
“WhyCan'tWeLiveTogether.mp3”: “Why Can't We Live Together?...” [Sade]

[“150607tosooth.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 8)

June 1, 2015... Sisters and Brothers: The vampire metaphor fits “hidden 'power'” because these behind-scenes 'power'-mad statesmen can only persist in darkness. Openness about our aims... drawing as much attention to what is... after all... our only possible future – unless we accept totalitarianism as the legacy we leave our children... and the earth... to struggle with – is the only way to get the world we want. They are bullies... they pick off people one by one... but two who work together (and if soul-mates... all the better...) moves life forward ('compassion' may come too late... but love... arrives right on time...)

A room... a space... a rendezvous...
...freedom can start with two... willing to plan to seize it...
...to say “I am done with duckin' and dodgin'...”
With just a little means... and a lot of love...
...we can have...
...the future we want...

As you know... because each day I must walk a gauntlet – not to sound overly-dramatic – and then try to heal from it... each day more times than the day before... I am more motivated than most... I want to realize the dream... and I've come... thanks to these play-pretend-double-o-seven-slash-minions of 'power'... to appreciate more than most the gift of a new day... hearing the pleas of the earth... and having one more chance to reply.

Have you ever wanted... more than anything... to sooth another person... in every possible way?... to sooth with moon a wind-ruffled water... That's the earth calling... take that feeling... and lay it across the world... To listen... to love... to long... On just such wings... our freedom comes...

[“150607emfweapons.mp3”:]

Because I want these discussions of how we go about reclaiming our human energy to be useful... I've... as I found myself targeted and punished (with EMF: electro-magnetic force... weapons...) for my publication and trumpeting (to the best of my ability...) of our process of thinking this challenge through... I have incorporated my experience of being targeted and punished (with EMF weapons...) into our analysis and discussions... because if it is happening to me... it has happened... is happening... and will continue to happen to many many others...

...unless we talk about it... and make it a practice for 'power' that is no longer tenable... for the reason that they cannot run the risk of widespread de-legitimization.

[“150607emfweapons2.mp3”:]

The fact that some huge sum has been sunk into the development... and marketing... and sale... of these weapons – to global statesmen and their functionaries of every stripe of authoritarian ideology... across the globe – means they will stretch the limits of legitimization... which provides to us an opening... which we must seize... to push our collective lives forward... by loosening 'power's grip on our heads.

We've said that what's missing from the theory and analysis of the Left is a theory of why we obey... Alice for the most part provides it... but it has never been incorporated...

And never has it been more needed than in this moment... in which... as Alice warned (and many before her...) the power of our collective thought... amassed and hoarded in the hands of a Tiny Few misanthropists... is wreaking incalculable havoc...

["150607streamdown.mp3":]

["150607whyweobey.mp3":]

And while we on the Left need a theory of 'why we obey'... and to integrate this understanding into our strategic planning...

...the 'global-state-statesmen' have known for quite some time... at least since Bentham (if they forgot their Plato...) that such a theory was needed. Their agenda... of course... is control... so they devise the levers to apply... to force us to implement their designs...

By contrast... the thought of the left has been reactive in the extreme... and by ceding this question of our 'obedience' to them determined to compel it... they imply agreement... provide tacit support... to 'rule'... covert and overt.

Minimally... the Left... assuming a grasp of the centrality of 'obedience'... and the crafting of it in every human under 'class'... could have presented to us all a practical unmasking of Bentham... a translation into plain language and a framing of it in terms of a clear allegiance with our Sisters and Brothers... thereby furthering the discussion... and placing on center stage the most critical understanding we need... to get free.

In a previous show we discussed one of Bentham's key gifts to the global-state-statesmen: showing them how to craft popular acceptance of one's 'class' position by controlling the thoughts we are allowed to think (in order to make permanent our subservient position.) But in what follows we'll be examining the theory behind the strategy.

Obligation. – Obligations may exist without rights; – rights cannot exist without obligations.

Obligation – a fictitious entity, is the product of a law – a real entity.

A law, when entire, is a command; but a command supposes eventual punishment; for without eventual punishment, or the apprehension of it, obedience would be an effect without a cause... [To obey unquestioningly is not our nature... so force must be applied by those who want to compel our tacit consent... to the terms of our enslavement... – P.S.]

The word right, is the name of a fictitious entity: one of those objects, the existence of which is feigned for the purpose of discourse... [I.e, 'rights' begin with the state... is what he's saying... By 'right' he means simply coercion. 'Scarcity'... and a harsh 'nature'... comprise the opening premises of his thought... – P.S.]

Law supposes government: to establish a law, is to exercise an act of government. A law is a declaration of will – of a will conceived and manifested by an individual, or individuals, to whom the other individuals in the society to which such will has respect are generally disposed to obey.

[So this is very straight-forward... we obey because 'power' has studied... plotted... and planned... for millennia how to get us to obey – how to compel our obedience – as... without it... unless we internalize these limits... 'power' does not exist...

["150607bentham.mp3":]

Now... this 'theory' of 'why we obey' has been proven... by its successful implementation... generation after generation... is not in dispute... So why does the Left not incorporate it into its strategic planning? The answer... partly... is that 'Marxist theory' seemed to supersede the need to... seemed to render it moot... There is an 'historical' (to use Karl Popper's word...) bend in it... that says... 'society' develops in 'stages'... inevitably... and once 'the people' have sufficiently grown into their 'historical mission'... then comes our freedom... But... as Karl

Popper shows... 'power' will always ensure this never happens... and... instead... we-the-people ourselves... must take our lives into our own hands...

That being the case... what are the strategic implications of the theory of 'why we obey?... – P.S.]

Now government supposes the disposition to obedience: – the faculty of governing on the one part has for its sole efficient cause, and for its sole measure, the disposition to obey on the other part.

This disposition may have had for its cause either *habit* or *convention*: a convention announces the will of one moment, which the will of any other may revoke; – habit is the result of a system of conduct of which the commencement is lost in the abyss of time. A convention, whether it have ever yet been realized or not, is at least a conceivable and possible cause of this disposition to obedience, from which government, and what is called political society, and the only real laws, result. Habit of obedience is the cause, a little less sure – the foundation, a little less solid, of this useful, social, disposition, and happily the most common.

[“150607lakeshorelockdown.mp3”:]

[“Shall this habit of obedience be continued unbroken, or shall it be discontinued upon a certain occasion? Is there more to be gained than to be lost in point of happiness, by its discontinuance? Of the two masses of evil – intensity, duration, certainty, all included – which appears to be the greatest, that to which one believes one's self exposed from continued obedience, or that to which one believes one's self exposed by its discontinuance?...” Yes... by all means... let's talk about it... all of us... not just the global-state-statesmen... Bentham believed that for 'rule' to succeed 'rulers' must work behind scenes... and stay continuously focused on their vision... 'Indirect legislation' means... everything we're given to see... is crafted... E.g... yesterday's 'Lakeshore Lockdown...' If we are turned against the police... we are effectively turned from our future... we have to begin working with the police around these messages that the issue is a coerced work system... that a coerced work system is inherently totalitarian... – P.S.]

The true rampart, the only rampart against a tyrannical government has always been, and still is, the faculty of allowing this disposition to obedience – without which there is no government – either to subsist or to cease. The existence of this faculty is as notorious as its power is efficacious.

Shall this habit of obedience be continued unbroken, or shall it be discontinued upon a certain occasion? Is there more to be gained than to be lost in point of happiness, by its discontinuance? Of the two masses of evil – intensity, duration, certainty, all included – which appears to be the greatest, that to which one believes one's self exposed from continued obedience, or that to which one believes one's self exposed by its discontinuance?...

But this calculation is not sufficiently rapid for those who choose for their amusement the destruction and reconstruction of governments. (*Pannomial Fragments*, p. 253 – 6)

[In what follows... consider the global-state-statesmen's obsession with regulation... control... predictability... and 'order'... Given those ends – and therefore the need to 'institutionalize' – throw in Machiavelli in service to Plato... put Plato on a pedestal – and out of this mix... one result you will get... inevitably... necessarily... is 'power'-driven child-rearing methods... Now this is obvious... once we think about it... yet it is never discussed on the Left... Most of us miss this because we're not accustomed or encouraged to look at the big picture when we think about the world... – P.S.]

[“150607whycantwebefree.mp3”:]

[I hope folks will re-read the essay (below) from Bentham: *The Limits of Jurisprudence Defined*... because I want to delve more into this in future shows: the implications of the fact that we live in a world in which what we're presented with is false... is a construction... the media... the entertainment... is crafted by means of the 'money-lever'. 'Money' determines what gets done... So we need to think about it: what are the exceptions to this?... what are the ways around this?... what are the 'counters' to this?... Because our children are being brought into this world which is a construction... in order to capture their brains... and hearts... early... This is why Alice Miller's work is so important...

If we are going to be successful we have to develop 'counters' to this that speak to our inherent truth... that speak to that child... as Alice Miller tells us... who wants to be honest... who wants those answers to those questions that never got answered as to "why is everything so false?"... "why are there things people don't talk about?"... "why can't we be happy?"... "why can't we be as free as the birds?... are they 'smarter' than we?"... I guess so. Let's start being like the birds... – P.S.]

[End of the June 7, 2015 show.]

Legislation is a state of warfare: political mischief is the enemy: the legislator [and the updated word for 'legislator'... given we exist in a single world-system... is 'global-state-statesmen'... – P.S.] is the commander: the moral and religious sanctions his allies: punishments and rewards (raised some of them out of his own resources...

[Bentham's is an early acknowledgement of a point we discussed in our readings of Diana Spearman (See "Founding and Realizing a Test Site...", an online page and pdf) and her book *Modern Dictatorship*: i.e. that a monopolization of 'power' – held in the hands of the global-state-statesmen... respects no boundaries or rules... which... it is understood among them... exist to control we-the-people... i.e., ensure our obedience... – P.S.]

...others borrowed from those allies) the forces he has under his command: punishments his regular standing force...

[I have a story or two to share about those 'punishments'... Bentham... we've discussed... serves the 'power'-guys as a 'Practical Plato'... the modern advisor to 'power' who took the time to identify all the things that move us... all the ways to turn us into puppets... just as Papa so converted them... when they were infants... – P.S.]

...rewards an occasional subsidiary force too weak to act alone: the mechanical branch of legislation, the branch we have been treating of in the present chapter, the art of tactics: direct legislation a formal attack made with the main body of his forces in the open field: indirect legislation a secret plan of connected and long-concerted operations to be executed in the way of stratagem or *petite guerre*. All these heads except this last have been discussed already. It remains that we should say something of this irregular system of warfare: a system which on account of the economy with which it may be used and the ingenuity which it is thought to require and which it often gives Beccaria [Cesare] to display stands in much higher favour with men in general than that which is carried on by open force....

[Let's repeat that: 'Direct legislation' is "a formal attack in the open field..." 'indirect legislation' is "a secret plan of connected and long-concerted operations to be executed in the way of stratagem..." And... because of "the ingenuity... it is thought to require..." it "stands in much higher favor with men... than... open force..." In what follows he suggests that 'power' consider the advantages of being 'indirect': it is the result of 'cool heads'... and so... presumably... bullet-proof...; it is hidden and therefore free from popular interference...; and – at the intersection of these two – most importantly... it can be viewed along the line of your (i.e. 'power's) requirements for furthering your ('power's) vision. He's saying... per Plato... that if the design itself is 'hard' enough... it can serve as a lodestone... a lodestar... a proof... – that tests the worth of any tactic (legislation, e.g....) or strategy (the 'foreclosure crisis, e.g....) So perhaps he's not advocating one ('indirect') over another ('direct')... so much as urging the statesmen of his day (and beyond... he was a visionary for his cause...) to get focused... and to... methodically yet surely... get there: get to the goal... in which no change is possible... all possible contingencies have been accounted for... all escape routes for we-the-people... anticipated and closed.

Now... the question that seems to rise... for us... from this is: can we counter 'power's head-start and concerted focus in pushing its requirements... furthering its vision... with our own requirements for an opposite future?... – P.S.]

If the science of legislation were as far advanced as that of grammar, and it were the custom for legislators to be as well acquainted with that science as it is for school boys to be with grammar, a statesman would be thought to have but a small proficiency in legislation, if in any book of law that were set before him there were a word which he knew not how to refer to the place that it occupies in some mandate. But to love power is one thing; and to love the labour which alone can qualify a man to exercise it as he should do, is another.

Laws that are hasty have often been cited in proof of the necessity of interpretation... but... they [also] bespeak the infancy of the science: and that when once it shall have been brought to a state of tolerable maturity the demand for interpretation will have been in great measure if not altogether taken away.

Now the mischief in cases of this sort being manifest, it was necessary to apply a remedy.... A cure and that a pretty effectual, need not be despaired of. Such an one unless I am much mistaken, might be extracted from the principle of utility. To demonstrate that this may be done and to shew *how* it may be done is part of the object of the present work. Let the legislator have carried his views over the whole field of human action, let him have given a certain degree of perfection to his method, of regularity and consistency to his laws, he may bring them to such a degree of perfection, that they shall need no more interpretation than he himself is equal to apply.

In a system thus constructed upon this plan, a man need but open the book in order to inform himself what the aspect born by the law bears to every imaginable act that can come within the possible sphere of human agency [‘The system’ can only be ‘self-regulating’ if we are ‘self-regulating’... the ‘habit of obedience’ is here assumed... always aimed toward an end. What end? Bentham would say ‘happiness’... and add – to the global-state-statesmen – “make certain you control the definitions...” – P.S.]: what acts it is his duty to perform for the sake of himself, his neighbor, or the public: what acts he has a right to do, what other acts he has a right to have others perform for his advantage: whatever he has either to fear or to hope from the law. In this one repository the whole system of the obligations which either he or any one is subject to are recorded and displayed to view: delineated either actually by the commands it pronounces contained in it, or potentially by the powers it confers: powers of manual governance, or powers of issuing commands either permanent in the shape of laws or transient in the shape of executive mandates....

In a map of the law executed upon such a plan there are no *terrae incognitae*, no blank spaces: nothing is at least omitted, no thing unprovided for, the vast and hitherto shapeless expanse of Jurisprudence is collected and condensed into a compact sphere which the eye at a moment’s warning can traverse in all imaginable directions.

Such are the fruits of a method planned under the auspices of the principle of utility, in which the laws are ranged according to the ends they have in view. (*The Limits of Jurisprudence Defined*, p. 164 – 7)

[What are the implications of the ‘theory’ of ‘why we obey’ for our strategic planning?... i.e. how would we incorporate what Alice helps us see?: discussions of her insights... certainly... but what she tells us essentially is that to end this system we have to end the ‘habit of obedience’... to do which requires breaking the ‘cycle of contempt’ (as Alice terms it in *Prisoners of Childhood...*) for each other... and ourselves – included in which as a basis: we have to love our children... and give them permission to pull the world within their circle of empathic-connectedness... to learn an open tribalism... a heroic concern for furthering the soul-expansiveness of all humanity... Let’s think more about the steps involved in doing this... What are *our* requirements? What do we require to be successful? I mean... we have the technology... there is no need to wait for some hypothetical ‘future’... we are in that time... when we can reclaim our lives... – P.S.]

[“150607.mp3”:]

[Today’s reading: we continue our excerpt from Samuel Butler’s *The Way of All Flesh* and of the chapter “Poisonous Pedagogy” in... Alice Miller’s *For Your Own Good...* – P.S.]

[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, nor 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;...

[You hear this still today: “children cannot be reasoned with...” Of course this is covert propaganda... this elevation of 'power's key con to the status of a god... Remember when Alice said that she could foresee a day when “...we will regard our children not as creatures to manipulate or to change but rather as messengers from a world we once deeply knew, but which we have long since forgotten, who can reveal to us more about the true secrets of life, and also our own lives, than our parents were ever able to. We do not need to be told whether to be strict or permissive with our children. What we do need is to have respect for their needs, their feelings, and their individuality, as well as for our own.” – This is the way out of 'class'... and into our free future... – P.S.]

...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]