
“IfILoveYou.mp3”: “If I Love You...” [Joe Cocker]

[“150531fascismontheback.mp3”:]

Today’s show: “Establishing a 'safe' place to plan and express our love: places for the cultivation of soul-sufficiency... which necessarily means: helping each other get 'big' – the process of reclaiming... sharing... and expanding our original 'selves'...” (Part 7)

...these spaces can be anywhere where enough love for the project flourishes...

...and while the breakdown of the barriers between us with the infinite expansion of the electronic space... expands the possibilities for our self-/soul-sufficiency spaces... we have to do this in actual physical reality... I'm committed to that being wherever my body cleaves... i.e. wherever my love is... the importance of face-to-face... in a mutual project of soul-expansion... cannot be over-estimated...

And I have to apologize... because I've been in 'survival' mode – the amazing numbers of people helping to track me... to help with the targeting... has just astounded me... this is fascism on the back of a dollar... and I think fascism... totalitarianism... has always rode in on the back of a dollar – it's called the 'wage-work-system' – which compels the behavior you want... if you're hidden-'power'...

...and we have to start talking about it – but because I've been in this tense place of simply trying to exist – combat the swollenness and burning of my head... knees... chest... try to hang onto a smile or two... when almost everyone I see seems to want me to leave the planet... because of this I've been too self-absorbed and I've missed some things... the full extent of how much trouble I've brought to some doors – the dead piling up...

You know in the last year of my neighbor's – Mrs. Trotter's – life she said to me... questioningly... “My feet hurt...” and she looked at me as if to say, “have you ever heard of such a thing?” And then she died... and then... my feet started to hurt. I think the folks paid to do this see themselves as 'high-tech-hunters' – they go for the head, chest, legs... and feet... to make the target less mobile... easier to kill. How many since then... indirectly connected to my actions? Fascism on the back of a buck... people paid to do these things. So this is a gloomy time for me... I look in the mirror and see a deep-haggardness from no sleep... graying-hair-stress... radiation cooking me into a toxic mess... It's taken me some time to see... the full extent of the trouble I've meant... to other beings... for which... there is no recompense...

...all I can say... is that on this point I would agree with Churchill: “If you're going through Hell... keep going.” But I would add... keep unmaking it as you go.

[“150531rootsrundeep.mp3”:]

May 25, 2015... Sisters and Brothers: With the loss of our earth-given empathic-connectedness... we lose authentic relationships... which means we lose ourselves... the ultimate theft... turning us into betrayers of life... but when... our heart opens... we are given again... our original... tenderness.

When we choose 'soul-sufficiency'... we become the top of the canopy... we become the roots run deep... bringing sustenance and light... to the whole tree.

Parents: don't you want your children to be full... complete humans? Well... if they do they will be targeted... We must ask what we want for our children.

[“150531hardsoil.mp3”:]

[Today's reading: we continue our reading of the chapter "Poisonous Pedagogy" in... Alice Miller's *For Your Own Good...* – P.S.]

Recall from the opening of the chapter "Poisonous Pedagogy" in Alice Miller's *For Your Own Good...* Alice was just describing her thought process leading to her decision to write this important book... and the issues she considered most important to address... She left us thinking about the role of coercion in stunting the growth of the soul: – P.S.]

...Coercion [produces a soul with] soil too hard for anything to grow in, and the only hope at all of forcibly producing the love demanded of one as a child lies in the upbringing given one's own children, from whom one then demands love in the same merciless fashion.

For this reason, it is my intention to refrain from all moralizing. I definitely do not want to say someone ought or ought not to do this or that (for example, ought not to hate), for I consider maxims of this sort to be useless. Rather, I see it as my task to expose the roots of hatred, which only a few people seem to recognize, and to search for the explanation of why there are so few of these people.

I was giving serious thought to these questions when I came upon Katharina Rutschky's *Schwarze Padagogik (Black Pedagogy)*, a collection of excerpts from books on child-rearing, published in Germany in 1977. These texts describe all the techniques, which I refer to in this book as "poisonous pedagogy," that are used to condition a child at an early age not to become aware of what is really being done to him or her; they offer clear corroboration on a concrete level of the conjectural reconstructions I have arrived at in the long course of my analytic work. This gave me the idea of juxtaposing certain passages from this excellent but very lengthy book so that with their help readers can answer for themselves and on their own personal terms the following questions I shall be raising: How were our parents brought up? How were they permitted – even forced – to treat us? How could we, as young children, have become aware of this? How could we have treated our own children differently? Can this vicious circle ever be broken? And finally, is our guilt any less if we shut our eyes to the situation?

It may be that I am trying to attain something with these texts that either is not possible at all or is completely superfluous. For as long as you are not allowed to see something, you have no choice but to overlook it, to misunderstand it, to protect yourself against it in one way or another. But if you have already perceived it for yourself, then you don't need me to tell you about it...

[This is a version of "Socrates' Dilemma" ...

(...behind which... we'll be exploring... is: "our thought gets stuck in the question... 'what's true... what isn't?'" – and Samuel Butler deals with this question comprehensively... and children under 'class' must necessarily as well – because if nothing is what it seems... thought has nothing to which to cleave... Because we craft our souls from what we believe to be true... That being so... we are dependent on our fellows... for the quality of our souls... As Nikola said... everything that touches us... influences us. Samuel Butler puts it like this:

"A man should not only have his own way as far as possible, but he should only consort with things that are getting their own way so far that they are at any rate comfortable. [And of course here he's talking about free beings...free from any kind of compulsion... inner or outer... – P.S.] Unless for short times under exceptional circumstances, he should not even see things that have been stunted or starved, much less should he eat meat that has been vexed by having been over-driven or under-fed, or afflicted with any disease; nor should he touch vegetables that have not been well grown. For all these things cross a man; whatever a man comes in contact with in any way forms a cross with him which will leave him better or worse, and the better things he is crossed with the more likely he is to live long and happily. All things must be crossed a little or they would cease to live – but holy things, such for example as Giovanni Bellini's saints, have been crossed with nothing but what is good of its kind."

Now... I disagree with his conclusion... as 'class' stunts us all... and we can't heal this thing unless we all consort joyfully – but this requires soul-sufficiency as our goal and focus – but it's worth discussing... I'm sure we'll return to it... after giving it its due pondering...)

["150531theoryandpain.mp3":]

... "Socrates' Dilemma" ... which we learned about from Karl Popper. Recall what he said about this:

“131006socrates.mp3”: “Socrates’ Dilemma”: “This is connected with a question which seems to have puzzled Socrates a great deal: that those who are not sufficiently educated, and thus not wise enough to know their deficiencies, are just those who are in the greatest need of education. Readiness to learn in itself proves the possession of wisdom, in fact all the wisdom claimed by Socrates for himself; for he who is ready to learn knows how little he knows. The uneducated seems thus to be in need of any authority to wake him up, since he cannot be expected to be self-critical....” (from chapter 7, “The Principle of Leadership” of Karl Popper’s *The Open Society and Its Enemies: The Spell of Plato*) [I think the way out of this seeming dilemma of the ‘need – or not – for authority’... is to recognize, and to trust, the authority of the earth... its power to recapture mis-taught souls. The ‘force’ upon our minds of that which feeds us is profound... and authentic judgment rests... on being self-sufficient. – PS.] [This is an excerpt from our October 6, 2013 radio broadcast.]

The way out of the dilemma we said... was when we... hear... recognize the superior authority of... the earth... superior in the sense of carrying the weight of truth (under what circumstances do the formerly deaf begin to hear again?...) We who hear her see her superiority to that in which we’re told to believe: i.e, the authority of the state... which we are introduced to in the first place by our parents... as its representatives.

For ‘thought’ to grow... and so for there to be a possibility to see through the lies of ‘the system’ – i.e. for there to be the possibility of de-legitimization – one’s parents themselves must become questions. “Poisonous pedagogy” is in essence... Alice tells us... false information... i.e., lies... and with the hand of the state on our shoulders... its boot on our backs... we parents do tend... with the best of intentions... to lie to our children – not consciously... and not always in words... but as Alice says... with looks... inattention... and indifference.

There was a point I was trying to make last week about how we are encouraged... by the ‘power’-fed media... to think about the sadness and grief that often grips us under ‘class’ – we are encouraged to think about them as being as inherent in the human condition as the mourning of loss. But we’re talking here... about a particular kind of pain: the pain of soul-loss – a pain that cuts to the core of us... – the pain of repressed suffering... which is unconsciously touched... when we experience any grief or loss... triggering a sense... that “it’s all hopeless...”

...which is also going to come up when we meet in self-/soul-sufficiency gatherings.

In fact... I think we should sit with this for a minute... because the issues raised by the foregoing are coming up for me...

...and in terms of our organizing soul-sufficiency gatherings successfully... I think addressing them is key. We have to understand the real issues that sink us... generation after generation... not the phony ones generated by the ‘power’-constructed ‘Intellect’ to the universal acclaim of the ‘power’-fed media. In a post from September 4, 2014 of initial thoughts to our reading of the “Introduction” of *Antisystemic Movements* [see below], I argued that what was missing from the analysis and strategic thinking of the left was theory of why we obey. It seems this must be given a central place in our planning for how to make self-/soul-sufficiency gatherings ‘safe’... and so for us to be able to reach our goals.

[“150531outrage.mp3”:]

(...I don’t think its ‘sycophantic outrage’ if you’re doing everything you can to call attention to the fact that ‘coercion’ is the problem... the ‘wage-work-system’ is the problem... that this is a global issue... not the problem of one nation-state... but the nation-state system... and global-statesmen who have no allegiance except to themselves... and the world-view they all share and are working together to realize...)

[“150531prigbegotten.mp3”:]

Alice is key to our developing such a theory... but in thinking through this matter of psychic ‘safety’... let’s hear what Samuel... who pondered this question deeply... had to say about it:

I have said more than once that [Ernest] believed in his own depravity; never was there a little mortal more ready to accept without cavil whatever he was told by those who were in authority over him: he thought, at least, that he believed it, for as yet he knew nothing of that other Ernest that dwelt within him, and was so much stronger and more real than the Ernest of which he was conscious. The dumb Ernest persuaded with inarticulate feelings too swift and sure to be translated into such debatable things as words, but practically insisted as follows:

“Growing up is not the easy plain sailing business that it is commonly supposed to be: it is hard work – harder than any but a growing boy can understand; it requires attention, and you are not strong enough to attend to your bodily growth and to your lessons too. Besides, Latin and Greek are great humbug; the more people know of them the more odious they generally are; the nice people whom you delight in either never knew any at all or forgot what they had learned as soon as they could; they never turned to the classics after they were no longer forced to read them; therefore they are nonsense, all very well in their own time and country, but out of place here. Never learn anything until you find you have been made uncomfortable for a good long while by not knowing it; [Can you tell that this is a man who listened to his body... and as a result... a rich bounty came to him... not from 'the system'... but from the source into which he tapped... – P.S.] when you find that you have occasion for this or that knowledge, or foresee that you will have occasion for it shortly, the sooner you learn it the better, but till then spend your time in growing bone and muscle; these will be much more useful to you than Latin and Greek, nor will you ever be able to make them if you do not do so now, whereas Latin and Greek can be acquired at any time by those who want them.

“You are surrounded on every side by lies which would deceive even the elect, if the elect were not generally so uncommonly wide awake; the self of which you are conscious, your reasoning and reflecting self, will believe these lies and bid you act in accordance with them. This conscious self of yours, Ernest, is a prig begotten of prigs and trained in priggishness; I will not allow it to shape your actions, though it will doubtless shape your words for many a year to come. Your papa is not here to beat you now; this is a change in the conditions of your existence, and should be followed by changed actions. Obey *me*, your true self, and things will go tolerably well with you, but only listen to that outward and visible old husk of yours which is called your father, and I will rend you in pieces even unto the third and fourth generation as one who has hated God; for I, Ernest, am the God who made you.”

[“150531leadstofollow.mp3”:]

Samuel has just given us some leads to follow... as well as vivid confirmation of something we just said: that for 'thought' to grow... and so for there to be a possibility to see through the lies of 'the system'... one's parents themselves must become questions...

...and this familiar 'split'... that we feel emotionally even if it has not yet been articulated... between what our bodies say... and want to do... and the demands and dictates of 'the system'... must also become a question...

...and the source of the split... that initial trauma of discovering that our feelings don't matter... likewise.

How does this inform the design of a safe space? How do we build solidarity... mutual caring... meld our longings into mutually-reinforcing actions... unless we discuss how hidden 'power' is shaping us... keeping us unconscious through its conditioning of us... discuss the specific features of this conditioning... what circumstances prompt us to obey its dictates... and then how we resist it and turn again to our original earth-allegiance?

This is what we all want... and speaking to that longing is something we're going to be figuring out together how to do... so that we can increase the numbers of us who are willing to help expand these discussions... raise these necessary questions...

And to my One... my love... I just want to say 'thank you' for bringing it all together... and so miraculously... so unexpectedly... What a gift. Thank you.

—

[“150531children.mp3”:]

So we need Alice Miller to help us learn how best to support each other... and strengthen our planning... but not only she.

Certain books are foundational for me... meaning they are cornerstones of my reason-to-be: this book... *For Your Own Good*... is one... *The Open Society and Its Enemies*... another... – and certain novelists have been key: George Eliot and Charlotte Bronte (*Villette* particularly...) and high on this list is Samuel Butler's *The Way of All Flesh*... which provides ample illustration of how parents lie to children. Samuel Butler brings a fully awake consciousness to the problem of unmasking the system:

Theobald [the father] had never liked children. He had always got away from them as soon as he could, and so had they from him; oh, why, he was inclined to ask himself, could not children be born into the world grown up. If Christina [the mother] could have given birth to a few full-grown clergymen in priest's orders – of moderate views, but inclining rather to Evangelicalism, with comfortable livings and in all respects facsimiles of Theobald himself – why, there might have been more sense in it; or if people could buy ready-made children at a shop of whatever age and sex they liked, instead of always having to make them at home, and to begin at the beginning with them – that might do better, but as it was he did not like it...

It might have been better if Theobald in his younger days had kicked more against his father: the fact that he had not done so encouraged him to expect the most implicit obedience from his own children. He could trust himself, he said (and so did Christina), to be more lenient than perhaps his father had been to himself; his danger, he said (and so again did Christina), would be rather in the direction of being too indulgent; he must be on his guard against this, for no duty could be more important than that of teaching a child to obey its parents in all things....

[“150531women.mp3”:]

The practical outcome of the foregoing [his reading into “the wholesome authority” which should be “exercised by the head of a family over all its members...”] was a conviction in Theobald's [the father's] mind, and if in his, then in Christina's [the mother's], that it was their duty to begin training up their children in the way they should go, even from their earliest infancy. The first signs of self-will must be carefully looked for, and plucked up by the roots at once before they had time to grow. Theobald picked up this numb serpent of a metaphor and cherished it to his bosom.

[“150531splits.mp3”:]

Before Ernest could well crawl he was taught to kneel, before he could well speak he was taught to lisp the Lord's Prayer, and the general confession. How was it possible that these things could be taught too early? If his attention flagged or his memory failed him, here was an ill weed which would grow apace, unless it were plucked out immediately, and the only way to pluck it out was to whip him, or shut him up in a cupboard, or dock him of some of the small pleasures of childhood. Before he was three years old he could read and, after a fashion, write. Before he was four he was learning Latin, and could do rule of three sums.

As for the child himself [I love that... well before Alice... he was clearly distinguishing between the 'true self'... and the 'false self'... – P.S.], he was naturally of an even temper, he doted upon his nurse, on kittens and puppies, and on all things that would do him the kindness of allowing him to be fond of them. He was fond of his mother, too, but as regards his father, he has told me in later life he could remember no feeling but fear and shrinking. Christina did not remonstrate with Theobald concerning the severity of the tasks imposed upon their boy, nor yet as to the continual whippings that were found necessary at lesson times. Indeed, when during any absence of Theobald's the lessons were entrusted to her, she found to her sorrow that it was the only thing to do, and she did it no less effectually than Theobald himself, nevertheless she was fond of her boy, which Theobald never was, and it was long before she could destroy all affection for herself in the mind of her first born. But she persevered....

Truly, Mrs. Theobald loved her child according to her lights with an exceeding great fondness, but the dreams she had dreamed in her sleep were sober realities in comparison with those she indulged in while awake....

[May 31, 2015 show ends.]

[The narrator is Mr. Overton, Ernest's godfather... what follows are his observations during a visit... – P.S.]:

I was there on a Sunday and observed the rigour with which the young people were taught to observe the Sabbath; they might not cut out things, not use their paint-box on a Sunday, and this they thought rather hard, because their cousins the John Pontifexes might do these things. Their cousins might play with their toy train on Sunday, but though they had promised that they would run none but Sunday trains, all traffic had been prohibited. One treat only was allowed them – on Sunday evenings they might choose their own hymns....

Ernest was to choose the first hymn, and he chose one about some people who were to come to the sunset tree. I am no botanist, and do not know what kind of tree a sunset tree is, but the words began, “Come, come, come; come to the

sunset tree for the day is past and gone.” The tune was rather pretty and had taken Ernest's fancy, for he was unusually fond of music and had a sweet little child's voice which he liked using.

He was, however, very late in being able to sound a hard “c” or “k,” and, instead of saying “Come,” he said “Tum, tum, tum.”

“Ernest,” said Theobald, from the arm-chair in front of the fire, where he was sitting with his hands folded before him, “don't you think it would be very nice if you were to say 'come' like other people, instead of 'tum'?”

“I do say tum,” replied Ernest, meaning that he had said “come.”

Theobald was always in a bad temper on Sunday evening... I had already seen signs that evening that my host was cross, and was a little nervous at hearing Ernest say so promptly “I do say tum,” when his papa had said he did not say it as he should.

Theobald noticed the fact that he was being contradicted in a moment. He got up from his arm-chair and went to the piano.

“No, Ernest, you don't,” he said, “you say nothing of the kind, you say 'tum,' not 'come.' Now say 'come' after me, as I do.”

“Tum,” said Ernest, at once; “is that better?” I have no doubt he thought it was, but it was not.

“Now, Ernest, you are not taking pains; you are not trying as you ought to do. It is high time you learned to say 'come,' why, Joey can say 'come,' can't you, Joey?”

“Yeth, I can,” replied Joey, and he said something which was not far off “come.”

“There, Ernest, do you her that? There's no difficulty about it, nor shadow of difficulty. Now, take your own time, think about it, and say 'come' after me.”

The boy remained silent a few seconds and then said “tum” again.

I laughed, but Theobald turned to me impatiently and said, “Please do not laugh, Overton; it will make the boy think it does not matter, and it matters a great deal;” then turning to Ernest he said, “Now Ernest, I will give you one more chance, and if you don't say 'come,' I shall know that you are self-willed and naughty.”

He looked very angry, and a shade came over Ernest's face, like that which comes upon the face of a puppy when it is being scolded without understanding why. The child saw well what was coming now, was frightened, and, of course, said “tum” once more.

“Very well, Ernest,” said his father, catching him angrily by the shoulder. “I have done my best to save you, but if you will have it so, you will,” and he lugged the little wretch, crying by anticipation, out of the room. A few minutes more and we could hear screams coming from the dining-room, across the hall which separated the drawing-room from the dining-room, and knew that poor Ernest was being beaten.

“I have sent him up to bed,” said Theobald, as he returned to the drawing-room, “and now, Christina, I think we will have the servants in to prayers,” and he rang the bell for them, red-handed as he was.... (Samuel Butler, *The Way of All Flesh*)

Alice illustrates her points with lengthy excerpts from the 'child-rearing' pedagogues who set untold numbers of children up for a lifetime of abuse. What we have to keep in mind as we read (some of) this... is that the deeper abandonment... of our parents... and there's... across the generations... is the abandonment of their souls... their true selves – given over to a coerced-work system... and that as we access our repressed feelings of sadness and anger that our 'mother' was not psychically or physically there for us... we release that energy to spontaneity... and the ability to feel deeply... care... about the normalized abuse under 'class' that our Brothers and Sisters experience... here... and around the world. I'll post what I've

already typed of the excerpts Alice provides... but for the illustrations that I read out-loud during the show... I prefer Samuel's critique-infused presentation... making the same points as Alice... but more richly-painted... – P.S.]

It may be that I am trying to attain something with these texts that either is not possible at all or is completely superfluous. For as long as you are not allowed to see something, you have no choice but to overlook it, to misunderstand it, to protect yourself against it in one way or another. But if you have already perceived it for yourself, then you don't need me to tell you about it. Although this observation is correct, I still do not want to give up the attempt, for it strikes me as worthwhile, even though at the moment only a few readers may profit from these excerpts.

I believe the quotations I have chosen will reveal methods that have been used to train children not to become aware of what was being done to them – not only “certain children” but more or less *all* of us (and our parents and forebears). I use the word *reveal* here although there was nothing secretive about these writings; they were widely distributed and went through numerous editions. We of the present generation can learn something from them that concerns us personally and was still hidden from our parents. Reading them, we may have the feeling of getting to the bottom of a mystery, of discovering something new but at the same time familiar that until now has simultaneously clouded and determined our lives. This was my own experience when I read Rutschky's book about the phenomenon of “poisonous pedagogy,” Suddenly I became more keenly aware of its many traces in psychoanalytic theories, in politics, and in the countless compulsions of everyday life.

Those concerned with raising children have always had great trouble dealing with “obstinacy,” willfulness, defiance, and the exuberant character of children's emotions. They are repeatedly reminded that they cannot begin to teach obedience too soon. The following passage by J. Sulzer, written in 1748, will serve as an illustration of this:

As far as willfulness is concerned, this expresses itself as a natural recourse in tenderest childhood as soon as children are able to make their desire for something known by means of gestures. They see something they want but cannot have, they become angry, cry, and flail about. Or they are given something that does not please them; they fling it aside and begin to cry. These are dangerous faults that hinder their entire education and encourage undesirable qualities in children. If willfulness and wickedness are not driven out, it is impossible to give a child a good education. The moment these flaws appear in a child, it is high time to resist this evil so that it does not become ingrained through habit and the children do not become thoroughly depraved.

Therefore, I advise all those whose concern is the education of children to make it their main occupation to drive out willfulness and wickedness and to persist until they have reached their goal. As I have remarked above, it is impossible to reason with young children; thus, willfulness must be driven out in a methodical manner, and there is no other recourse for this purpose than to show children one is serious. If one gives in to their willfulness once, the second time it will be more pronounced and more difficult to drive out. Once children have learned that anger and tears will win them their own way, they will not fail to use the same methods again. They will finally become the masters of their parents and of their nursemaids and will have a bad, willful, and unbearable disposition with which they will trouble and torment their parents ever after as the well-earned reward for the “good” upbringing they were given. But if parents are fortunate enough to drive out willfulness from the very beginning by means of scolding and the rod, they will have obedient, docile, and good children whom they can later provide with a good education. If a good basis for education is to be established, then one must not cease toiling until one sees that all willfulness is gone, for there is absolutely no place for it. Let no one make the mistake of thinking he will be able to obtain any good results before he has eliminated these two major faults. He will toil in vain. This is where the foundation first must be laid.

These, then, are the two most important matters one must attend to in the child's first year. When he is over a year old, and is beginning to understand and speak somewhat, one must concentrate on other things as well, yet always with the understanding that willfulness must be the main target of all our toils until it is completely abolished. It is always our main purpose to make children into righteous, virtuous persons, and parents should be ever mindful of this when they regard their children so that they will miss no opportunity to labor over them. They must also keep very fresh in their minds the outline or image of a mind disposed to virtue, as described above, so that they know what is to be undertaken. The first and foremost matter to be attended to is implanting in children a love of order; this is the first step we require in the way of virtue. In the first three years, however, this – like all things one undertakes with children – can come about only in a quite mechanical way. Everything must follow the rules of orderliness. Food and drink, clothing, sleep, and indeed the child's entire little household must be orderly and must never be altered in the least to accommodate their willfulness or whims so that they may learn in earliest childhood to submit strictly to the rules of orderliness. The order one insists upon has an indisputable influence on

their minds, and if children become accustomed to orderliness at a very early age, they will suppose thereafter that this is completely natural because they no longer realize that it has been artfully instilled in them. If, out of indulgence, one alters the order of the child's little household as often as his whim shall dictate, then he will come to think that orderliness is not of great importance but must always yield to our whim. Such a false assumption would cause widespread damage to the moral life, as may easily be deduced from what I have said above about order. When children are of an age to be reasoned with, one must take every opportunity to present order to them as something sacred and inviolable. If they want to have something that offends against order, then one should say to them: my dear child, this is impossible; this offends against order, which must never be breached, and so on...

The second major matter to which one must dedicate oneself beginning with the second and third year is a strict obedience to parents and superiors and a trusting acceptance of all they do. These qualities are not only absolutely necessary for the success of the child's education, but they have a very strong influence on education in general. They are so essential because they impart to the mind orderliness per se and a spirit of submission to the laws. A child who is used to obeying his parents will also willingly submit to the laws and rules of reason once he is on his own and his own master, since he is already accustomed not to act in accordance with his own will. Obedience is so important that all education is actually nothing other than learning how to obey. It is a generally recognized principle that persons of high estate who are destined to rule whole nations must learn the art of governance by way of first learning obedience. *Qui nescit obedire, nescit imperare*: the reason for this is that obedience teaches a person to be zealous in observing the law, which is the first quality of a ruler. Thus, after one has driven out willfulness as a result of one's first labors with children, the chief goal of one's further labors must be obedience. It is not very easy, however, to implant obedience in children. It is quite natural for the child's soul to want to have a will of its own, and things that are not done correctly in the first two years will be difficult to rectify thereafter. One of the advantages of these early years is that then force and compulsion can be used. Over the years, children forget everything that happened to them in early childhood. If their wills can be broken at this time, they will never remember afterwards that they had a will, and for this very reason the severity that is required will not have any serious consequences.

Just as soon as children develop awareness, it is essential to demonstrate to them by word and deed that they must submit to the will of their parents. Obedience requires children to (1) willingly do as they are told, (2) willingly refrain from doing what is forbidden, and (3) accept the rules made for their sake. [J. Sulzer, *Versuch von der Erziehung und Unterweisung der Kinder* (An Essay on the Education and Instruction of Children), 1748, quoted in Rutschky]

It is astonishing that this pedagogue had so much psychological insight over two hundred years ago. It is in fact true that over the years children forget everything that happened to them in early childhood; "they will never remember afterwards that they had a will" – to be sure. But, unfortunately, the rest of the sentence, "the severity that is required will not have any serious consequences," is *not* true.

The opposite is the case: throughout their professional lives, lawyers, politicians, psychiatrists, physicians, and prison guards must deal with these serious consequences, usually without knowing their cause. The psychoanalytical process takes years to work its cautious way back to the roots of the trouble, but when successful, it does in fact bring release from symptoms.

Lay persons repeatedly raise the objection that there are people who had a demonstrably difficult childhood without becoming neurotic, whereas others, who grew up in apparently favorable circumstances, become mentally ill. This is supposed to be proof of an innate predisposition and thus a refutation of the importance of parental influence.

The Sulzer passage helps us to understand how this error can (and is meant to?) arise on all levels of society. Neuroses and psychoses are not direct consequences of actual frustrations but the expression of repressed traumata. If primary emphasis is placed upon raising children so that they are not aware of what is being done to them or what is being taken from them, of what they are losing in the process, of who they otherwise would have been and who they actually are, and if this is begun early enough, then as adults, regardless of their intelligence, they will later look upon the will of another person as if it were their own. How can they know that their own will was broken since they were never allowed to express it? Yet something one is not aware of can still make one ill. If, on the other hand, children experience hunger, air raids, and the loss of their home, for instance, but in such a way that they feel they are being taken seriously and respected as individuals by their parents, then they will not become ill as a result of these actual traumata. There is even a chance for them to remember these experiences (because they have had the support of devoted attachment figures) and thus enrich their inner world.

The next passage, by J.G. Kruger, reveals why it was (and still is) so important to pedagogues to combat "obstinacy" vigorously:

It is my view that one should never strike children for offenses they commit out of weakness. The only vice deserving of blows is obstinacy. It is therefore wrong to strike children at their lessons, it is wrong to strike them for falling down, it is wrong to strike them for crying; but it is right and proper to strike them for all of these transgressions and for even more trivial ones if they have committed them out of wickedness. If your son does not want to learn because it is your will, if he cries with the intent of defying you, if he does harm in order to offend you, in short, if he insists on having his own way:

Then whip him well till he cries so:
Oh no, Papa, oh no!

Such disobedience amounts to a declaration of war against you. Your son is trying to usurp your authority, and you are justified in answering force with force in order to insure his respect, without which you will be unable to train him. The blows you administer should not be merely playful ones but should convince him that you are his master. Therefore, you must not desist until he does what he previously refused out of wickedness to do. If you do not pay heed to this, you will have engaged him in a battle that will cause his wicked heart to swell with triumph and him to make the firm resolve to continue disregarding your blows so that he need not submit to his parents' domination. If, however, he has seen that he is vanquished the first time and has been obliged to humble himself before you, this will rob him of his courage to rebel anew. But you must pay especial heed that in chastising him you not allow yourself to be overcome with anger. For the child will be sharp-witted enough to perceive your weakness and regard as a result of anger what he should deem a meting out of justice. If you are unable to practice moderation in this regard, then yield the execution of the chastisement to another, but be sure to impress upon the person not to desist until the child has fulfilled his father's will and comes to beg you for forgiveness. You should not withhold your forgiveness entirely, as Locke justly observes, but should make it somewhat difficult of attainment and not show your complete approbation again until he has made good his previous transgression by total obedience and has proven that he is determined to be a faithful subject of his parents. If children are educated with befitting prudence at a young age, then surely it will very rarely be necessary to resort to such forceful measures; this can hardly be avoided, however, if one takes children in to be reared after they have already developed a will of their own. But sometimes, especially when they are of a proud nature, one can, even in the case of serious transgressions, dispense with beatings if one makes them, for example, go barefoot and hungry and serve at table or otherwise inflicts pain upon them where it hurts. [*Gedanken von der Erziehung der Kinder (Some Thoughts on the Education of Children)*, 1752, quoted in Rutschky]

Here, everything is still stated openly; in modern books on child-rearing the authors carefully mask their emphasis on the importance of gaining control over the child. Over the years a sophisticated repertory of arguments was developed to prove the necessity of corporal punishment for the child's own good. In the eighteenth century, however, one still spoke freely of "usurping authority," of "faithful subjects," etc., and this language reveals the sad truth, which unfortunately still holds today. For parents' motives are the same today as they were then: in beating their children, they are struggling to regain the power they once lost to their own parents. For the first time, they see the vulnerability of their own earliest years, which they are unable to recall, reflected in their children (cf. Sulzer). Only now, when someone weaker than they is involved, do they finally fight back, often quite fiercely. There are countless rationalizations, still used today, to justify their behavior. Although parents *always* mistreat their children for psychological reasons, i.e., because of their own needs, there is a basic assumption in our society that this treatment is good for children. Last but not least, the pains that are taken to defend this line of reasoning betray its dubious nature. The arguments used contradict every psychological insight we have gained, yet they are passed on from generation to generation.

There must be an explanation for this that has deep emotional roots in all of us [under 'class'... – P.S.]. It is unlikely that someone could proclaim "truths" that are counter to physical laws for very long (for example, that it is healthy for children to run around in bathing suits in winter and in fur coats in summer) without appearing ridiculous. But it is perfectly normal to speak of the necessity of striking and humiliating children and robbing them of their autonomy, at the same time using such high-sounding words as *chastising*, *upbringing*, and *guiding onto the right path*. The excerpts from *Schwarze Padagogik* which follow indicate how much a parent's hidden, unrecognized needs stand to profit from such an ideology. This also explains the great resistance to accepting and integrating the indisputable body of knowledge about psychological principles that has been built up in recent decades.

There are many good books available describing the harmful and cruel aspects of traditional methods of child-rearing (by Ekkehard von Braunmühl, Lloyd de Mause, Katharina Rutschky, Morton Schatzman, and Katharina Zimmer, to mention a few). Why has all this information brought about so little change in the attitudes of the public at large? [But add the fact that 'power' acts clandestinely to maintain this way of things... that 'all' (for them...) depends on capturing and controlling human energy... on convincing us that we are 'workers'... and the puzzle is solved... – P.S.] I used to try to address the numerous individual reasons for problems resulting from child-rearing, but I now believe that there is a universal [to 'class'... – P.S.] psychological phenomenon

involved here that must be brought to light: namely the way the adult [under 'class'... – P.S.] exercises power over the child, a use of power that can go undetected and unpunished like no other. Seen superficially, it is not in the best interest of any of us to expose this universal mechanism, for who is willing to relinquish either the opportunity to discharge pent-up affect or the rationalizations that enable us to keep a clear conscience? Nevertheless, making these undercurrents of our behavior known is crucial for the sake of future generations. The easier it becomes by means of technology to destroy human life with the touch of a button, the more important it is for the public to understand how it can be possible for someone to want to extinguish the lives of millions of human beings. Beatings, which are only one form of mistreatment, are *always* degrading, because the child not only is unable to defend him- or herself but is also supposed to show gratitude and respect to the parents in return. And along with corporal punishment there is a whole gamut of ingenious measures applied “for the child's own good” which are difficult for a child to comprehend and which for that very reason often have devastating effects in later life. What is our reaction, for example, when we, as adults, try to empathize with the child raised according to the methods recommended by Villaume:

If a child is caught in the act, then it isn't difficult to coax a confession from him. It would be very easy to say to him, so-and-so saw you do this or that. I prefer to take a detour, however, and there are a variety of them.

You have questioned the child about his peaked appearance. You have even gotten him to confess to certain aches and pains that you describe to him. I would then continue:

“You see, my child, that I am aware of your present ailments; I have even enumerated them. You see, then, that I know about your condition. I know even more: I know how you are going to suffer in the future, and I'll tell you about it. Listen. Your face will shrivel, your hair will turn brown; your hands will tremble, your face will be covered with pustules; your eyes will grow dim, your memory weak, your brain dull. You will lose all your good spirits, you won't be able to sleep, and you'll lose your appetite, etc.”

It is hard to find a child who will not be dismayed by this. To continue:

“Now I am going to tell you something else. Pay attention! Do you know what the cause of all your suffering is? You may not know, but I do. You have brought it on yourself! – I am going to tell you what it is you do in secret...”

A child would have to be extremely obdurate if he did not make a tearful confession.

Here is another path to the truth! I am taking this passage from the *Pedagogical Discourses*:

I called Heinrich to me... [...much later in this agonizing interchange... – P.S.] “Heinrich, there must be another reason; your face betrays it. You are becoming more upset. Be honest, Heinrich; by being honest, you make yourself pleasing in the sight of God, our Heavenly Father, and all men.”

H: “Oh, dear – ” (He began to cry loudly and was so pitiable that tears came to my own eyes – he perceived this, grasped my hand, and kissed it passionately.)

“Well, Heinrich, why are you crying?”

H: “Oh, dear.”

“Shall I spare you your confusion? Is it not true that you have done what that unfortunate lad did?”

H: “Oh, dear! Yes.”

This second method is perhaps preferable to the first if one is dealing with children of a gentle, sensitive character. There is something severe about the first one in the way it almost assaults the child. [1787, quoted in Rutschky]

Feelings of resentment and rage over this devious form of manipulation cannot surface in the child here because he does not see through the subterfuge. At the most, he will experience feelings of anxiety, shame, insecurity, and helplessness, which may soon be forgotten, especially when the child finds a victim of his own. Villaume, like other pedagogues, takes pains that his methods remain undetected:

One must observe the child closely but in such a way that he does not notice, otherwise he will be secretive and suspicious, and there will be no way of reaching him. Since a sense of shame will always impel the child to try to conceal this sin, we are not dealing with an easy matter here....

The conscious use of humiliation (whose function is to satisfy the *parents'* needs) destroys the child's self-confidence, making him or her insecure and inhibited; nevertheless, this approach is considered beneficial:

It goes without saying that pedagogues themselves not infrequently awaken and help to swell a child's conceit by foolishly emphasizing his merits, since they are often merely large children themselves and are filled with the same conceit.... It is then important to eliminate this conceit.... Hold up to a talented lad the examples of living or historical figures who possess far more splendid talent than his and who have used their talent to accomplish admirable deeds; or hold up as examples those lacking in any especially brilliant mental powers who have nevertheless achieved far more by means of a sustained iron discipline than has a frivolous talent – here too, of course, without explicit reference to your charge, who will of his own accord make the comparison privately. Finally, it will be useful to call to mind the dubious and transitory nature of merely material things by occasionally pointing out appropriate illustrations of this: the sight of a youthful corpse or the report of the collapse of a commercial house has a more humbling effect than often repeated warnings and censure. [K.G. Hergang, ed., *Padagogische Realenzyklopadie (Encyclopedia of Pedagogy)*, 1851, quoted in Rutschky]

Feigning friendliness helps even more to conceal this type of cruel treatment:

When I once asked a schoolmaster how he had been able to bring it about that the children obeyed him without being whipped, he replied: I attempt to persuade my pupils by my entire demeanor that I mean well by them, and I demonstrate to them through example and illustration that it is to their disadvantage if they do not obey me. Further, I reward the one who is the most amendable, the most obedient, the most diligent in his lessons by preferring him over the others... [...these are tactics as old as 'class' itself... as we saw in our reading of Xenophon... applied in that instance to 'slaves' and 'laborers'... – P.S.]

[Continuing:] Feigning friendliness helps even more to conceal this type of cruel treatment:

When I once asked a schoolmaster how he had been able to bring it about that the children obeyed him without being whipped, he replied: I attempt to persuade my pupils by my entire demeanor that I mean well by them, and I demonstrate to them through example and illustration that it is to their disadvantage if they do not obey me. Further, I reward the one who is the most amendable, the most obedient, the most diligent in his lessons by preferring him over the others; I call on him the most, I permit him to read his composition before the class, I let him do the necessary writing on the blackboard. This way I awaken the children's zeal so that each wishes to excel, to be preferred. When one of them then upon occasion does something that deserves punishment, I reduce his status in the class, I don't call on him, I don't let him read aloud, I act as though he were not there. This distresses the children so much that those who are punished weep copious tears. If there is upon occasion someone who cannot be educated by such gentle means, then, to be sure, I must whip him, however, for the execution thereof I first make such lengthy preparations that he is more affected by them than by the lashes themselves. I do not whip him at that moment when he earns the punishment but postpone it until the following day or the day thereafter. This provides me with two advantages: first, my blood cools down in the meantime, and I have leisure to consider how best to go about the matter; later, the little delinquent will feel the punishment tenfold more sharply because he has had to devote constant thought to it.

When the day of reckoning arrives, directly after the morning prayer I make a pathetic address to all the children and tell them this is a very sad day for me since the disobedience of one of my dear pupils has imposed on me the necessity of whipping him. The tears begin to flow, not only his who is to be chastised but also those of his fellow pupils. After this lecture is over, I bid the children be seated and I begin the lesson. Not until school is over do I have the little sinner step forward; I then pronounce my verdict and ask him if he knows what he has done to deserve it. After he has given a proper answer, I administer the lashes in the presence of all the children, turn then to the spectators and tell them it is my heartfelt desire that this may be the last time I am constrained to whip a child. [C. G. Salzman (1796), quoted in Rutschky]

For purposes of self-protection, it is only the adult's friendly manner that remains in the child's memory, accompanied by a predictable submissiveness on the part of “the little transgressor” and the loss of his capacity for spontaneous feeling:

Fortunate are those parents and teachers who have educated their children so wisely that their counsel is as forceful as a command, that they seldom have cause to mete out an actual punishment, and that even in these few cases such methods as

withdrawing certain pleasant but dispensable things, banishing the children from one's presence, recounting their disobedience to persons whose approbation they desire, etc., are feared as the harshest punishment. Yet few parents are so fortunate. Most of them must occasionally resort to more severe measures. But if they want to instill genuine obedience in their children by so doing, both their miens and words during the chastisement must be serious but not cruel or hostile.

One should be composed and serious, announce the punishment, carry it out, and say nothing more until the act is completed and the little transgressor is once again ready to accept counsel and commands....

If after the chastisement the pain lasts for a time, it is unnatural to forbid weeping and groaning at once. But if the chastised use these annoying sounds as a means of revenge, then the first step is to distract them by assigning little tasks or activities. If this does not help, it is permissible to forbid the weeping and to punish them if it persists, until it finally ceases after the new chastisement. [J. B. Basedow, *Methodenbuch für Vater und Mutter der Familien und Volker (Handbook for Fathers and Mothers of Families and Nations)*, 1773, quoted in Rutschky]

Crying as a natural reaction to pain is suppressed here by means of renewed beating. To suppress feelings, various techniques may be used:

Now let us see how exercises can aid in the complete suppression of affect. Those who know the strength of deep-seated habit also know that self-control and perseverance are required in order to break it. Affects can be regarded in the same category as deep-rooted habits. The more persevering and patient one's disposition in general, the more efficient it is in specific cases in overcoming an inclination or bad habit. Thus, all exercises that teach children self-control, that make... [Sulzer, quoted in Rutschky]