the modern secularized intellectual, including the Marxist, contrasts sharply with this Catholic doubt of identity, role and function!

- "There exists, on many levels, throughout the West, a lopsided moral crisis. Since no traditional authority can put an end to this crisis, countless people are beginning to look to other authorities. Indeed, the whole mess with 'black magic' coincides with the fashion of Zen Buddhism, of LSD 'consciousness expansion' under the guidance of Timothy Leary (...), of extreme political engagement, of anti-authoritarian education.

In the same direction, the increasing popularity of pre-existing sects, such as Jehovah's Witnesses, the anthroposophists, all Walden-like experiments of a certain duration, the Mormon Church (...). Note: this is not to say anything about the possible intrinsic value of each of these marginal groups. It is merely stated here that the marginal groups appear to provide a final hold on countless people who can no longer accept the established churches, institutions and moral authorities. It seems as if the term "anti-authoritarian" commonly used in education sums up just about all the phenomena: people are looking 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 antiauthoritarian attitude that admits that it too has only a limited vision.

One can rightly applaud this on humanist and academic-scientific grounds; but it must not be forgotten that the mass of our fellow citizens are not ready for anti-authoritarianism, that they interpret the humanist loss of face negatively, just as, e.g., in Belgium they also negatively value the loss of face of our pre-eminent moral authority, the Catholic Church, and then often lock themselves into an irreconcilable rigidity, like, e.g., our 'Troubled Parents. If "anti-authoritarian" means abandoning any guiding norm, then the anti-authoritarian movement leaves the coast clear for any (fascistoid) demagogue, a phenomenon we can easily observe in the so-called political "debate on abortion. (*Thus L. Geerts, Garlos Castaneda: magician by profession*, in Streven, 41;6 (March 1974), 577/578).

- Leninism, is Marxism, but militarily interpreted. Wage earners want redistribution of income on a just basis, but not a materialist-collectivist revolution on a planetary scale. This is why Lenin (1870/1324) reimagined and reforged Marxism strategically-tactically. Violence, especially the classical war, the A(toom)-B(acteriological)-C(hemic) war and - this is Lenin's invention - the psychological war (perfected by Stalin, Mao, Castro; also by Hitler, are the means! Leninism is secretly undermining the opponent's will to resist! To make the people distrust their authority figures by making them suspicious, behold "the" means! Chiang-Kai-Tsjek ('corrupt regime') Salazar, Caetano (dictatorship) Diem ('corrupt', 'sold' to the USA), Nixon ('corrupt': Watergate), Thieu ('corrupt'), - France (torture in Algeria), Doebeck ('revisionism'), Chile ('illegal coup'), Nato ('perpetual danger of war').

We do not claim that all the cases enumerated are blemish-free - there is no blemish-free establishment power, including and especially the Leninist one -: we underline the rhetoric (the techniques of persuasion that are "anti-authoritarian," but as tools of manipulation exacerbate the moral crisis in our midst).

- In a second phase, this becomes polarization ("dialectization" says the Hegelian jargon): antagonisms (irreconcilable oppositions) are stirred up! In the church (integrists/ progressists), in the army (fascist/ leftist officers), in the universities (Marxist/ moderate students), in the syndicates (revolutionary/ apolitical trade unions)....



- Thus, e.g., 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 nationality bigotry), no national socialism (racism), but rather personalism (mankind as a community of persons in solidarity) was the basic tenet of Catholicism as a social system. 'Solidarism' as a name originated in France (1852), by Pierre Leroux to oppose Marxist socialism).

"The Christian social system is:

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

(2) a labor system, which regards the working man as the chief cause of national prosperity, - from every mercantilist or physiocratic one-sidedness keeps itself free;

(3) a solidaristic labor system on a private economic basis as opposed to the individualistic 'system of natural freedom.' Thus Beirich Pesch, *Das christlich-soziale System der Volkswirtschaft*, at the beginning of this century.

- "Why has our Church abandoned her social identity to such an extent to engage in Marxist analysis of the facts and immediately renounce herself? The solidarist message, enriched with recent insights, still offers a nuanced and solid social doctrine, in accordance with the essence of the Church. - Leonor Ossa, "Die Revolution - das ist ein Buh und ein freier Mensch," Hamburg, Furche, 1973). Speaking of Latin America, even the Council of Chalcedon, which called Jesus both God and man, felt it had to be razed to the ground in order to establish social justice in Latin America! Jesus is man!

Only a purely human thought Jesus can act as liberator of the Central and South American popular masses, the fear of an invisible world, filled with uncanny powers, such as the Sacred Heart of Jesus, an arsenal of popular saints, prevents empowerment (individuation) and is a remnant of the Oedipal phase and prevents Marxist analysis. - Let it be that religion, in well-defined forms, was and still is animistic-magical, yet therein lies the Heavenly God belief (Urmonotheismus) and that has always worked as a social corrective. But the Marxist does not see this, working with simplistic concepts of religious history as he is.

- Yes, our religious doctrine and theology has allowed itself to be deprived of religion! 'Religion' is, artificially by the way, contrasted with 'faith': faith is secularized religion, i.e. from Heavenly God belief, from sacramental awareness, from ethical code on sacred basis, from ecclesiastical authority 'liberated' religion! This is passed on - not as one of the many, in our pluralistic society normal opinions, but - as a new truth to our youth. With all its consequences: God, resp. Trinity as creator, divine world plan, sacred history, incarnation, redemption through and in resurrection, decalogue, ..., all that is "questioned." One no longer learns; one asks "Does religion still make sense to us secularized people?" With these question marks, then, young people must cope with the concrete assignments. Is neurosis then still far? Identity-less beings are doomed to neurotization!

- Intellectually, our religion, which nonetheless - for centuries has proved its role of yeast in the pagan dough,- is decried as irresponsible for the forum of modern reason (Kant, Hume); morally, it is decried as socially oppressive opium, of (or for) the people (Marx, Kant); emotionally, it is denigrated as infantilization of the individual (Freud).

Thereby the opposition "omnipotent and omniscient Supreme Being/ impotent and ignorant man" is central. Submissiveness is the main virtue: it oppresses socially, it maims psychologically. This is, without nuance, simplistically imparted to youth! It is in fact atheism in its triple criticism! - Thereby forgetting e.g. that magic, especially black magic, has created authoritarian religion, but not the Heaven-God Faith, core part of all religion (worthy of the name)

-When are our Catholic theologians, teachers ... dare to proclaim this again and engage in refutation? Where has the religious identity of our Church flown to? Does our Catholic identity then have no place in a pluralistic society? Does "understanding" of "this earth" consist in blindly accepting what dissenters, dissenters, say (often without serious arguments, often not half-truths as a basis)?

### ***Parenting Wisdom.***

Strasser defines the parenting relationship as the synthesis of leading (Führen) and letting grow (Wachsenlassen), rooted in pre-scientific parenting praxis. No "fatalism" no "transzendental Freiheit" (transzendental' = all-encompassing), but the fusion of the two, Herbart says, defines parenting. That is Catholic peda-andragogical identity. The educator is auxiliary (subsidiarius) says the Middle Age scholastic way of thinking; he is not a substitute for the child or adult to *be educated*. The a.a.o. reminds us of the one-sided presentation of things, by correcting our synthesis. - Or as *G.Snyders, Pédagogie progressiste*, 1971, puts 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 child's individuality, with a sense for his self-activity, for his initiative, for his participation and interest. Fusion of classical and new education, but not norms of authority-hostile Dionysian intoxication! - Why not address the anti-authoritarians with this elementary synthesis? Surely, in a pluralistic context, they are not the unique wisdom, but only one opinion!

The critiques of the a.a.o. will, as time moves forward and the establishment of the a.a.o. will show us, instead of utopia, together with its ideology (i.e., its sham scientific description), the real results. Thus, one learns that a certain R. C. Robertiello, psychiatrist in New York, fiercely engaged with patients about twenty years old, has come to the conclusion that the failure syndrome is becoming the striking feature of the products of the new (and, among other things, already non-directive, yes, permissive) education. Sympathetic beings, sweet, uninhibited, contact-able toward the opposite sex, etc.!

But, once outgrown the parental home, thrown into the hard, rock-hard American business world or even at the higher institutions, they prove remarkably defenseless: they feel impotent, doomed to failure.

- The reason, says R., is the non-ludic nature of the real world for people who have been raised ludicrously. Not mortified, not accustomed to boundaries, they butt wounds to the rock-hard "real" life (Freud's so-called reality principle!).

- Dr. Robertiello emphasizes two fundamental points as therapy:

(i) the intimate, corporeal and human contact of the mother with the child (Indian mothers carry their children strapped to her back for up to two years; - this gives to the Indian children security, sense of safety, so that fear becomes practically impossible, in that very earliest childhood, and, immediately, the basis of neurosis; our "modern" mothers often leave them alone or in strange hands with the consequences);

(ii) from the second-third year, the mother must gradually and gently let go of her child, physically and psychologically, but in such a way that it learns to carry out the will of the mother (father), if necessary by explicit authoritative command, and/or prohibition; this so as not to allow a false ludic image of reality to grow in the child's immature, naive mind; it must perform tasks as early as possible and, from the age of ten, learn to earn pocket money through its own work, in order to learn, in the teenage years, to have its own image (hairstyle, room with teenage decorations, choice of clothing, footwear but of its own (sufficient) pocket money), except for the "right" to bad mates (especially between twelve and eighteen) Dr. L. C. de Vries. twelve and eighteen) Dr. R. considers the teenager incapable of resistance to spoilage by association with wrong comrades; if necessary by very severe means, the parent must respond, he says) and also to tobacco use (which must be strictly barred.) This sounds in keeping with the educational wisdom of all centuries. If the account of Robertiello's views is correct, this is a first criticism of a.o. of a business nature as democracy at its Dionysian, as ludic democracy.

### *Sofistics*

Particularly fascinating is the comparative study of current a.o. regarding Greek Sophistry. This movement, grown out of the great crisis of ancient Greek religion and pre-socratic philosophy (Ionian concept of matter, Parmenidean nominalism (= the conviction that the proper nature of concrete things is only a label (nomen, name) relative to. the mystical Unity of the world), Heraklitean mobilism (= the conviction that everything is unstable and pure changeability), Demokritean materialism and hedonism (pleasure morality), all these views as a basis of skepticism, doubtfulness, to all that is higher and sacred to all that is ancient and handed down) resembles what has grown with us from the enlightenment of the XVII-XVIII century until today.

Against this were the Pythagoreans, Socrates (although hesitant and half, Aristotle, the Stoa (also hesitant and half), the late-antique theosophies (neo-pythagor., neo-platon. but pantheistic; - also the Church took a position against skepticism, but Biblical (Yahweh, resp. Trinity faith). On this basis grew the Patristics, later the Scholastics.

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

A. T'Jampens