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Abstract


The purpose of the study is to discuss the problems of work and leisure as they have occurred in education from the beginnings of human history. Specifically examined are the proposed educational solutions of various thinkers from Antiquity to contemporary. While the "classical" philosophers of education have been analysed by so many writers, some less known but nevertheless influential and relevant figures were chosen for this treatise, such as Francis de Sales, Don Bosco, Georg Kerschensteiner, and Joseph Cardijn. This shows that the concept of a philosophy of education is not narrowed-in to the specific academic discipline.

The starting point for the study is the assumption that education ultimately is the guiding of man to become himself. While work and leisure oftentimes are
problemata in the original meaning of the Greek word -- "things thrown at me" -- man faces the danger of losing himself rather than realizing his human existence in and by them.

The two problems are examined in their various aspects: psychological, anthropological, historical, educational, and theological. The complexity of the issues becomes visible as connecting lines of contemporary problems in the city to the conditions in the medieval and early industrial cities are discussed: poverty and crime, alienation and violence stem from the split between the spheres of life and work (Lebensraum and Arbeitsraum), to a large extent. The attempt of a synthesis characterizes most of the philosophies of education, but since the Middle Ages such a synthesis was never reached again.

Findings and propositions of the treatise point to the fact that in an age of totalitarianism man is increasingly endangered to lose his perspective, if not identity, in dehumanized and dehumanizing work and
leisure. Both work and leisure have been abused to manipulate man. The writer wants to show that unless man is deep-rooted in his culture, and from these roots can give direction to both his work and his leisure time activities, he will fall victim to the manipulative powers. The religious basis of culture, and the ultimate value of life are the data on which human existence in freedom and dignity must be realized.

The philosophies of a Joseph Cardijn and a Teilhard de Chardin are proposed as practical and relevant for our contemporary situation, where the young generation seeks meaning in their existence and demands relevance in their encounter with the world. The writer proposes as the main educational objective a perspective of life in which work and leisure are unified and sanctified. The two philosophies mentioned are shown as the only ones that unequivocally take into consideration the modern world of science and work, in accordance with Christian thought.
DEO CREATORI MEO
PATRI MATRIQUE EDUCATORIBUS
MAGISTRIS ADIUVANTIBUS
ATQUE UXORI COMITI AMABILI.
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I. Introduction

In the discussion of man's activities or of man himself, sooner or later we arrive at the point where man and his existence escape any clear-cut definitions upon which all of us could agree. This is the main difficulty in the attempt to analyse, i.e. to define more or less accurately the problem of work and leisure in education.

There is no doubt that both work and leisure are problems in human life. We find the theme in all documents of human thought, from primitive man's cave pictures to contemporary literature and philosophy, where it appears as one of the central issues. When we use the word "problem" in this context, it is in the original meaning of the Greek term τὸ πρόβλημα that describes exactly the quality of these facts which man faces in his existence: the literal translation says "something that is thrown at me!" Each one of us is confronted with the necessity to work; and there is leisure, the time we have beyond the necessary work, and its challenge to use or abuse it.

It is true, the two concepts are only part of what makes up our existence. But they are
obviously important parts, as we have to spend so much time on the one, and so much of our desires on the other.

No one likes problems; we do not want things that are "thrown at us", man wants to decide and choose for himself. Can we really choose, when we were not even asked to choose our very existence? Who of us could say that he decided to be born in this country at this time? Life is a datum, a fundamental "given" which is to be accepted and on which everything else will be built. There is no real alternative to this acceptance. If one were to reject this datum and be consistent it would mean the end of life.

In our subsequent discussions we should keep this in mind that human existence is possible only on this basis of acceptance: we have to accept that we live in this particular era, in this country with its culture. It makes a difference whether one was born in the western world or behind the so-called Iron Curtain, whether one lives in a city or in a rural area. Not only is a person determined by so many factors in his way of life and thinking, but also in the whole perspective before even becoming aware of it. The meaning of existence can be seen only in this context,
in the polarity of time and space.
The philosophical term Dasein includes this emphasis on the "now and here", as the fundamental given in human existence. However, this should not lead us to the conclusion that man is ultimately determined and thus incapable of any attempt to change his situation. It seems that human nature has the innate tendency to rebel against any given. From time immemorial mankind has attempted to break through the bonds of time and space and become his own master. The myths of a Lucifer with his Non Serviam, or the hybris of a Prometheus are the perennial theme of the human drama up to Camus' "metaphysical rebellion".

This attempt is seen most clearly in man's work: from the caveman's stone ax to the Apollo space capsule the story of work is a constant struggle in which man wrested one given after the other from the hands of the gods. Will he eventually even become the master of life itself?

A parallel is visible in leisure. Aristotle already speaks of the divine in man's mind; his ideal of an intellectual life that would bring the effortless and immediate knowledge of everything to man,
was, in a way, similar to the promise of the serpent to Adam and Eve, "you will be like God...." Man wanted to know, and he pushed back the frontier of faith deep into the territories that once were regarded as the inaccessible realms of the divine. What the Egyptian priests contemplated has nowadays become a chapter in our high school texts. The effortless life of the ancient gods is lived now by the highly paid factory worker on his vacation...
And yet, man seems farther away from the omnipotence and happiness of the gods than ever before in history. He sees himself entangled in so many new problems that threaten him even in his very existence that he is about to give in, and withdraw into frustration and despair.

In this paper, the author will try to describe and analyse the perennial endeavor of man to come to grips with the problem of work and leisure. The setting in which we will have to see the whole problematic is the city. It is here where our lives happen, where man has worked and played from the times of Jericho to this era of Megalopolis. In fact, the city is a product of human work and leisure, as Arnold Toynbee, the English historian, points
out in his definition of the city. He describes as the main criteria of the city the presence of a temple, a meeting place for the transaction of business, public buildings, and a defensive wall with towers and gates.¹

The combined efforts of people to keep off enemies by a wall and thus preserve the fruits of their work, the surplus of goods which are necessary to feed all, though not all are engaged in producing food, and especially the political and religious life are a complex manifestation of work and leisure, in sharp contrast to the struggle for survival of primitive man.

The discussion of the human problems should not remain an academic exercise only. The purpose is practical: first, to direct the view of our future teachers to the problematic qualities of work and leisure. What a teacher does is ultimately nothing else than to guide young people into life. For all of them this life will mean work, but should it be work alone? This is already the second objective of this paper: to show that work

cannot and must not be the only activity in human life. With so many of our contemporaries being engaged in hard work to make a living, and no less of them incapable of finding a counter-balance to this work, it is of prime importance that the schools guide the young generations to find a solution to these existential problems. The paper will at first outline some of the basic concepts which are fundamental for the understanding of the issues discussed. Then a description and analysis of some paradigmatic philosophies of education will present the attempts of mankind through the ages to find meaning in work and leisure, and solve the problems as they occurred in the respective eras. The relevance for contemporary education will be shown wherever it is possible to draw connecting lines, running from former times to the late twentieth century. The main emphasis will lie on modern philosophies, however. We conceive philosophy in its widest possible span; by no means can we confine ourselves to the thoughts of those who were proclaimed as "philosophers". The same must be said about education: it happens not only in the schools. One may find, therefore, ideas and propositions of
quite a few people who are not commonly regarded as philosophers or educators, in this treatise. As the reader will see, they have nevertheless an eminently relevant message for education in our current situation.

One of the weaknesses of the whole discussion will be that work must be separated from leisure in this analysis. Unfortunately man can speak about one thing at a time only. Many things will so appear one-sided and apodictic. While this cannot be avoided, it is, at times, also on purpose. It is not possible to present all existing views, and if it were, the perspective would remain on the surface. The passionate researcher sees things with his eyes, and his views will thus be his own. It is not the purpose to impose this own view upon others, but to challenge them to respond, and, perhaps, set out to see things better and more clearly for themselves. The whole enterprise the writer of this sets out to do is thus a challenge to those who are in the educational field, to respond by helping the children and students to find their lives more meaningful and not as mere data.
II. The Method

Philosophy - a Search for Certainty.

Man's desire to know everything about himself and the surrounding world is the root of all philosophy. The collective and individual attempts in this area have been characterized by two main strands throughout the history of human thought. To visualize the two lines we may trace the theme of "reality" from Antiquity's to contemporary philosophical endeavor. There are two possible aspects which are typical for these two movements: one that sees an "idea" behind the mere phenomenon\(^1\); and the other which holds that there are objects that can be manipulated, seen, smelled, heard, and others which our senses cannot discern\(^2\).

The two representatives of these "schools" in human thought are Plato on one side, who, with his "Parable of the Cave" tends to the "idea"-point of view; and Aristotle on the

---

\(^1\) "idea": Greek \(\varepsilon\iota\delta\varsigma\) = picture, image.

"phenomenon": \(\varphi\alpha\iota\omega\nu\omicron\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\) = that which appears to me, to my eye.

\(^2\) "object": Latin \textit{objectum} = something that is thrown at me (cfr. Greek \textit{problema}).
other side, with his concept of *έμπειρία* that tries to reconcile the theoretical with the practical.

For Plato, phenomena are reflections or projected shadows on the walls of his "cave" which stands for the human mind. Aristotle, on the other side, holds that reality comes to man through the senses "mediately", and through contemplation and intuition "immediately", i.e. without the media of the senses. In his model of the human mind the Stagirite makes the distinction between the *ratio*, which is the active, scientific dimension, and *intellectus*, an effortless, speculative dimension of man's mind. There is no emphasis of the one over the other but the attempt of a synthesis of both in Aristotle's thought.

From these two classical philosophers go the long paths of Idealism and Realism through the history of philosophy: There is Augustine with his emphasis on the "light", the spiritual over against the material, the eternal *contra* the corruptible; then, a Martin Luther and a Calvin who

---

3 explanation below, p. 17.
see the world as an "exile", while the "real" life is in the hereafter; and in our times, a Kierkegaard for whom human existence is a "sickness unto death". Maybe we can also count the dream of a Marcuse in this row of Idealists: the dream of a life of pleasure that leaves all work and hardships to machines.

The other camp of Realism, led by Aristotle, proposes a much wider view, that accepts the opposites even when they cannot be reconciled: the great attempts of a Plotinus with the idea of "the One", or a Nicolaus Cusanus in his *Coincidentia Oppositorum*, find their culmination in a Thomas Aquinas who sees both, the world and the beyond, as belonging together although they are not the same. In Thomas we have the counterpart to Augustine, just as Erasmus of Rotterdam was the antagonist to Luther. The humanist's perspective would see a this-worldly education that goes together with an education for eternal beatitude. This was a sharp contrast to the reformator's emphasis on "faith alone". In our times it is Hegel who, in his dialectic, attempts to relieve the tension between opposites. Dewey was widely influenced by this
"Idealist" who actually belongs to Realism when he discusses the problem of the dichotomy of the practical and theoretical. One may see this treatise with its dialectic of the analysis of work and leisure in the mainstream of Aristotelian-Realist attempts of a synthesis that accepts the polar tension between both aspects of human existence. This will indeed be our method, to show the dialectic of work and leisure. The synthesis will not and cannot be a promise of a solution that would do away with work, or the demand that would exclude leisure from man's life and postpone it until the life hereafter. The synthesis must be the acceptance of both and the integration of work and leisure into one's personal existence. The tension between these poles will never cease to challenge man to search for more certainty. He will always try to see and understand more clearly the meaning of work, of leisure, and of his whole life. This cannot be achieved by one for all. Each one has to set out and find this meaning for himself, to know for sure what to do in this life.
In this quest for certainty we see three dimensions, which at the same time are basic concepts in both philosophy and education: knowledge, experience, and environment. One might call this triad the fundamental problems of human existence when we see how much of our lives is happening within this framework.

When we discuss man and his life, the place and the dimensions in which this life happens, we arrive at so many different views that the question arises immediately: "which is the right view?" Who, for example, could claim, that he sees the problem most clearly? Without going into the depths of epistemology (it would lead beyond the scope of this paper) we have to clarify at least tentatively which are the avenues on which man approaches reality. It will, in a way, also show the method by which we proceed to analyse the problems of work and leisure in the philosophies of education.

First, the problem of knowledge. We may see three levels of knowing, which can best be illustrated by the three Latin words for the term "to know": scire, cognoscere, sapere. The English word science is derived from scire,
which means man's approach to reality by means of the senses. Whatever comes into man's view can be smelled, touched, heard; and man gives a name to it. The "scientific method" includes this observation and manipulation of objects, and also the giving of a name. (It is significant to see how this name-giving has a special connotation in the Hebrew language: to have power over the thing which is named. When Adam, for example, gives names to the creatures, the book of Genesis wants to express that man was endowed with the power over them. The refusal of the Hebrews to name God is consistent with this connotation.)

Scire is thus to know what something is, and how it works, to see and manipulate objects. In education much of the subject matter is acquired by the learner on this level: learning the names of things, seeing facts, learning how to operate and make use of objects, etc. (In the Aristotelian view it would correspond to the ἔργον or practical experience. This will be discussed below.) But a child is not satisfied with this level of knowing. He tries to understand how things are related and why they work. This is meant
by *cognoscere*. The prefix "co-" gives already the hint, that something is "put together". While the mere gathering of data and the learning of subject matter does not lead to understanding all by itself, but requires the act of relating it to previously established knowledge, all learning proceeds on this path, if it ever should arrive at understanding. The teacher, for example, ties any newly introduced items to the child's previous experience. Only when the child integrates the new information and "sees" the relationship between the former and the new, will he understand and say "I see!". In the examination of human problems the mere gathering of data and facts will not lead to an understanding. In the human realm we deal often with concepts, in other words, with "non-objects" which do not appear in our sensual perception but are made up by a complex synthesis of concrete and abstract aspects. Speaking about "family", for example, the term does not mean a concrete object but the sum of concrete persons, each one by himself is not the family. Only taken together ("conceived") do we "see" the family. Especially in philosophy, but to a certain degree also in science, do we take into consideration as
many aspects and data as possible. It is the ideal of philosophy to consider "all possible aspects, even if they were only possible." In this respect, philosophizing means a transcending of the two levels of scire and cognoscere into the third and highest level of knowledge, sapere. This term appears also in the biological name of the human species: homo sapiens, i.e. "man who knows". One could point to the fact that animals know also. The difference appears immediately, however, as soon as we focus on the objects of knowledge in the animal and in man: the former knows only objects and concrete phenomena in its respective environment, whereas man is aware not only of what is going on around himself but also of his own self. Man reflects on his own acts and even his knowledge. The philosophical term of "Bewusstsein" denotes this existential awareness of man that characterizes man as a sapiens. The noun derived from sapere is sapientia, which is wisdom. This is at the same time the root of the Greek word \( \phi \lambda \sigma \sigma \gamma \delta \alpha \)  

4 Josef Pieper in a lecture given at DePaul University, April 10, 1968. (Taped.)

5 The literal translation of "philosophy" is "love of wisdom".
which denotes not so much a concept but an activity of the human mind, in its original meaning. One may see in this a hint as to the impossibility to "have" wisdom or any knowledge in its ultimate meaning; in other words man will never achieve it but has to pursue it with the ardent fervor which at the same time is the basis of love. With this we cannot conceive the highest level of knowledge as an opposite to the basic level of scire. Science or the recognition of facts must be the foundation of all philosophy. And yet, the eye cannot see everything. There is much beyond the phenomenon, that can only be "seen" with the "eye of the spirit". For many of our contemporaries this may sound too much like Plato’s Idealism. The fact, however, that even science extends the sensual approach by a theory, indicates that we cannot limit our knowledge to the merely observational. This is all the more valid when one deals with man. With all the scientific data collected about man, and their synthesis into a concept or image of man, we will nevertheless arrive at the point where we have to admit that something had escaped our eyes.
The French proverb "on ne voit bien qu'avec le coeur!" warns especially the teacher that with all his scientific background and knowledge about children he will hardly be able to say that he "knows" when he excludes the "heart", the human dimension.

What this means becomes more clear when we examine the concept of experience. At first sight this appears to be only a variation of the theme "knowledge". It is, indeed, but there is another aspect which makes it different: The problem of how reality comes to man has occupied most of the philosophers and quite a few scientists. It is the main theme of the so-called Empiricists. When we examine the meaning of this label, we recognize a term which was used by Aristotle, and which spans a much wider horizon than empiricist philosophy's "experience": the concept of έμπειρία. 6

---

6 Aristotle, The Analytics (I and II.) For Aristotle the concept of experience rests on the two foundations of έμπειρία and πράξεις. One cannot precisely translate these two terms by "theory" and "practical". For a discussion of the terms see below.
It seems that Dewey's concern was to re-construct this wider concept of experience. When he points out that "experience in its vital form is experimental, an effort to change the given; it is characterized by projection, by reaching forward into the unknown; connection with a future is its salient trait..." 7 then he says nothing else but the same as Aristotle who insists that the theoria, the view of the whole in its entirety of dimensions must come to the praxis, the mere objective, concrete knowledge and activity if man should have the "complete" experience. When some passages in Dewey's works seem to criticize the "traditional" or "ancient" view of experience, it most likely meant the one-sided interpretation of experience as a mere πάθημα, something which I "suffer". Such a "spectator"-experience was never proposed by the classic philosophers. The concept of theoria, or the reconstruction of the complete experience in both directions of time, in the past and in the future, outlines the wide span of human experience. It is clear that the exclusively objective interpretation is

only a narrow aspect of experience. The subjectivity of man plays an important role in *theoria*, and thus in the complete experience. The question will arise immediately whether man is ever capable of the complete experience, to "see" reality in its entirety. When we have this difficulty in knowledge, the more it will appear in experience:

"It is the aim of knowledge to see the context of the entirety in being. But this is never achieved. Nevertheless will man never cease to claim this entirety."\(^8\)

The present generation of students criticize education for not leading to the experience. They demand "relevance" and "meaningful curricula". While not all of the demands can be done away with the remark that the young people are immature and incapable of finding meaning in their studies, we must admit that education, and with it also work and leisure, have not yet changed very much since a Dewey criticized the one-sidedness and de-humanization of these activities of man. All too often do we fragmentize man's

---

existence into various "subjects", separating education, work, leisure from the whole of life. This danger of separating must also be heeded by the writer of a treatise like the present. If the discussion of such existential problems as work and leisure should become relevant it must come from personal experience, and not from academic studies and research alone. The author feels strongly, that his own work in factories and at the assembly line, the years as teacher and student, and his personal views must be one of the foundations of his analysis. On the other hand, the readers of this treatise cannot conceive it as a mere academic exercise. Each one will see it with his own eyes, against the background of his own experience in the field of education or philosophy.
How much man's views are determined by a variety of factors is a question which we will have to consider here for a moment. Man's existence or Dasein happens within the coordinates of space and time. It makes a difference whether one lives here, now, or a hundred years from now. Man has to take this Dasein as a datum, a given fact, which he can change or modify, but only under great efforts. When we take a look at an animal's existence, we discern that it is entirely tied to its environment, with instincts that are geared to that particular environment and that do not allow an escape unless it should risk to succumb. For example, a snake of the desert would never survive in the arctic ice because its instincts would not find any object such as food or materials for shelter. Man's lack of such determining instincts leaves him the room for "adjustment". The word is used here with caution as it has been used ambiguously in educational terminology. One should be aware that man's adjustment is not only a change.

9 The German term Da-sein is composed of the preposition "da" (= here, right here), and "sein" (= to be). The "right here" includes also the "right now", thus combining both dimensions of space and time.
in himself, but very often a changing of conditions outside of himself. Theoretically, each one of us could survive if suddenly dropped in the Arctic. Our adjustment would not consist in growing a fur on our skin, but rather in the efforts to hunt an animal to get its fur, or to build an igloo.

Man still needs food and water, warmth, etc., like the animal, but his choice of securing these necessary conditions is greater. He is able to make even the most extreme environment into one that is "safe", but he also goes beyond this by transforming it into his "home" or even his "world". It seems that this tendency not to accept the merely objective environment as a "given" is the basis of culture: the student who moves into a furnished room makes it his "den" by adding things of his own liking; a worker puts the picture of his family somewhere on his machine; wherever man lives can we see his character imprinted onto the environment. Mankind has endeavored from the beginning to make this earth into a "world". Is this "subjective quality" a category of the mind, in Kantian terms, or is there the relationship of a "cognate identity" as Plato conceived it? These two perspectives have become an issue in contemporary philosophy. It seems that only
the concept of a relationship between man and his world as it is proposed by Plato originally, and after him by many other philosophers, can avoid the conclusion that man lives in a hell, rather than in a world that is his.

Plato's view of human existence as ἐνθουσίας or cognate with all phenomena has implications which have been overlooked for some time in both philosophy and education. When the Greek thinker sees, for example, that the essence of man (whatever that might be) is of the same quality as the Idea behind everything that man can encounter, he describes the relationship between man and these things as ἐνθουσίας, i.e. "filled with the spirit", a spirit present in both man and the phenomena. This enthausiasmós is the basis of a respect for life, for everything that exists, and it is a sharp contrast to the "objectifying" of everything, including man, as Sartre discusses it. The senseless destruction and pollution of

10 Our English concept of "enthusiasm" is derived from this Greek word. But it has not much in common with the original meaning, when we think of the manifestations of "enthusiasm" about the Beatles, or for Hitler at his "Reichsparteitage" in Nuremberg in the Thirties.
nature, and its transformation into a "hell" is the alternative to this respect!
In fact, the theme of hell in contemporary literature and philosophy has sprung from a distorted view of man's environment.
John Dewey hit the point when he criticized the "spectator point of view" in his works. His concern was that man should realize his involvement, his interaction with the world. He touches here the core of one of our most burning problems: the crisis of culture in which we find ourselves in this century. There is no need to add to the many discussions of this theme; for our analysis of work as a problem in education it is, however, necessary to clarify the concept of culture and its distinction from civilization.
While the first is derived from cult, with this word still as the root of "culture", the second is derived from civitas, the Latin word for city or state.
Speaking of past cultures one thinks especially of Egypt, Babylon, or Greece. What is known of these cultures are monuments that have lasted through the centuries: temples and other religious items. Practically all of the arts are characterized by the religious theme, only modern eras have the
predominance of secular quality in their manifestations of art. The city in its development is an example of this distinction between culture and civilization. While the early city was centered by a temple with its own gods, or a cathedral with the patron saint of the place, the modern city no longer has the conspicuous center of a spire or an "acropolis", but the towers of the business district. The emphasis is no longer on a central idea or figure -- a faith or a god -- but the abstract idea of a civitas, a society of citizens who live together in what they call city. No doubt, the ancient city was such a civilization too: the purpose of a communal settlement was the advantageous life in an organized structure, but the difference to our urbanized life consisted in the Überbau (maybe we could translate this Marxian term by "ideology") that gave direction to the whole societal life in the city. Medieval life, as it was centered by liturgy, shows this role of a "common faith" in life: the calendar was the liturgical church year with its many religious feasts. The physical appearance of the city with its churches and religious symbols even on the walls of the municipal buildings, statues of saints on the private homes, etc. was only an expression of a religious attitude that
integrated work and religious worship. In other words, there was no distinction between religion and life, service to God and service to man or society. Renaissance with its shift from religion to man's autonomy brought the change. The city of Florence still has the mighty cathedral in the center, but the proud tower of the Palazzo Vecchio, the City Hall, is at least of the same height. Art depicts no longer religious themes exclusively, but pagan gods and the potentates of the city. The authority of God or of his representatives was gradually replaced by the political authority of the Magistrate or potentate. The religious ideology became a political one; worship should be a private affair eventually while the "common faith" -- one thinks here of Dewey -- is the awareness of belonging to a city, or society, eventually even to a nation.11

The modern city with its towers of Wallstreet or Lake Shore, of a Parliament or television transmitters rising high above the dwellings of the people manifest

11 The meaning of the word "political" reflects this development: originally it meant "belonging to the city" (pólis), now it pertains more to the state, or nation.
that the cult has become something different. It is true, there are still people who worship in the churches and temples, but it is no longer the only cult. Many other activities of man have adopted cultic characters, like sports and making money, political and technological objectives, etc. This indicates at least that we can no longer speak of a "culture" in the strict sense of the word, even though this element is not completely absent. It is not necessarily a negative statement when we call our world a "civilized" one, but we cannot deny the fact that with this civilization mankind has developed forms of life, and cities in which this life takes place, that at best can be described as "hell".

What else are the slums? As we will see below, poverty and misery was not alien to the ancient city, but the poor belonged to the city. While they could not belong to society, they were nevertheless regarded as persons. Charitable organizations took care of them, especially in the medieval city where it was the obligation of the Christians to help the poor and sick. No one, whatever miserable his condition was, would have come upon the idea to call
this life a "hell". For the believer the hell was outside of the world, in the hereafter, and then it was characterized by the eternal, unchangeable pain. This misery here would not last forever, thus it could not be called "hell". But for quite a few of our contemporaries it seems that there is no hereafter, that the miserable condition of mankind appears as final and unchangeable. Many of our slum-dwellers are rejected not only as members of society but even as human persons. Nobody cares for him and his life; there is no hope that this would change for him...

It is not only the people who live in the ghetto of our cities, but also the well-to-do in the suburbs who suffer the same "hell". Many of them are surrounded by all the riches they want. But obviously they see themselves surrounded by nothing but objects, "things thrown at one".... The statement of a rich man whom the author of this envied for his beautiful home and all the artifacts he had collected, is a shocking illustration of this tenet, that to be surrounded by things (this is the literal meaning of "environment") is not the sole happiness of man:

"All this is nauseating me! The pictures stare at me; the whole house is cold and empty...."
Man lives, at least wants to live in a world. He does not only look at objects, he wants to see more. It is significant here to mention a concept in the educational thought of Pestalozzi, the principle of Anschauung 12. The Swiss educator wants this principle as the foundations of any educational act in general, seeing it as the basis of knowledge in particular. Education is thus not an acquisition of objectified data, of mere cognition, but a leading into a world of meaningful things, of persons and traditions, beliefs, aspirations and dreams. The child playing with a piece of wood may be an illustrating example of this Anschauung, as the child "sees" more than the factual nature of wood when he plays. This piece may be a car, an airplane, or even a doll that can speak and cry. The child's phantasy enlarges the perspective of the physical eye. Can modern man living in a world of science and facts afford to use his phantasy? Does

12 Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, Wie Gertrud ihre Kinder lehrt (Zürich: Rascher, 1945), IX; X.

The word "schauen" or "anschauen" cannot exactly be translated by "to see". It has the connotation of a contemplative way of seeing reality, like letting things "act upon" the one who encounters them. It corresponds to the Greek concept of theoria.
not technology demand the objective and realistic point of view? This is the question which we must answer with an unequivocal statement that man must approach this world with the phantasy and the heart, otherwise he will see nothing but a hell. Even the scientist cannot excuse his heart and the view of the whole if he should not become the tool of the demonic power that threatens the existence of the world. Einstein, one of the "fathers of the atom bomb", insisted on the scientist's conscience which must make him a philosopher over and beyond his science.\textsuperscript{13}

When philosophy is called a Weltanschauung occasionally it indicates that only the view of a world -- this is the literal translation of the term -- that includes the heart, the phantasy, and man's entire faculties, that only such a view can reveal to man the meaning of this world and the life in it. Only this can be the human perspective when man looks at his "environment".

\textsuperscript{13} cfr. two articles on letters from Albert Einstein to Max Born between 1916 and 1955: "Der Luxus des Gewissens", in Rheinischer Merkur, January 9, 1970; and "Ethische Überzeugungen in einer Gesellschaft von Zynikern", in Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, August 30, 1969.
It is with this background of a world, of experience, and man's knowledge, that we will now begin to examine and discuss how man's work and leisure appear in the thought of educators and philosophers of the past and present times, and analyse them in terms of a relevance for our contemporary educational enterprise.
III. Work and Leisure

Man's Problematic Existence as "Homo Faber" and "Homo Ludens".

As one speaks of a "problematic existence" the above mentioned concept of problema is underlying our view of existence or Dasein. This Dasein is a given fact which man never can choose. In our introductory discussions it was pointed out that this datum includes more than the mere life or existence at a given time in a given space; what makes it a human existence is the entirety of social and geographical, cultural, educational and economic factors, the problems and traditions as well, as the future prospects which one has or encounters as he proceeds through this life. Man is thus confronted with many προβλήματα -- things "thrown at him" -- which he did neither plan nor choose to encounter. The task of life seems to be nothing else than to come to grips with them; in other words, to accept the challenge and respond with the whole of one's personality: with the talents and skills as well as with
the emotions and thoughts.

If man had succeeded in this task at all times we would not have so much of discussions about these problems of life. We chose only two of them -- work and leisure -- which obviously have occupied man at all times. That both, work and leisure, are still problems in our times will most likely be agreed upon by everyone. Each one of us has to work, whether he likes it or not. What makes it an issue even more in our time is the fact that many people do no longer find a fulfillment in their work and leisure, while apparently it must have been found by man in the past.

The following chapters will discuss how these two problems appear in the philosophies of all eras in the history of human thought, and how people have tried to find a solution, at least for the young generation that "should have it better", in the respective future. A final solution evidently never was found, as we see ourselves still discussing the same problems. Nevertheless may we find points and hints in the attempts of the past, which are of some relevance for our present condition and the endeavors to change them towards the better. This is one of our objectives, while
the other is to examine some of our contemporary proposals. The complexity of the problems requires an approach which does not confine the analysis to one particular discipline's point of view. The inter-disciplinary approach should be consistent with the three levels of knowledge, mentioned earlier in this paper. As the writer is not a specialist in all of the mentioned disciplines, it will not be possible to go into the depths of all fields. This may be seen as one of the weaknesses in the treatise. The author prefers this to the alternative of a one-sided view that would have to leave out much of the complex issues, and thus provide nothing but a narrow solution which could not be a solution at all.

Work as a Problem

Each one of us has to work, in one form or another, in order to make a living. This phrase "to make a living" indicates that our lives are somehow dependent on the activity which we call work. There are a variety of aspects under which we can examine and define work: anthropologically, philosophically,
politically, economically, theologically, etc. It is almost impossible to go into all the ramifications of this human activity, and yet we will have to consider this complex quality unless we risk a very narrow concept of work. Any human act is influenced if not determined by a multitude of factors, such as motives and reasons, etc., even more so a human activity like work. When we outline some of the main traits of work using these tentative delineations as a basis of our discussions, we are well aware of the inadequacy of such an attempt in terms of an exhausting definition. Anthropologists have tried to show the roots of human work by pointing to the necessity to do something about survival. Man undoubtedly had to do something about finding food, building or using a shelter, making clothes and tools, weapons and utensils, hunting, fighting, and defending himself and his family against wild animals and human enemies. Modern man basically still does the same: we still gather food, build shelters and defend ourselves against the powers of nature. Unfortunately, man still has to defend himself against human enemies, people who threaten him in his existence. The difference is only that modern man does it in a more sophisticated method.
The fight goes no longer only on biological survival, it can mean political, economic, or psychic survival, what man works for. The necessity remains, the challenge from outside to which man must answer.¹

This is, however, only one side of the phenomenon of work. The challenges from outside meet a corresponding "inner" faculty of man. Primitive man's work, for example, often went beyond the mere necessary. The ornaments in the tools and weapons, the paintings on the walls of a cave, and especially the production of absolutely "use-less" items such as jewelry and cultic things suggest that there are "creative forces" within man that may not have been challenged by an external need. It is true, some theorists like Otto Rank from the circle around Freud would see "necessary" roots even in the artistic creativity of man. At least during the time as he was a disciple of Freud did he see the role of libido in the creative act of man. In his work Art and Artist, however, he tries to show that man creates in some sort

¹ This is one of the main themes in Émile Durkheim's sociology. Cfr. especially his Rules of the Sociological Method, transl. by Solovay and Mueller (New York: Free Press, 1938).
of polarity between the cultural and the personal factors:

"The raw material for creative experience is provided by culture, but the creative act itself is the unique accomplishment of the artistic type of personality who uses and transforms the collective heritage in an especially meaningful way."²

This would, however, not explain why man, primitive man, ever started to be an artist. Early man could not draw from a heritage, could he? An anthropologist, David Bidney, points to man's potentiality for freedom and freedom of choice, as the roots of culture, in other words, of work that includes also artistic work.³ At least one cannot deny the fact that at times man also wants to work by himself, when we do not discern a need, pressing on him.⁴

The term of a homo faber includes this twofold stimulus from outside and within of man that urges him to produce and transform the materials of his surroundings.


David Riesman and Robert S. Weiss deal with this problem in a paper on the problems and prospects of work, where they also mention Thorstein Veblen's concept of the "instinct of workmanship" as a propensity in man to work by virtue of his nature. They see, however, an implicit doubt in this polemical concept of Veblen's, while modern psychology and the other behavioral sciences lead to a deeper understanding:

"...that we still work, even when the bare subsistence is not an issue, so long as we can find in our job a basis for self-esteem."  

One cannot forget that to a certain degree physical activity, the use of muscles in an effort, can be coupled with a feeling of pleasure in man. The hard "work" of a sportsman or a mountain climber is accompanied by such feelings which are reinforced when the achievement is reached. The sight of the product of one's work, too, provides a fulfilment. All these factors make up the concept of homo faber. We might see here


6Ibid., p. 555.
the problems with modern man's work, which so often has to be done under conditions which neither allow these feelings of pleasure, nor require anything from man's propensities. The above-mentioned Thorstein Veblen pointed to this aptitude which makes man seek in every act "the accomplishment of some concrete, objective, impersonal end".7 This end and the efforts that lead to it are two different things, as it is shown in the two Latin words for work: labor and opus. The one denotes the physical effort which is necessary to make anything man undertakes, while the other focusses on the achieved, or conceived end of this effort. Opus can even be the idea of what is to be achieved, comparable to the statue of the Pietà which Michelangelo saw already in his mind when he watched the men breaking off the block of marble in the quarries of Carrara. While the whole work still existed only in his mind, he had to labor hard to realize it. What we admire now in St. Peter's in Rome is this opus.

Examining the meanings of the two Latin words labor and opus more closely, it is significant that the accompanying verbs laborare and operari appear in different forms: while laborare is a regular verb, depicting an activity, the other is a so-called deponens, i.e. a verb that occurs only in the passive voice, but carries an active meaning. We can see a hint in this difference as to the intrinsic quality of operari as including an element of "passivity" in the act. Human work in this sense is therefore not only a physical act but also a response to an internal or external stimulus. The end of the work, the opus is thus already present in the very act of operari, the realization of the work. In Theology we encounter the same distinction, where operari is attributed to God or gods, in as much as the divine being needs no effort, no labor, to realize his work. The mere idea of the opus creates the whole "immediately", i.e. without the "media" of any sort. Man seems to share some of this divine "creativity", as he has an idea of the end of his work and then works to realize it. The difference is only that man has to labor in this realization of
his ideas. This subjective dimension is man's privilege over the animal; perhaps it is one of the aspects in his "likeness to God."

The Bible uses the two terms in the story of man's expulsion from Paradise. While the curse is hurled after him, "to eat the bread in the sweat of thy brow", the original mandate remained: "... fill the earth and subdue it!" The divine mandate and sharing in creativity on one side, and the penal burden and curse on the other, is exactly that polarity which we see in the external and internal necessity, in creativity and productivity, in laborare and operari. This polarity cannot be ignored; it is felt by each one of us how it makes up the tension in which we find ourselves whenever we work. Hundreds of generations seem to have attempted to relieve this tension, and we still do it in our endeavor to educate our children and youngsters. The question is, whether we are closer to the solution than preceding ages.

When we hear the term "creativity" so often nowadays in the educational terminology, it might be a reaction to the development of work, more precisely industrial work, into a burden that has taken from man much
more than he could have put into it. The demands of our students to relieve the burden of requirements by leaving more room for interest and creativity are ultimately the desire of man to have the initiative, to determine for himself and choose his own way. How free one can become in this respect is a question which man faces in everything he makes. When we say "I create", it is not precisely the same as the act of creating which we attribute to a God: to make out of nothing and to be absolutely free in the creation of an object. Man is always a "maker", i.e. he takes pre-existing material and puts it together in a new way. This fact represents one of the main limitations to human creativity. Matter dictates certain modes of transformation; every artist struggles with these limitations, when he tries to transcend the material. The aforementioned Pietà by Michelangelo is an example of this attempt: though the viewer knows that it is made of Carrara marble, he has the impression that it is living flesh. We could even go further, by pointing to our scientific products which would be "devils' work" for medieval man. Our chemical products like the polymeric
amides (Nylon, for example), would never suggest that they were made of liquids and gases -- "nothing" for ancient man or the Alchemists. For us, with the insights into the molecular and atomic structure of matter this has nothing to do with the Alchemist's attempts to transcend the limitations of homo faber; it is no magic but the same as the cabinet-makers' job of putting things together. All our tools and scientific methods are in the hands of the homo faber, but the desire to be like God is deep-rooted in man: from Prometheus to Faust, and on to Einstein and the biochemists of today the attempts to overcome the limitations drive man. A Teilhard de Chardin would, for example, see in this another hint as to the convergence of science and art, of all human activities towards the point Omega.8

The Dehumanization of Work

There is no doubt, the majority of mankind has to work in order to live. We need not go to the so-called underdeveloped countries to verify this. Even in our own country, which boasts of the world's highest standard of living, many people work under conditions which cannot be called "human" when we measure them with the criteria of laborare and operari. A vast majority of working men and women are engaged in exclusively objective activities, with no room for any subjective quality. Could an assembly-line worker have an "opus" in view, when he is told what to do and how to do it, down to the very movement of his little finger? When he does not even know what he makes, where the parts he watches coming out from the machine would eventually go, how should he have an "idea of the whole"? The industrial worker in this setting is not even a "faber" any longer, but a mere functional part in the process of production. It is true, man's intelligence and creativity originated and devised the tools and sophisticated machines that make it possible to work much more efficiently and productively, with far less efforts involved. With the rationalization of work we can afford to buy the products which are made
at much less cost than before when people made an item completely alone. This was a fundamental insight of Henry Ford when he introduced the assembly-line. But at the same time, man has become degraded into a machine himself, he has to "function", no longer to "make". It is the machine that makes things, and man has to "operate" it.9 The old axiom of Metaphysics, "omne ens agendo perficitur" seems to have turned into its very opposite. But the roots of what we see as dehumanizing in work are not in the conditions that demand from man to function when he is told what to do. It appears that there is no alternative to the "feudalist" constitution of industry: there will always be people who have devised machines and efficient methods of production, and others who will be told to run these machines and apply the methods. Just as the material itself dictates the method of procedure, all the more will machines dictate the patterns and rhythm of work, because they are constructed to be operated

9 It seems that the "passive voice" of operari received a totally different meaning in this phrase "to operate a machine". The German language has it even more, when it translates this "to operate" by "eine Maschine bedienen", which is literally "to serve" a machine.
in such and such a way. The worker will thus always have to obey and follow the directions of those who employ him. However, it should not be necessary to put the machine in the first place and demand from man to adjust to it. Conditions in many factories and mines still ignore the findings of physiology and psychology to a horrifying extent. There are, on the other side, quite a few companies which consider man's nature when they build their plants around man and not around machines; light and color create an atmosphere which is more pleasant, and which lets the workers have the feeling that he is not a machine to which it does not make any difference in what environment it is installed. It cannot be denied that much of this is made to increase productivity -- and it has resulted in such an increase -- but it grew also out of the realization that, by making the place of work more acceptable to man, man accepts more readily his work as fulfilling and satisfying. The underlying idea is the insight that one cannot go too far in the separation of man's environment into two divided areas, which are called Lebensraum and Arbeitsraum in sociology.
When differences grow too extreme, man will become alienated. There is no possibility to return to the complete unity of both spheres as we had it in the primitive society, where the producer was at the same time the consumer of the products. Work can no longer be done at home, but when we demand from man that he be away from his home for most of the day, and even most of the week, then one must provide for some room where he brings his own atmosphere into the place of work. When, for example, modern buildings do not allow any personal note, when even the architect prohibits any changes in the offices which he had designed, and thus the employees may not even bring flowers or pictures into the rooms in which they have to work, then this is degrading man into a mere termite that has to work in these ant-hills.

The ability of man to adjust to various situations is said to be unlimited.\textsuperscript{11} It is true that man is not determined by instincts as an animal, but he needs a room which he can call his "own". When the environment changes he will try to transform it into a "home", into "my office", etc. Should the environment change drastically and beyond his capacity to adjust, or, if he is not allowed to change it, he will usually withdraw internally and regard his presence only as forced. The desire is to get out as fast as possible, to be in his own world afterwards. It seems that this insight has not yet come through very far in industry, nor in education. The problem of drop-outs in both areas can, at least in part, probably be accounted for by the separation of the child's or workers' \textit{Lebensraum} and \textit{Arbeitsraum}.

The elementary school teacher knows of the difficulties and emotional problems that arise with first-graders when, for the first time in their lives, they have to

be away from their homes regularly. Or, could one really say that the grey bare walls of some of our schools, the cold electric lights that make even windows unnecessary, and the barren academic curriculum contribute to the pleasure and fulfilment which we expect the children and students to find in learning? Friedrich Engels observed this with the workers of last century's factories:

"The worker first feels that he is with himself when he is free from work, and apart from himself, when he is at work.... (In consequence) man, the worker, feels himself acting freely only in his animal functions, like eating, drinking, begetting... whereas in his human functions (like work) he is nothing than a work-animal."\(^{12}\)

We are aware of the fact that there are more factors involved in the dehumanization of work, such as the political, economic, and also psychological. It is, however, mainly the educational and philosophical

aspects that show the roots of the problem. In the various attempts of educators to re-humanize work, this emphasis on the unity of the two spheres appear as a main idea. We will discuss these solutions below.

Attempts to Re-humanize Work by Education

The development of the city from a unity of Lebensraum and Arbeitsraum into the split world of a "leisure class" and a "working class" is one of the roots of our contemporary educational and social problems. The early city did not know this split. It was, after all, one of the first steps forward in the history of mankind, that people agreed upon a certain place in which they wanted to live together. The choice of a place with its advantages over the open country, and the agreement upon a social structure are the two elements on which the "organism" of the city is based. The individual finds security and property, he also has a more or less clearly defined function within this organism.
Whether we want to explain the rise of the city in terms of an "overproduction of goods" that made it possible to live together in a larger number; or as the "crystallization of social instincts", we cannot ignore the foundational decision of people to live and work together under the idea of a "whole". As such, the city is an opus which is realized by the labor of all. It was possible only on the basis of equality, where all individuals had the same power of decision in the choice of the site, and the distribution of tasks. We do not have records of the very start of any ancient city, but one can safely assume that at the beginning the unity of life and work must have been established. The separation into "classes" of those who live, i.e. who enjoy life, and the others who work and support this life, was an important change taking place most likely in the early stage of the development. The induction of captive enemies to do the hard and unpleasant work, relieved the citizens from this burden. Here began what we see throughout the history of the city: the distinction between those who have to work, and the others who are free to pursue their own things.
The earliest known cities, like Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa in India, Jericho and Babylon had a clearly distinguishable social order with a group of slaves doing the necessary work, and the "citizens" or free people who could pursue the activities like the arts and the cult, administration and education. One can, maybe, see an early attempt to secure or restore the unity and bring the opus back into to consciousness of the people in Hammurabi's Code. When this king of Babylonia (2123-2081 BC) demanded that "the strong must not oppress the weak", that wages for workers and professionals are to be fixed, and the corvée, i.e. the conscription of people to do public labor for canals and roads, be regulated, it is a hint that there were problems. Such problems existed also in Egypt. A papyrus of the Middle Empire era (around 2000 BC) suggests that the ideal

---

of man's life was at that time "to turn the heart to books", while it was a "misfortune to be a soldier, and weariness to till the earth". The split between the laborer and the free citizen is complete where something like the following is written:

"I have never seen the smith as an ambassador,
Yet I have seen the smith at his work,
At the mouth of his furnace,
His fingers were like crocodile (hide). He stank more than the roe of fish..." 

It must be noted that this gap did not stem from an educational system that would be based on class-distinction. The Egyptian schools did not exclude children from the "lower class". Both the sons of princes and of workers attended, but when it became clear that a boy could not keep up with the rigid curriculum in writing and calculating, he could not become a scribe or administrator. He then went to learn a practical skill from his father at the workshop. Such was not the job of the school which was to pro-

---


15Ibid., p. 446.
vide the administrators and priests for society. This, of course, was only a minority, so the selection was made on the basis of outstanding intelligence in the child.

Another famous attempt to overcome the gap between work and life is the sacred text of India, the Bhagavad Gita. The god Krishna speaks to Prince Arjuna:

"... there be two paths shown to this world; two schools of wisdom. First, the Sankhya's which doth save in way of works, prescribed by reason; Next, the Yog, which bids attain by meditation, spiritually: Yet these are one!
No man shall 'scape from act by shunning action; Nay, and none shall come by mere renouncements unto perfectness. Nay, and no jot of time, at any time, rests any actionless; His nature's law compels him, even unwillingly, into act; For thought is act in fancy.

... Work is more excellent than idleness; The body's life proceeds not, lacking work..."

---

16 The Bhagavad Gita originated probably about 1000 BC. It was written down for the first time around 500 AD. The following is from Robert Ulich, Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965), p.4.
No such a path is suggested by the Greek ideal of life that accepts the abyss between the free and the slaves. The emphasis on freedom (from the necessity to work) puts the intellectual life high above the level of the working slaves. Aristotle's model of the human mind, with its distinction between ratio and intellectus points out that only the latter is the "human dimension" which man has in common with the gods. The ratio, or practical reason, is what man shares with the animals, and thus below man's dignity. Aristotle has nothing but contempt for those who are engaged in such a life that is determined by purposeful and necessary work, as they do the same as animals which too have to be active for specific purposes. 

For the Greek education was the way to this intellectual life; it had nothing to do with the skills and tasks of everyday life. The educator and his pupil should pursue knowledge for its own sake, 

17 It is not exact to contend that the Greek held the slaves as "animals". They were regarded as humans but not able to lead the full human life. Intellectus should not be translated by "intelligence", as it denotes more the dimension of the human mind that corresponds to the concept of theoria, the effortless, contemplative,intuitive in man.
free from any necessity and constraint. This should not be misunderstood in a way that knowledge should remain with the person alone. The idea of the opus was still present: the educated man would serve the polis, his city, by taking over responsibility, ruling with wisdom both the free and the working people. The distinction between the activities of the free, and the work of servants, would become an issue throughout the following centuries, under the heading of "artes liberales" and "artes serviles", as we will see later. 18

A totally new concept which stood in sharp contrast to this gap arrived with Christianity: the concept of service. Some explanations of the roots of the new perspective point to the fact that the Christian religion spread first among the slaves and workers whose lives were made up of toil and hardship, and that Christ himself did not address the educated, even being a worker's son. This does not explain, however, the impact which the new religion had upon the world of Antiquity.

18 The discussion of the Liberal Arts concept is on pages 134 sq.
The starting point for Jesus was the human condition which cried for redemption. He did not mean the poor and slaves alone, but it was this group who felt the need most urgently, while the others often were self-complacently occupied with the life of the intellect. The "reversal of all values", to use a Nietzschean phrase here, saw any human activity as a fulfillment of God's will, a service to Him and to one's neighbor. For the slave, his condition was a datum which he could not escape. With the Christian perspective the subjective element became the essential aspect of work: while work still would remain the same hardship and burden objectively, it was, at the same time, transformed into cult -- service to God -- and thus transcended the humiliating condition of the slave. He who had to serve his master, now wanted to serve. Centuries later, Karl Marx would criticize this motivation as an "opiate for the people".

19 The original quote in Marx' Einleitung zur Kritik der Hegel'schen Rechtsphilosophie is: "Religion is the sigh of an oppressed creature, the emotion of a heartless world... just as it is the spirit of despirited conditions. It is the opium of the people!" (Own translation) Cfr. also Werner Post, Die Kritik der Religion bei Karl Marx (München: Kösel Verlag, 1969), p.166.
Karl Marx was not the first one to bring up such a view. Already in 1761 the Frenchman Holbach wanted to "pull the veil from the face of Christian philosophy" and show that it is nothing but the "intoxication of the people that should prevent them from seeing the evil which comes from those who hold them down by power..." 20

It is remarkable what mankind could achieve under this "intoxication" when we regard the climax of Christian culture in the Middle Ages. The cathedral of the medieval city is the manifestation of the Christian view of work as a service to God. The realization of this service in terms of an opus was possible only on the basis of a world view that accepted man's condition as God-given. The Creator had placed man into this world with a spécifique mandate: to serve God, and in this, to serve his neighbor. It is not true that medieval citizenry just fulfilled orders of a bishop or a

---

secular principality when the cathedrals were built. The cathedral of the City of Ulm in southern Germany, like most of the European cathedrals, was willed and planned by the citizens of the city. They raised the necessary funds and hired the architects. When the foundations were laid in 1377, not only the magistrate, merchants and craftsmen gave their donations, but even the poor.\textsuperscript{21} There was no bishop to take his "cathedræ" in the tremendous church, it was a "people's church", made by and for the people of the city. No slaves worked on the project, but artisans and workers cooperated for generations on the great opus of their community. (It was to be finished after more than 500 years, in 1890 !) The uniformity of style, and the cathedral as a representation of the cosmos

\textsuperscript{21}Felix Fabri, \textit{Chronica der Stadt Ulm} (Ulm: 1488).


can be explained only in terms of a uniformity in "Weltanschauung". The labor and the idea were integrated into this model of the world: we find the animals and plants of the earth together with the demons and devils of the under-world, and also the saints and angels of the heavens. The people of the city and their everyday activities, from the arts to gossip, appear in the building's depiction of the world. While we would not like to have these profane scenes in a sanctuary, for medieval man everything was seen \textit{sub specie aeternitatis}, with view of eternity. The young generation that saw the project rise, was trained in the skills and techniques of the various trades and crafts, in order to continue the task. If this were a mere imposition of a job from one generation to the other, it is highly improbable that the project should have been carried over more than 500 years. The enthusiasm for such an \textit{opus} of the community obviously can no longer be understood by some of us. We are tempted to judge medieval conditions with twentieth century criteria. Our time has not much left for the perspective,
that focusses on the work, over against its fruits such as money and prestige. But there are still examples of this capacity of man, in our times: the work of the Mormons in Salt Lake City and modern Israel.

We see another important factor in this conception of work in the Middle Ages: the emphasis on personal responsibility. Here too some historians present a grave mis-conception of medieval Guilds when they describe them as some form of Trade Unions, similar to our contemporary power groups in society. The foundations of the Guilds were the master-disciple relationship, similar to the one of the Greek philosophers and early Christianity. The master craftsman acted in loco parentis for the young apprentices who lived in his household. There is nothing to romanticize about these hard years of apprenticeship. The common sigh, still heard in Germany, tells enough of this: "Lehrjahre sind keine Herrenjahre!"

22 German proverb: "The years of an apprentice are not the years of a master!"
But these years were the basis of a professional life that would stand on the firm grounds of a well-learned trade. All of the famous artists and architects of the Middle Ages went through this tough school. A rigid system of control watched carefully over quality and honesty in work. (When we compare our modern buildings of the twentieth century to a medieval structure, we see the difference of quality and honesty in workmanship!) The master had to meet certain requirements before he would receive his license to keep apprentices in his workshop and household. He was personally responsible for the physical and spiritual welfare of the young people whom he taught. Even when the apprentice had graduated and travelled abroad as a "journeyman", would any fault fall back upon the master's reputation.

This philosophy would determine the ethos of work in Europe up to our times. With the rise of big companies and their factories, and thus the appearance of the fluctuant masses of unskilled laborers who would neither learn a trade from the scratch, nor remain in the field long enough, came also the drop in quality and the lack of responsibility which we lament now. The amount of rejects in the production, the huge apparatus of quality control which
some reputable companies have to entertain
is enough of an illustration of this
situation.

The schools did not have much to do
with this education for work. Many people
never went to school in the Middle Ages.
It seems that until the era of Reformation
the majority of the working people, even
the journeymen, were not far beyond the
rudiments of writing and reading. What
counted more was the ability of the whole
person to cooperate in the world. Vocational
education and training were integrated into
the whole life which led the young worker
from simple tasks to more complex respon-
sibilities. The principle of service
remained the same for all the levels which
one might have achieved: to fulfill the
will of God.

The shift should come however: From
the view of work as a service the emphasis
goes to work as a cooperation with God;
man continues God's work of creation by his
mastery of the world. "Subdue the earth..."
becomes the main objective with the dis-
covery of new continents and materials. Soon
it should become the strong self-consciousness,
claiming that not God governs the cosmos, but
"natural laws", and, that the sick were healed
through knowledge and techniques of the doctor,
and not by God's own hands. Knowledge, once attributed to God alone, now becomes the claim of man. (One is reminded of the promise of the serpent to Adam and Eve again...) All of man's efforts, his thought and work, focus on the world now. In this emancipation of man's life from cult, the roots of a development become visible, that would eventually lead to the claim of absolute autonomy.

The impact is felt in education immediately: now the perfection of skills is of prime importance. Knowledge and scientific experimentation blaze the way into the darkness of faith. With this in focus, we see the rise of the University, and the development of the Guilds as powerful institutions as the "Renaissance", i.e. the rebirth of human hybris: to be like God, to be the "measure of everything". It is a return to Antiquity in many respects; for us it is significant to see the old split of the working class and the "free" coming to the daylight again. Those who cannot achieve perfection in knowledge or work fall behind. The city still produces great masterpieces of architecture and art, but they are no longer the opus of the community. The Renaissance cities like Florence or Bologna
can boast of miraculous achievements, but it was a potentate like the Medici or Borgia who ordered, and the work had to be done. Even a Michelangelo Buonarotti complained that he was but a slave.23

The emergence of the "industrial captains" who would build palaces and stuff them with paintings and statues, while the workers had to labor hard in the quarries and factories, would create increasingly tensions and problems which were to remain with us until today. What was new in contrast to Antiquity and the Middle Ages, was the view that placed the workers outside of society, even outside of the city. In Athens the slaves were not a class, but they belonged to the polis. In the modern city, and this began with the Renaissance, they would be denied even this belonging. The concept of the Ghetto arises at the moment where a specific group of people are no longer allowed to live with the established society. While the slaves of Antiquity still

lived with their masters, in the same household, the modern city assigns a special part -- usually the worst! -- to them.\textsuperscript{24} It is true, the workers were needed to support society, but they were not accepted by this society. This made the important difference, and it created much of the tension on which a Marx and a Mao-Tse Tung would base their whole philosophy of a "new humanism". In the following paragraphs, we will examine in more details some of the educational philosophies that sought a solution for the problem of work, since the time of the Renaissance.

The scope of the paper does not allow for an analysis of all the educators and philosophers who discussed the theme. The author chose among the most influential of thinkers and from less known figures, whose thought is of relevance for our present situation in education as to the problem of work.

\textsuperscript{24} The word \textit{ghetto} appears for the first time in the Italian cities of the 16th century. It meant the separate quarters of the city where the Jews had to live.
Jean Calvin and Francis of Sales.

The Swiss reformer Jean Calvin (1509-1564) is one of the most influential figures of his era, the so-called Reformation. In contrast to Martin Luther, he was not only a religious leader a specific theology, but also a teacher and educator, diplomat, politician, and organisatory genius. In a time when the old split going through western culture, between the world and the divine, seemed to be perpetuated once and for all in a world-view that conceived man as his own law-giver, Calvin made the great attempt to bring the world back to the original submission under the will of God. Here we can examine only those aspects of Calvinism which pertain to the philosophy of education in general, and to the concept of work in particular.

The central idea of Calvinism is the existence of God who reveals himself in the scriptures of the Bible. The word of God is directed to man whom God knows from eternity, in other words, whom God has chosen to belong to his people. Only by this specific decision of God can man reach his eternal destiny. Man's life must thus be characterized by gratitude and obedience to him, by fulfilling the duties which each one's existence at this particular time and in this particular place
entails. This is the key to the understanding of the so-called Calvinist ethos of work, that has influenced generations from Calvin's to our times: the tremendous dynamic of the early Americans building their colonies, and, at the time of Calvin, the experiment of a theocracy in Geneva, Switzerland. 25

In the Ordinances given to the Church of Geneva in 1576, Calvin points out, that there "be established a certain rule and order of living, by which each man may be able to understand the duties of his position." 26

The view of man's depraved nature made it necessary that strong authorities "helped" man towards this understanding by a rigid discipline that saw to it that each one did his "right things".

25 With this in view one could rather speak of a philosophy than of a religious doctrine what Calvin developed. The universality of an almost perfect system of thought includes every aspect of life.


26 Ordonnances Écclésiastiques, Préambles.
Tawney describes how every action was "brought under the iron control of a universal rule." This resulted in a tremendous development of the sciences, of politics, and economy. Man's work and leisure, his most intimate acts even were determined by the philosophy of this theocracy. That it was one-sided and repressive has been recognized already by some of Calvin's contemporaries, especially by one of the most important anti-Calvinists, François de Sales, after Calvin's death.

While Calvin reacted to the claim of autonomy with an emphasis on the dependence of man, in other words, replacing the "homo mensura" by theocentricity, the perspective of Francis of Sales (1567-1622) is not characterized by the extreme. He points to man's dignity and freedom vis-à-vis God, insisting on man's ability to decide for himself, and the existential necessity to leave this decision to each one as a person. This could be

misunderstood as the very "autonomy" of the Renaissance, but the bishop's of Geneva anthropocentric philosophy is not in contradiction to a Christian theocentricity: rather a complementary aspect of man's existence as a creature endowed with freedom and dignity.\footnote{François de Sales, \textit{Les Controverses} (Annecy: - 1672). As bishop of Geneva, Francis worked successfully for the recovery of many Calvinists for the Catholic faith. His sermons were published in Annecy already in 1641.} The term "humanisme dévot" for his philosophy is adequate as it sees man put into existence by God's will, but then it is man's decision that gives direction, and eventually determines whether or not he will find his eternal happiness. Man can, of course, not deny his limitations which his nature entail, and which force him to do things which he does not like to do. In our context, work is conceived as one of the activities which oftentimes are necessitated by the human condition. At the same time it is also a similarity to God's creative faculty. Thus man can find fulfillment in his work and realize himself, serving God by his efforts, even though
God does not need man's contribution or cooperation. The perspective of a happy service is a sharp contrast to the enforced discipline of the Calvinists. With the exclusively religious tendency of Sales' works he did not directly appear on the stage of philosophy and education, and this is why he is not known in the academic world. But we see his decisive influence upon the educational thought of some Catholic educators like Don Giovanni Bosco, and perhaps also of Maria Montessori. This is why we will discuss some of his main ideas.

In Francis de Sales' book *Philothea, Or An Introduction To The Devout Life*[^29] which we might call a "guidance and counseling" book, the underlying idea is that man has to accept his human condition and try to ameliorate it by using the means he has: intelligence, virtues, emotions, and his will. In all of his activities one will realize the

limitations. In a letter to Madame Brulart, he discusses the problem of vocation, which so often is sought to be solved by an unrealistic attempt to overcome these limitations of human nature: "Let us be what we are; but let us be it wholly.... Let us accept what God gave us, and not attempt to be something against his will. ... For those who ... always want to be what they cannot be, and who do not like what they never can escape from ... are evil off."30

Objections against such an attitude point to the danger of apathy and lack of initiative, that would prevent any progress and change in the human condition. This is missing the point; the issue is here the question whether man should waste energy and time on conditions that cannot be changed. It sounds almost like the statement of a contemporary psychotherapist, when one reads: "I cannot approve of one's harboring a desire for a different way of life, when he

has a specific vocation and area of competence and duties. What he does is splitting up his heart and diverting energy from the necessary work. He is losing time with replacing the genuine desire, which he should have, namely the desire to fulfill his duties as well as he can, by the futile desire to be what he can not be."\textsuperscript{31}

The conscientious choice of the vocation on the basis of talents and interests is, of course, a prerequisite for such an attitude. Unless we want to deny the individual's right of decision, we can only advocate the responsibility of all educators, parents, and teachers to help a young person to become aware of his potential, and to assist him also in the utmost development of it.

Only then can he make a decision, his own decision, to which he will see himself bound. It is true, man has often the faculties for a variety of vocations, but he can fill only one, and find a fulfillment

\textsuperscript{31} \textit{ibid.}, p. 193.
only when this one is brought to perfection. Much of our young people's perfection stems from frustration, the lack of success in work. Fulfillment comes only with this success, when one sees or feels an achievement.

The advantage of de Sales' philosophy over Calvin's is this realistic view of human nature. There is no denying the fact of human existence being a datum, but the emphasis on man's own dignity and faculty to make this existence into his very own. The rigorous discipline of the Calvinists is a striking contrast to the insistence on love. We will see below, in the discussion of Don Bosco's pedagogical thought, how this perspective can be realized in education.

An attempt to synthesize the two views may be seen in Utopia by Thomas More (1516). In this description of the a land named "Nowhere", the objective and aim of all education was the reasonable and natural life of man who finds happiness in physical and spiritual harmony, in serving the community, and in the reverence of the highest being that is beyond all comprehension.
Reason ... admonishes us to lead our lives as happy and free from sorrows as possible, and to help all people to achieve the same, according to our natural common state." 32

The role of the state is to guarantee this harmonious and happy existence. All education is thus controlled by the state, which again is based on reason. In contrast to the usually collectivistic views of a perfect state in other utopian solutions, Thomas' Utopia has a genuinely humanistic and subsidiary state. The lumen rationis, a typical concept of the humanists, permeates all aspects of life. Schools are compulsory for all. They do not only affect the intellectual potential of the children, however. Already in childhood, for example, both boys and girls are trained in agricultural work, from which nobody can be excused. " The other trades are learned too, but only one by each man or woman. The latter performs only the easier tasks, as she is weaker, spinning wool or weaving linen... Usually the men learn the trade of their fathers, as this is the natural

tendency. But if one discovers a leaning towards some other activity, he may be adopted by a family who practises this trade of his liking ... By this way it is possible that one can learn two trades, ... of which he may practise the one of his preference unless the community would need the other more than the one." 33

The attitude of the Utopians toward work is described by Thomas as "appreciating the time of leisure, doing the work with industry and perseverance, when necessary, but not beyond necessity..." 34

"The state authorities do not bother the people with unnecessary work and against their will, as the Constitution of the State has only one thing in view: to guarantee happiness by securing as much free time for the cultivation of the spirit, as the common good allows, and not to tie down the citizens to servile work." 35

This is possible only with a social order which Hythlodeus, the narrator in Utopia, calls the only order that deserves its name. There is no contrast between city and country. All have to work in the fields for a time. The whole economy is what could be called

33 Thomas More, Utopia, p. 54.
34 ibid., p. 78.
35 ibid., p. 58.
a "communism of production and consumption", where money is not needed with plenty of supply of all goods. Thus the apotheosis of work and the constant "expansion" of productivity and income are unknown to the Utopians. They work in order to live: six hours a day with many "holidays" in between. It is, however, everybody's obligation to work; idling is not allowed, neither is over-time or "moonlighting".

These ideas have had much of an influence upon later educational thought. A clear reflection of some of them is found in John Ludovicus Vives (1492 - 1540) and, later on, in Johann Amos Comenius (1592 - 1670), perhaps even in the New Atlantis of Francis Bacon (1577). It is true, Thomas More's book was not the first of utopian writings in the field of education and politics. Plato's Politēia (Republic) counts in this category. Especially the Civitas Solis of Tommaso Campanella (1602) picks up Plato's ideas again. Combining them with More's, he proposes a grandiose attempt to establish a state in which

36 Vives was a personal friend of More, his educational thought was much influenced by him; from Vives go direct lines to Comenius, especially his Informatorium Maternum, which resembles to Vives' De Institutione Feminae Christianae.
a total unity of power, love, and wisdom should be established. What strikes the reader of the *Civitas Solis* (i.e. the "State of the Sun") is the concept of equality of manual workers and the intellectuals at a time where the gap between these two was unsurmountable.\(^{37}\)

The American utopian Edward Bellamy should centuries later pick up some of Campanella's ideas in his *Looking Backward: 2000 - 1887*.\(^{38}\)

The old dream of mankind to know everything and to become free from the uncontrollable that keeps man busy all his life, is ultimately the motive behind these attempts to establish the balance between work and the freedom to pursue one's own interests. As Vergil put it already in his famous verse:

"Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas
Quique metus omnes, et inexorabile fatum,
Subjecit pedibus, strepitumque Achreontis avari."\(^{39}\)

---


\(^{39}\)English: "Happy the one who knows the causes of all things, he puts under his feet all fear and the inexorable fate, and the noisy avidity of hell."
The desire to be the master of the world must be deep-rooted in man's nature. From cave-man to the contemporary American we see the attempts to overcome the unpredictable, to secure existence against the un-foreseen, even to rebel against the limitations of human nature. Man will never cease to gain this freedom, but will he ever reach the point where he could say:

"Occupavi te, fortuna, atque cepi; omnesque aditus tuos interclusi, ut ad me adspirare non potes!"\(^{40}\)

Will he ever put his feet over the powers of the world and check on the whims of fate? The endeavor can go as far as to the "Non serviam" of a Lucifer, or the quick response of an Adam and Eve to the Serpent's promise to know and to be free from the authority of God. We saw this again in the claim of autonomy of the Renaissance, and still encounter it in the rebellion of our younger generations against authority and "establishment". With a perseverance unending mankind has tried to bring light into the darkness

\(^{40}\) Cicero, Tusculanae Disputationes, V.9. (ca. 50 BC): "I have you, oh fate, in my power and keep you; all doors will be closed to you, so you cannot do any harm to me!" Rousseau quotes this verse in his Emile (Book I).
of the unknown, unveiling the sacred
and seemingly untouchable, discovering
remote lands and hidden laws in nature.

"The natural demands upon man are,
that he first understand all things,
second he can rule over all things,
and himself... and third, that he
and all things be related to God
as the Source..."41

We cannot say that in this endeavor to
"rule over all things" man had succeeded
to rule himself. Science, and with it,
industry have brought so many changes in
man's life and his view of the world, that
we do no longer dare to speak of a "natural
demand" as to the three points of Comenius.
The development of the medieval city into
the industrial conglomerate is the best
illustration of this development.
As we saw, the Middle Ages attempted, and to
a certain degree achieved the restoration
of the unity of Lebensraum and Arbeitsraum,
and with this, the reconciliation of the
working class with the so-called free. Each
one, even the poor and sick had his place

---

41 Johann Amos Comenius, Didactica Magna,
in Ulich, Three Thousand Years of Educational
Wisdom, p. 341.
in the city. While the latter could not belong to one of the "classes" of society, he belonged nevertheless to the city. It was, for example, impossible for a crippled person, to enter apprenticeship with any trade, nor could he become a religious, in the medieval city. Unless he had some job as a servant, or a place within a family, the poor depended on begging or receiving alms from the people. It was in fulfillment of Christ's mandate that a well-organized system of charities took care of most of the poor. (The so-called "hospices" of the Guilds, universities, and monasteries were such charitable institutions.) It is not true that the poor were dying in the streets, etc. Nor were there that many of the poor in the city. It was not possible for others to move into a city; one had to be born in this particular place, to be a "cityzen". So the number was relatively stable and the society could handle the problem of poverty. This changed drastically with the disintegration of the feudal system and the opening up of the city gates to the people from the country. The growing needs for workers in the new "factories" recruited mainly people from the country, who for the first time in their lives were free. The cry
"the air of a city makes you free!" was often heard among these people who before were serfs on the farms, with no rights to move away, not even to marry, and with no pay except for an allowance that was paid to them once a year. Now they flocked into the city, where they would have work and daily pay, "own" living quarters which were provided by the employers (and which were nothing more but shabby shacks or grey barracks, but for them it was their first home, their place!), and especially the freedom to marry, to be on his own. As long as the factory would employ these people, everything was fine, but more often than not it happened that the place had to close down because a competitor won the market, or a machine replaced many hands, or the worker got sick, maybe lost his health at work..., then he would not only lose his income but also

42 Up to this time it was common in some European countries, that under the system of primogeniture, the eldest son would inherit the farm, while the other brothers and sisters had to remain as servants, unless they could find another job outside. The economic conditions would not allow for many families to live on the farm, so these people could not marry, nor did they receive a wage. The yearly allowance was usually paid after the harvest, on St. Martin's Day (November 11), and often used up immediately on the carnival or market which was held on this particular day.
his place: he had to move out from the apartment. Now it showed that the freedom had its other sides too: unprepared for the unexpected he faced disaster. Back on the farm, he would not have to worry about these things. Even when he was sick, he could have remained on the farm. But now, with his family, he could never return.

This was the problem of the industrial city: it faced, all of a sudden, the additional burden of poor, who could not return to their original place, who had nothing to do, nor a place to live. The existing charitable institutions could not handle these crowds, nor were the Bürger willing to help these "have-nots" and "good-for-nothings". As they could neither write nor read, not even learned a trade, what could these people do to get out of this misery? The pressure in the city rose as these contrasts came up.

43 This German word for "citizen" became the French "bourgeois" which, at that time, began to be used in a sens péjoratif. The "established" citizenry looked down upon the rootless "rabble" and called it "proletariat". Marxism's terminology received its meaning from these situations in the early industrialized cities of the Continent.
This was the situation at the time of a Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-78) and Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827), both of whom saw that man did not succeed in putting everything under his feet, but rather got under the wheels of the machinery he had created. Their concern was to find a way out of the crisis, which threatened not only to "corrupt" (Rousseau), but even destroy man in his essence (Pestalozzi).

The starting point for Rousseau was the fact that man's condition was everything but human in his time. He saw the roots of the problem in the corrupting influence of society. The beginning sentence of his famous book Émile shows his view:

"Everything is good as it comes forth from the hands of the creator; everything corrupts under the hands of man."44

The only way, the French philosopher saw was a return to nature: "Rétour à la nature!"

The insight was, in fact, not far from the truth: that man cannot get away from his nature without suffering harm. The question

44Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Émile, ou de l'éducation (Amsterdam: Jean Néaulme, 1767).

The following quotes are from the selection in Ulich, Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom.
arising is only, what one means by this "human nature". If it is the purely "natural" state of man, as in a re-constructed original condition at the beginning of man's appearance on this earth, then it is a fiction. Man never was merely "natural" like an animal. If it means, however, the complex quality of man as a psycho-somatic unity, with all its faculties and limitations, then the "natural education" would have to take into consideration, for example, that the child is not a "little adult". In Rousseau's thought we have both, the misconception of a primeval stage of natural "innocence", and the concern for the acknowledgement of man's, specifically of the child's state. At a time when children really were regarded as quasi-adults, who had to work and behave like adults, and who were taught in the schools regardless of their natural condition, this was revolutionary. A strong belief in the

power of Nature which lets things grow and develop if only harmful influences are kept out characterize Rousseau's concept of a "natural education". It is, however, not exactly the "laissez faire - laissez aller" philosophy which some people obviously have read into Émile. The following should clarify this:

"Remember, I do not advise you to acquire a talent, but a trade; a mechanical art, in the exercise of which the hands are more employed than the head; an art which never will lead you to a fortune, but by which you may be enabled to live without one... If I have made myself understood hitherto, the reader will understand, that, while I have accustomed my pupil to corporeal exercise and manual labor, I have given him insensibly a taste for reflection and meditation; in order to counterbalance that indolence which would be the natural result of his indifference for the opinions of mankind, and the tranquillity of his passions, it is necessary that he work like a peasant, and think like a philosopher, lest he become idle as a savage. The great secret of education is, to make the exercises of the body and the mind serve as a relaxation to each other." 46

46 Émile, book III. (From Ulich, p. 416.)
Rousseau's merit is having directed the view of educators toward reality while their eyes were too much on ideals. The paradox is that his *Émile* as a whole is utopian, proposing an ideal too, which is far beyond reality. Seeing this educational utopia in the context of his *Contrat Social*, a political utopia where the spirituality of a common will makes each citizen work and contribute to the whole, one can understand his concern for the future of mankind. He observed the growing number of rootless, jobless, uneducated people in the cities. These masses were not able nor willing to share this *volonté générale* which for him was the base of any society. But with all his concern, Rousseau saw no place for the "canaille", the "rabble" or proletariat, in his society of the perfect state.

This is exactly where Pestalozzi begins, when Rousseau quits: The Swiss educator wants to help this very "canaille". He wanted to help the people to get up again, and to clog "the sources of evil". 47

---

47 "Ich will dem lieben Volke aufhelfen" (= I want to help up my dear people), and "Auferziehung" (= education that is upward bound) are often occurring in his works.
In his main work, which is not even his best known, Pestalozzi tries to show the sources of evil which he sees among the people: the *Evening Hour of a Hermit* 48 points to the departure of human nature as the beginning of all the misery which man suffers in those times. The city with its artificial life style, and all the problems that came up with the nascence of industry, was running counter to this "innermost nature" of man, to which Pestalozzi refers so often in these meditations. He most likely knew Rousseau's view of the city, as it is reflected in *Émile*:

"Men are not to be crowded together in anthills, but scattered over the earth to till it. The more they are massed together the more corrupt they become. Disease and vice are the results of overcrowded cities.... Man is devoured: by his own towns,.... his strength lost in the foul air of the crowded cities...." 49

48 Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, *Die Abendstunde eines Einsiedlers*, 1780. A good selection from this sum of Pestalozzi's philosophical-educational thought is in Ulich, *Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom*, pp. 480 sq.

But while Rousseau held that children should be brought up on the country-side, Pestalozzi saw that this was not always possible. People have to live in the cities, and as cities are made by men, they can also be for men. It is true, for him the city was not yet the ugly moloch like a Paris appeared to Rousseau; Pestalozzi knew the smaller and relatively quiet cities of Switzerland. But he saw that the roots were not in the number of people living together. Rather was the source of the evil that these people did not have a home.

"The sphere of knowledge from which man in his individual station can receive happiness is limited; its sphere begins closely around him, around his own self and his nearest relationships; from there his knowledge will expand, and while expanding it must regulate itself according to this firm centre of all the powers of truth."

"... Man's domestic relationships are the first and foremost ones of nature. Man toils in his vocation and bears the burden of communal duties in order to enjoy his home in harmony and peace. To this peaceful enjoyment man's education for his vocation and for his social rank must be subordinated. Hence the home is the foundation of a pure and natural education of mankind. Hence the home is the school
of morality and of the state...
Whoever departs from this natural order and lays artificial emphasis on class and vocational education, or training for rule or for service, leads man aside from the enjoyment of the most natural blessings to a sea of hidden dangers!"\textsuperscript{50}

This is a clear demand that the sphere of work must be integrated, even "subordinated" to the sphere of life. While industrial work and the "communal duties" do not always allow this integration and subordination, man tries to find himself and to be himself in his home. To understand what Pestalozzi meant here, we have to know that the English word "home" is only a poor translation of Pestalozzi's concept of Heimat. For the Swiss, Heimat is not only his home, the house in which he is at home, but also the entirety of his home-land, with its mountains and rivers, the flowers and animals, people and their language, traditions, beliefs and superstitions. It is man's own "world" in which he grew up, and which, for the rest of his life, will remain the point of refer-

\textsuperscript{50} Evening Hour of a Hermit, in Ulich, op.cit., pp. 481-82, and pp. 484-85.
for most of what he will encounter.\footnote{Cfr. supra, p.29.}

It is important to note the role of man's subjectivity in his relationship to the Heimat, to the world. With Pestalozzi we have now a voice that insists on the relevance of subjectivity for education. For him this education is not only happening in the home, or in the school, but also in the cities where the masses are living who have lost their Heimat and thus need most urgently need education. When we read the following we almost think of a concerned contemporary of ours, describing the problems of our cities in the late twentieth century:

"Perversion of the first fundamental relations to your environment; murderous and oppressive power of tyranny, privation of all enjoyments of truth and happiness, unnatural absence of general national enlightenment concerning the fundamental interests and conditions of man, how your heavy shadow darkens the world!" \footnote{Evening Hour of a Hermit, p.483.}

The solution which Pestalozzi proposes is
not a "rétour" but rather the establishment of the natural relationship between man and man, and man and his world. This is not a reversal of mankind's development but -- as we would see it now with the concepts of a Teilhard de Chardin -- a step forward.53 Education had to encounter the development of the cities into something totally new. While the old structures disintegrated at a fast rate, movements of the population went on as they were unseen since the Great Migration in the 4th and 5th centuries AD. Just as there were no new structures to replace the vanishing, there was no place for the new crowds in the old cities. The example of a medium sized city in the south of Germany shows how fast the population grew: The city of Ulm had around 10,000 inhabitants from the Middle Ages to 1811. Then the number jumped to 43,000 in 1899.54 Most of the people were uneducated and especially inexperienced in the urban way of life. Crammed into make-shift quarters, which

53 See the discussion of Teilhard's concept of "convergence" below, p. 198.

54 Festschrift 1100 Jahre Ulm (Ulm: Ebner Verlag, 1954), p. 103.
were quickly set up by industry or the city, to accommodate the workers and their families, these people were used, for example, to throw refuse out of the windows, as you can do it on the country where the manure heap is right in front of the house. In the city, however, this added only to the growth of the slums.55

The pressures came mostly from younger people. As they had neither the basic education nor the necessary skills, they represented a highly unstable element. But there were also the trained workers, or journeymen among the younger ones, who preferred to work in the factories. Here they were free from the authority of a master, they could occasionally move up to better positions, etc., but not all of them were prepared for the "freedom" of urban life. A young priest, who had been a travelling worker too, made this problem his main concern: Adolf Kolping (1813-65), one of the most significant figures on the educational scene of the mid-nineteenth century in Germany.

While most of the philosophers and educators of that time were busy with writing utopian solutions to these problems, this priest wanted to do something, "right here, and right now". He did not "look backward" like an Edward Bellamy, or into a land of dreams in the future, but started with the given facts and problems of his immediate environment.

Coming from a poor family himself, Kolping knew from first-hand experience what it meant to be a worker. As a shoemaker journeyman he had travelled and came into contact with the problems of industrialization, specifically among the young workers. His point of departure was the insight that the source of evil did not lie in the machines, or in the injustice of the so-called capitalists, but in the workers themselves, who were uneducated, rootless, and thus falling victim so easily to the exploitation of

56 Edward Bellamy's utopia Looking Backward (1887) and Ferdinand Amersin's Land der Freiheit (Graz: 1874) were two of the utopian solutions which appeared in the last century, some years after Kolping's time.
the ruthless and powerful. Only the inability to cope with the new situations make the people frustrated. So he points to a realistic solution which rejects any utopian talk:

"Tätige Liebe heilt alle Wunden, Blosse Worte mehren nur den Schmerz!" 57

For Kolping, "education is life and presupposes life", and with this in mind he approaches the social and educational problem by pointing to a Christian perspective which puts life, human life in dignity, into the foreground. Man must be prepared to lead his life in the new situations created by industry, and which were quite different from the old life in a stable order. Now man is threatened in his relationships to each other and to his work, even to the whole of his world. To go against these threats is the first objective of education which, according to Kolping, should lead to "the good father in the family, who is responsible and cares for his household; the good worker who masters his trade and renders good quality in work; and the good citizen who sees his responsibility towards society and his country." 58

57 "Active love is healing all wounds, while words can only increase the pains!" The motto of Kolping.

58 Adolf Kolping, Der Gesellenverein (Köln: 1849), p. 23.
It is significant to note here, that Kolping did not propose schools or an educational curriculum. He started with the people at hand: with the young workers and their families in the city of Elberfeld, an industrial city in the Ruhr district of Germany, where he was a chaplain. His "Gesellenverein" should not only gather the people for lectures and happy get-togethers, but, in the first line, to help them have a place to live, to find jobs, and, of course, and educational program that would lead to the aforementioned three aims. The place where the people met developed into a center for young workers, with the family-like atmosphere that would provide the "roots" in the anonymous and alienating atmosphere of the city. These roots were, however, not only the "cosy home", but more the

59 The word says "Journeymen's Union" but it would be more adequately translated by "Young Workers' Club". The so-called Kolping-Houses can be compared to the YMCA hotels with all their activities and programs.

60 There are Kolping Associations in USA, especially in the Eastern States. Chicago has a "Kolping House" at 5826 North Elston Avenue.
awareness of belonging to a Stand in society. This concept appears as a key word in the social encyclicals of the Popes later on, and a central issue in the contemporary discussions of the social problems, especially in Europe. While conditions in America were and still are different, there is no equivalent to the word Stand in English. It is important here to clarify this concept, as it touches upon a particular perspective which places work as an existential determinant of human life.

The word "Stand" is usually translated with "status" or "class". Especially the latter is misleading since its specific connotation came from Marx and the socialists. Medieval society was built up by Stände (plural of Stand), i.e. strata or groups of society: the religious, nobility, and the citizens. The rural population, living outside of the city, did not belong to any of these groups, nor did the crippled and the poor in the city. They did not "stand" on the foundations^61 which make up this status: the common

---

61The English word "standing" is connected with the German Stand.
interests and rights, the common way of life, common responsibilities, and an awareness of belonging together. 62 The rise of the citizenry to power and the claim of even the peasants to be entitled to determine the res publica in the time of the French Revolution laid the ground of our present conditions. While we do no longer have the privileges of certain Stände over others, most of our people are still born into a certain socio-economic group or level of society which they can transcend only with efforts and under favorable conditions. More often, however, one has to remain in the

---

62 Pope Pius XI, Quadragesimo Anno (1931), uses the Latin word "ordo" for Stand or "class": "order" as it denotes also the religious life of the monks where all of the above mentioned factors apply. (Q.A. 81.)


John XXIII, Mater et Magistra (1961), speaks of collegia seu corpora, i.e. social structures based on a common activity (M.M. 65).

respective "class". The workers, for example, live under similar and rather uniform conditions which may even be described as a cultural pattern. As soon as some sort of "consciousness" or culture arises, an awareness of belonging to this particular group with a distinguishable way-of-life-pattern, perhaps even a pride in belonging to this "class", the individual begins to contribute to it by creating some "spirituality". This is exactly what the concept of Stand contains. When Kolping speaks of the Arbeiterstand, he points to these two aspects: the objectively "given" of the workers' condition, and the subjective awareness of one's place in this condition. Marx speaks of these two aspects also, but his solution is the establishment of one class by levelling out all differences. In this case, man is not asked to contribute but to function, not "standing" but "marching", marching in line, is the ideal of Marxism. In sharp contradiction to such a view, Adolf Kolping insists on the active and responsible participation of the worker in culture, when he speaks of "man's
life and work as cult". 63

It is tragic that Europe should have been influenced more by the one-sided and utopian doctrines of a Marx than by a Kolping. The same applies for the American scene, however! The uniformity that was in the minds of a Horace Mann with his "Common School" as the "great equalizer and balance wheel of society", 64 should win over the much wider concepts of culture as reflected in the Transcendentalists' view or even in the "Social Gospel" of a Rauschenbusch, who wanted not so much "equality", but a "progressive unity of mankind, but with the maintenance of individual liberty, and the opportunity (of nations) to work out their own peculiarities and ideals". 65


The relevance of Kolping's ideas becomes more visible nowadays where we have become aware of the dangers of standardization in human life. Instead of having arrived at the realization of a dream, where no crimes, and no egoistic exploitation takes place, we have the crass opposite with our ghettos and high crime rates. Today it seems much more difficult to escape the ghetto than it was in the Middle Ages to move from one Stand into another. (One may recall that it was possible for a boy of the "lower class" to become a religious and even climb up the ladder in the church's hierarchy!) We see also, how important the "good father of the family", the "good worker who masters his craft and renders good quality", and the "good citizen" is, which Kolping wanted to educate. Our times made it clear that one cannot mold every child into a stereo-type "middle class American", but that no free society can do without the responsible citizen who sees his responsibility in the family, at work and in the social obligations, while he may, at the same time, belong to a "sub-culture" or Stand of his choice or by his existence.
The only alternative to such a plurality would be uniformity in a totalitarian monolith. 66

One cannot deny that the condition of the workers in the last century was the genuine concern of Karl Marx (1818-83). He observed how people had to sell themselves as commodity to the factories, and how they became work-animals at the work-benches and machines. He attempted by his philosophy to redeem the people from this misery and lead man into the "communist society, where each one does no longer have an exclusive circle of activity, but the chance to get trained in any branch of industry; where society is regulating the production, and thus enables me to do this today, and that tomorrow, as, for example, to go hunting in the morning, fishing in the afternoon, and to raise cattle in the evening, then criticize just as I like it, without being a hunter, or fisherman, or farmer, or critic..."

"... (in which) also the servile subjugation of the individuals under the yoke of division of labor has disappeared, and with it the dichotomy of intellectual and physical..."

work; when work will no longer be a means for life, but the very first desire of life; ... then society can write on its banners: Each one as he can, to each one as he wants!67

A polytechnical education should enable everybody to achieve this freedom to take any job he wants. The practicality of such an education has been doubted by critics of Marx, and we need not discuss this any longer. Rather should we see the opposite of the Stand with its stability and continuity, which corresponds much more to man's desire to be "something". What is at the end of such a proposal like Marx' is the emancipation of man from his Stand and thus the radical separation of work and life. This is, however, exactly what Marx wanted to resolve! How can man, "who sees his own work as hostile and alien power outside of himself" 68 be redeemed from this alienation when he is driven even deeper into this split?

Marx does not go into details of an educational program that would lead to "the association in which the free development of the individual is the guarantee for the development of all..." but we have the proposition of a "polytechnical education" which would have the elementary academic curriculum plus physical training combined with productive labor, for every child.

"An early combination of productive labor with education is one of the most potent means for the transformation of present day society." This would be nothing else but child labor! Indeed, Marx is against the abolition of it, but he would provide measures to prevent harm in the children. Such an education would transcend the narrow classrooms and society would become the "school" in which the individuals realize.

---


70 ibid. Marx saw the necessity to have children trained in productive work as early as possible, yet he saw that the existing conditions went too far, at his time.
their human potential, in other words, where they become truly human beings. It will, however, remain a utopia. The efforts of the Soviet Union to realize this "paradise" have shown that the "schools of the future" do not produce the free man "united with his work, as he reaps the fruits of it as part of the collective which plans, owns, and operates the machinery of life production".\textsuperscript{71} Marx and Engels, of course, rejected the notion of being utopians by emphasizing that they had overcome utopism by "science". We do not buy this any longer, because their whole system of Marxism is basically unscientific. One would rather speak of an eschatological prophecy with an underlying pattern that is similar to the chiliastic beliefs of early Christianity or of the medieval mendicants. This is especially clear in Marx' description of history as a "World Drama" in five acts: The original stage of "Urkommunismus" with man's innocence. He lives in complete harmony with himself and with nature from which he is dependent.

Then happens the "original sin": the introduction of private property, and with it, inequality, religion, the family and the state. The corruption has begun; it leads to the third stage: the climax of corruption which is capitalism. Redemption is brought by the proletarian revolution, which, eventually, will bring the "new paradise, the higher level of communism" with its original state of innocence -- act five. This is evidently a religious pattern adopted by Marx, maybe unaware of it. There are striking parallels in Fichte's Betrachtungen über das gegenwärtige Zeitalter (published in 1805), and in Rousseau's Contrat Social (1762). It seems that the dream of the past two centuries was to find a new "religio" as a replacement for the old religion, a new "tie" which holds man and society together. That it always had to go at the expense of human freedom was the tragic error, which culminated in Hegel's view of the state as the only "complete person". The denial of man's personal integrity and freedom is the root of Marxism's danger. Many of the educators of the early twentieth century did not see this when they proposed similar solutions to the problem of work in human
existed. Among them was also a John Dewey, in America (1859-1952).

Dewey would probably never have admitted that his whole philosophy is more or less the search for meaning of human existence.\(^{72}\) His concern was similar to the one of Marx: to show a way out of the crisis in which man found himself with industrialized cities, an increasingly complex society, and the disintegrating moral structures. While Marx saw in work the "master value" that would bring salvation ("labor is both the source and the goal of human history"), Dewey wanted to solve the problem by showing man how to control his world rather than being controlled by it. But this solution is somewhat circular: Dewey demands that first society be changed, so that man can find it possible to develop freely. But one may ask, how society can change without previous changes in man himself. The answer may be that society has to provide the free room in which man can realize his own existence, and thus change, but this is exactly what complex society does not

\(^{72}\) *ibid.*, p.66.
allow. The same circular thought appears again when Dewey speaks of work. For him, work is the instrument to control the environment. As the environment and man are in constant interaction, the question is, whether man is, in his activities, always reacting to the demands of nature, i.e. the environment, or, by his acts, challenging the reactions of nature, to which he must re-act again, in order not to be controlled by these powers.

In *Democracy and Education* we find an important statement which shows Dewey's concern, and which gives us a hint as to his solution: "If the mass of mankind has usually found in its industrial occupations nothing but evils which had to be endured for the sake of maintaining existence, the fault is not in the occupations, but in the conditions under which they are carried on. The continually increasing importance of economic factors in contemporary life makes it more needed that the education should reveal their scientific content and their social value. For in schools occupations are not carried on for pecuniary gain but for their own content. Freed from extraneous associations and from the pressure of wage-earning, they supply modes of experience which are intrinsically valuable; they are truly liberalizing in quality."73

---

The distinction between work and occupation is also found in Marx' proposal of a "polytechnical education", which he believes to have the power of developing the human personality:

"The success of the clauses (of the British Factory Act of 1864) proved for the first time the possibility of combining education and gymnastics with manual labor... From the factory system budded... the germ of education of the future, and education, that will in the case of every child over a given age combine productive labor with instruction and gymnastics, not only as one of the methods of adding to the efficiency of production, but as the only method of producing fully developed human beings."\textsuperscript{74}

Can we see in this the attempt to resolve the polarity of perfectio operis and perfectio operantis? There are doubts, whether man really is developed into a full personality by work. Can work really be a vehicle for an understanding of values and patterns of social life, thus "humanizing" the student? Dewey is whole-heartedly convinced that this is so: "The great thing to keep

\textsuperscript{74} Karl Marx, Das Kapital (Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1957); p. 199.
in mind, then, regarding the introduction into schools of various forms of active occupation, is that through them the entire spirit of the school is renewed... To do this means to make each one of our schools an embryonic community life,... permeated throughout with the spirit of art, history, and science. When the school introduces and trains each child in the society into membership within such a little community, saturating him with the spirit of service, and providing him with the instruments of effective self-direction, we shall have the deepest and best guarantee of a larger society which is worthy, lovely, and harmonious."75

So far we can agree, particularly when we see service as one of the central motives in man's activities which lead him to a fulfillment. The difference seems to lie in the perspective when Christian philosophy speaks of service and when Dewey uses this concept. That there is in reality a very deep-going distinction becomes obvious as soon as we ask Dewey about his image of man, how he sees the human personality.

Unfortunately John Dewey never came up with a clear theory of personality, but we can gather his view from various passages in his many works. One hint is found in his Pedagogic Creed: "All education proceeds by the participation of the individual in the social consciousness of the race . . . the only true education comes through the stimulation of the child's powers by the demands of the social situations in which he finds himself." 76

Here the behavioristic view of man comes clearly out, when we hear the terms "stimulation" by "situations" and "demands". Parallels to the mechanistic psychology of a Watson are obvious:

"The active side precedes the passive in the development of the child nature; that expression comes before conscious impression; that the muscular development precedes the sensory; that movements come before conscious sensations; I believe that consciousness is essentially motor or impulsive . . . ." 77

This sounds almost like the following:

"Thought processes are really (sic!) motor habits in the larynx. Improvements . . . in these habits are brought


77 ibid., pp. 635 sq.
about in the same way that such changes are produced in other motor habits." 78

When the emotions in man are explained only in terms of reflexes of actions, and thus man is reduced to a mere mechanism that follows the patterns of stimulus response, then the above mentioned "service" and "self-direction" can no longer mean the same as the inner-directed acts of man for the other, carried by the power of *eros*, but rather describe only outer-directed re-actions to the demands of society or the environment. As soon as we do no longer accept the transcendentals ("the good, the true, and the beautiful") as an a priori in human existence, we have only the alternative of having some outside agent define what is right and good and beautiful. It would be quite justifiable then, that society, or an "almighty state", or a Big Brother,

will tell you someday what is good and what is true. Then we would have exactly what Soviet-Bolshevism has practised, and what Orwell saw in his book *1984*.

One would do injustice to John Dewey to contend that he wanted to lead mankind into totalitarianism. The very opposite was his aim, but one cannot ignore the dangers in his thought. If followed consistently, his propositions would inevitably lead to collectivism. The roots of his error lie in the neglect of the fundamental axiom, which says that man can never be absorbed or possessed by a social institution: "homo non ordinatur ad communitatem politicam secundum se totam et secundum omnia sua." 79 Thus, education cannot be exclusively "proceeding by the participation of the individual in the social consciousness" 80.

In this we have gained insights through the history of the first five decades of this


80 supra, p.111.
century, which Dewey could not foresee in his earlier works. He lived until the early Fifties, but it seems that his system of thought was set, with no place for radical changes that would have considered the rapid changes in the political and economic structures of the whole world. His whole concept of science is essentially Newtonian; and this framework of thought has, already at the time of Dewey's life, been broken through by an Einstein and Planck in their revolutionary new concepts. 81

We will see in the following, however, that already around the end of the last century, that is, at the time of Dewey's "best years", there were educators who ventured the break-through into a more open-ended concept of science, and with it, of man. There is especially the German Georg Kerschensteiner, who perhaps was influenced by Dewey. 82 Kerschensteiner (1854-1932) was Superintendent of the Munich


82 Kerschensteiner travelled in America in 1910. At that time most of his important works had already appeared, but contacts were quite possible before this year.
schools around the last years of the nineteenth century. His concern was for the education of the young generation in an urban society with its socio-economic problems. So it seems that he looked into the same direction as Marx and Dewey. Especially when we see the terms "work" and "state" so often in Kerschensteiner's writings:

"... it is not possible to consider education without first considering the type of state and civilization in which the education is to be carried out! The process and the ideals of education are determined to a large extent by the social, political, and economic circumstances of that civilization in which the pupils are educated." 83

When Kerschensteiner became the director of the school system in Munich (1895), the elementary and other schools were in the same situation as Dewey had deplored: bent on training the pupil in purely academic subjects with a curriculum that had become so crammed with material that none of it...

could be studied in depth. There were directives from the year 1803 which were supposed to be the official objectives of education in Bavaria. But Kerschensteiner did not find much of them realized. He wholeheartedly agreed, when it was demanded that "man's intellectual training must bring him nearer to his general calling of pure morality, otherwise this teaching would produce harmful knowledge. In addition to this, the instruction must take into account man's special calling; that is to say, it must make him useful. Certain technical skills are needed by everyone, and for this reason it is imperative to set up trade schools for boys and girls, which would work in cooperation with academic schools. All youngsters should attend these schools..."

But the superintendent becomes more explicit in the statement of the educational aims: For him the first goal of education must be "to produce a society consisting as far as possible of persons who have independence of

---

84 Kerschensteiner quoted these official guidelines in his Betrachtungen zur Theorie des Lehrplans (München: Gerber Verlag, 1899) p. 13.
of mind, a harmonious development, and who are morally free."85

We have an even more specific hint as to what the person should be in this context:

"To be a person in its ideal sense one must first be a useful person. The useful person is one who acknowledges his own work and that of his countrymen, and who possesses the will and strength to carry it out."86

This sounds almost like the earlier mentioned ideas of Marx and Dewey, but the emphasis is here on the own decision of the individual on the basis of his "calling". This is the key concept in Kerschensteiner's pedagogical thought;87 we may see in it the continuation of the concept of Stand, even though the word itself does not occur in his writings. The way work is conceived here shows that this human activity is more than just industrial physical efforts. The German concept Arbeit contains both


86 G. Kerschensteiner, "Berufs- oder Allgemeinbildung?" in Pädagogische Reform, 1904: I, 34.

87 "Beruf" is the German word for "calling" or vocation. It means not only the activity of a specific trade but also the attitude and the consciousness to belong to a specific group that works in this field. Cfr. Stand, supra p. 99.
mental and physical powers. This is important to keep in mind, to understand Kerschensteiner's main work, *Die Arbeitsschule*. An early translation into English, which appeared already one year after the original edition, has the title *The Idea of the Industrial School*, but this is a misleading translation. It is exactly the overcoming of an "industrial" schooling what Kerschensteiner has in aim. He puts "Arbeitsschule" in contrast to the "Lernschule", which was nothing but cramming material in the eyes of the concerned educator:

"Character is not gained by reading books, or listening to sermons, but by continuous and steadily applied work!" 90

This sounds almost like Dewey. In fact, the fundamental insight, that children learn by doing is the basis of this view. In the

---

88G. Kerschensteiner, Der Begriff der Arbeitsschule (München: - 1912.)


following we have an even more striking parallel, but also a hint that points beyond the framework of Deweyan thought:

"It is usually irrelevant what form educative work should take. There appears only one necessary condition, namely, that the worker can perform it cheerfully. This is mostly the case when the pupil is interested in his work. It is unimportant where work disciplines a man, whether at the study desk or at the easel, at the bench or at the loom, out in the fields or in the workshop, or in the service of practical charity. For there is one thing common to all upright, serious work, namely that it exercises the power of will, on which are based the most important civic virtues - diligence, care, conscientiousness, perseverance, attention, honesty, patience, self-control, and devotion to a firm distinterested aim."\(^1\)

The unequivocal emphasis on virtue as a central element in work seemed to foresee our contemporary conditions where mechanized work no longer requires primarily a skill but above all the virtues which Kerschensteiner listed above: more and more do we have to shift from  

\(^1\) *ibid.*., p. 39.  
concrete skills towards abstract virtues in the training of workers. An example is the work of the air controllers at a big airport or of the workers at highly sophisticated machines. These people do not so much exercise physical efforts but moral and character traits. What counts here are the virtues of absolute reliability and concentration. This cannot be learned from texts, but must be practised, especially in group work, as Kerschensteiner (and with him, Dewey) pointed out: "By doing this type of work the individual learns how to subordinate himself to others, and how to help his weaker and less talented companions. Here too, he first comes to understand that his own interests can, and should, merge into the interests of others." 92

The fact that Kerschensteiner's plans have become reality not only in Germany but other European countries, while Dewey did not succeed in shaping all of American schools, may lie in the vagueness of many of Dewey's propositions which pointed into exactly the same direction, but left room for so many mis-inter-

92 Ibid., pp. 69-70.
pretations. The most fundamental difference lies, however, in the metaphysical basis of Kerschensteiner's concepts: for him man was not only living in the secular environment, and his "calling" was not only a call from society or the environment, but also a religious concept. Man's deepest roots are not in the political but in the religious, and if we want, the emotional dimensions. That this is true may have been proved by the so-called "economical miracle" of Western Europe after the disastrous end of World War II. This "miracle" was possible only because the majority of the people were not totally frustrated and discouraged, but able to work reliably under extremely adverse conditions. A social psychology or environmental theories cannot explain this phenomenon. It were in reality these virtues of perseverance and responsibility, and the faith in a "calling", which were necessary. There was no "democratic ideal" which could have stood for a goal, nor the "common faith" of solidarity or whatever. The population was torn apart by the collapse of the political structures -- not only of the "Third Reich"! -- and the confidence in
any secular authority was shaken. The necessity to cooperate and to re-establish the community as a bulwark against the recurrence of totalitarianism was perhaps the only factor that contributed to the "common experience" of all, on this level. But it still needed the strong will to start all over again. There were many, for whom there was no such a start. They did not have the faith in themselves and in a future.

This faith and the perspective of the future is a central theme in another educator whose philosophy is of relevance here: Don Giovanni Bosco, who lived from 1815 to 1888.

While Kerschensteiner and Dewey represent figures of the academic world, with their thoughts written down in various volumes, this Italian priest never wrote a learned book, nor did he lecture at the universities. And yet he can claim that his influence went much farther than on the textbooks of education. One might even say that no educator of the past could boast of so many schools and other educational institutions all over the world that
have realized his ideas since more than one hundred years: The religious order of the Salesians of Don Bosco, founded by Don Bosco in 1841 with the specific intent to provide well-trained and educated people for the field of education, has spread all over the world. 1888, at Don Bosco's death, there were around 800 Salesians in 57 educational institutions, such like schools and boys' homes. In 1966 there were 22,626 in 1,390 places. One can guess that since 1841 millions of boys have gone through the educational institutions which were set up in the philosophy of Don Bosco; to help boys who found it hard to grow up to free and responsible personalities in the cities and on the country. When the young priest began to pick up youngsters from the streets of Turin, one of the biggest cities of northern Italy, he


There are Salesian schools and boys homes in the U.S.A.

The author had worked as a counselor in a Salesian Boys Town in Germany for three years.
first gave them food and shelter. Then he would go and find some work for the youngsters who so far had loitered in the streets of the city, jobless, homeless, hungry, and frustrated. The very first step, to provide a "home" with its atmosphere of community and security, and a job that would lead to self-esteem, and later on, to independence, reminds much of Pestalozzi. What was new, however, and what makes up the "secret" of the tremendous success of this educator were the three foundations on which he consistently based all of his educational efforts: reason, religion, and respect.94 This could not but result in an education that focussed on the whole human being, not only on social aspects, vocational training, or a natural development.


There have been many educators before and after Don Bosco who had emphasized the one or the other of his three points in education, be it that reason was overstressed or the religious tendency; here now we have a balanced view of one who saw that man is not only reasonable but irrational also.

When he speaks of religion he uses the example of the atmosphere in which one lives: one does not feel the pressure of it as it is inside and outside of the body. So he told again and again to his boys that *lavoro è preghiera*, just slightly changing the Benedictines' *lavoro e preghiera*.

Our concern in this paper is now, to examine how work appears as an educational objective in Don Bosco's educational philosophy. Here it is interesting to see how this educator of the mid-nineteenth century anticipated the importance of vocational guidance and counseling.

Don Bosco was enough of a realist to see how work played an important role in the lives of men. For him it just could

---

95 *Lavoro è preghiera* - work is prayer; *lavoro e preghiera* - work and prayer. The accent on the "è" makes all of the difference in Italian.
not be a "necessary evil", but an existential factor in man's life. When God called man to this life and placed him into the specific situation which makes up his human Dasein, then He must also include the "calling" to a specific role in this world. This call - the Latin vocatio denotes a "voice" that goes out to man - is man's genuine πρόβλημα.\(^{96}\) To hear it clearly and then to follow it makes up one of the most agonizing difficulties which a young man encounters: what shall I become? When this is a decision of "capital importance in our life", can education ignore it?\(^{97}\) Is not the youngster very often confused and needs exactly here the help of a guide whom he can trust, and who is dedicated to the well-being of his pupil?\(^{98}\)

\(^{96}\) Cfr. supra, p. 1.


\(^{98}\) Cfr. the chapter on "Erziehung für das Leben" in Peter Ricaldone, Der Heilige Johannes Bosco als Erzieher (München: Provinzialat der Salesianer, 1956), pp. 349 sq.
It is very important that the freedom of the individual to make this decision is guaranteed. Therefore Don Bosco insisted that all vocational guidance must be a cooperative attempt of both counselor and boy, to recognize and then to prepare for the vocation which is the most adequate as to the individual and social conditions of the respective boy. The conditions and the potential have to be taken into consideration while the educator contributes his experience, and the knowledge of the boy's possibilities. At a time when psychological tests were unknown, Don Bosco demanded from his "assistants" that they observe the boys closely and find out about their inclinations, talents, and their potential. At the National Congress of Professional Orientation in Turin, 1948, Don Bosco was shown as the pioneer in vocational guidance.99


Cfr. also Professor Alberto Caviglia, "L'orientamento professionale nella tradizione e nell' opera die Don Bosco", in Salesianum, IX, no. 4, pp. 553-576.
In this context it is important to note that Don Bosco did not believe in education for work in terms of occupational or polytechnical curricula. He insists that "work does not belong into schools!" He understood that the child cannot see the true values of work and its meaning. His criticism of those schools that had introduced manual occupations, even though adapted to the child's level of functioning and understanding, was pungent. The children are overtaxed by something, which at best, they can perceive only as "play" or "leisure-time activity". The results which Don Bosco saw was a very common disrespect for work, a lack of responsibility in the whole attitude of the young people who had gone through these "occupational schools". This was in sharp contrast to the boys who, after the elementary school, entered an apprenticeship or some other "serious work". Here the awareness that one makes a living by his productive work, however limited it might be at first, creates the attitudes of reliability and responsibility. When, for example, in a vocational school quality and accuracy
does not count, as it is meant to be free from any pressure; when and how will the youngster realize that it is exactly quality and accuracy in work that counts later on? As it was mentioned above, the author of this had been a counselor for young apprentices for several years. It was interesting to see how exactly those boys had difficulties in adjusting to the demands of the apprentices' workshops who had gone through occupational schools before. Others who came directly from elementary schools where they were never exposed to such programs except for arts and crafts, who were not over-burdened by parents to do regularly and systematically physical work, they were the ones who liked the apprenticeship program best and who did the best work. It seems that the child should remain in the child's world for the proper time and then only enter the world of work, which demands in all seriousness that the youngster develop attitudes different from play. It is interesting to see that there are increasingly voices in the contemporary educational field that discuss this problem. There is one which questions whether we should keep our youngsters away from "serious" work that long:
"Denied by the law to work, except under controlled conditions, required to attend school where he is often treated as a child, generally excluded from adult social, political, and civic activities and intellectual life, the adolescent bands together with his age mates in defense!"¹⁰⁰

Should we then return to the conditions of former times, maybe even with child-labor? The problems with our young generation, and especially the frustration of many of our college students, makes one ask what we really have gained over against previous generations who did not have the privileges which we take for granted.

"Consider the influence upon a young person's ideal of good workmanship when he worked with his father on the farm, or in the shop... and acquired directly from his parent not only the skill... but the style which gave quality to the skill, and which won approbation of the neighbors. .... Or consider the stimulus to improve that came with his gradual promotion, on the basis of performance, from a boy's to a man's work...."¹⁰¹


Here again, we see the importance of virtues in work. It is almost a paradox that in this "century of the child", we have overburdened the child with tasks of the adult sphere, demanding decisions and skills from them on the one side, and on the other we try to keep them as dependent children, unable to be responsible and reliable, deep into their adult years. The emphasis of Don Bosco to respect the child and the boy is of eminent relevance for us who seem not to take the child really serious. Respect is possible only when the common basis is seen: the child with the same dignity as the educator, with the same calling which is ultimately the religious dimension of human life. With this perspective, work can, of course, no longer be the first and foremost of human activities, or even the purpose of life. There is more to human existence than work. This is why we will have to turn now to the theme of leisure and play in life, and how it occurs in educational thought. Only after this can we propose our own solution to the problem of work in education.
Leisure as a Problem

It seems that any culture has a myth of a paradise, of a land or a time where man does not have to work. In our Judaeo-Christian tradition it is the Garden of Eden, from which man was driven, and the chiliasm belief of a time in the future where this original condition would be restored; with the North American Indians it is the idea of the "Eternal Hunting Grounds", where hunting is not a necessity but an everlasting pleasure; or the Papuas of New Guinea expect the return of their ancestors in richly laden boats, the cargo of which would make any effort of finding food and working for a living unnecessary.

Does not each one of us look forward to the week-ends or a vacation, maybe already for an early retirement, when there will be plenty of time to pursue one's own things? Most of these dreams are religious in content. Man was exiled because he had tried to rebel against the Gods, or some similar incident is the cause that man is no longer in this paradisic state. Thus life is regarded as a punishment; sometimes as a journey to
the promised land in the distant future. Practically all religions hold, on the other side, that the divine beings are free from the necessity to work, leading a life of pure leisure and pleasure. Whether man is regarded as trying to achieve the same, and then the Gods feel "envy", or as being promised to become participant of the divine life, in both cases there is the fact of man's constant endeavors to free himself from work, to be like the Gods. This is why the Greek philosophers can speak of leisure — ἕξολη — as the basic state of man, while work is only ἀσχολία, that is the "absence of leisure".102

102 "scholē" = leisure is the root of our English word "school". A parallel is found in Latin: otium = leisure; neg-otium = the negation of leisure = work. The Romans also used the word ludus for both "play" and the "school". It is difficult for us to see the connection between the two concepts which were one for the ancients. The following discussion of the Liberal Arts tries to show these connections.
When Aristotle speaks of man's life, he observes that "we are
unleisurely in order to have leisure".103 His model of the human mind is consistent
with this view: There is, according to Aristotle, the distinction between the
ratio and the intellectus, and, on the basis of this, the concept of the activi-
ties of the free man, the so-called aræ liberales.104

103 Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, X:7.
104 aræ liberales = the (seven)
Free Arts. The word "artes" cannot be
translated by "the arts", because it
denotes the typical human activities
which are not only "acts" but where the
entirety of man's faculties are involved.
Each act performed by man is based on a
multitude of motives, which not even are
known by the acting individual. Yet the
fact that man can act consciously and
reflect upon his activities make it into
what the Latin "ars" (singular of aræ)
describes.

While the "liberal arts" are the activi-
ties of the "free people", free from
necessity and external purposes, the
"servile arts" are those of the slaves
who are engaged in necessary and purpose-
ful physical work.

It is one of our difficulties to see
"purpose-free" activities in the Liberal
Arts, as all of them have become practical,
maybe even vocational subjects. This is
consistent with the doubts we have about
the original meaning of the word "school".

Cfr. supra, p.55.
Man shares the divine life of leisure in the contemplative activities of the intellectus, that is, in the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, and with this, of wisdom.

"Contemplation is at once the highest form of activity (since the intellect is the highest thing in us, and the objects with which the intellect deals are the highest things that can be known)... Also the activity of contemplation will be found to possess in the highest degree the quality that is termed self-sufficiency; ... it is the activity of the intellect that constitutes complete human happiness — provided it be granted a complete span of life, for nothing that belongs to happiness can be incomplete... If then the intellect is something divine in comparison with man, so is the life of the intellect divine in comparison with human life." 105

We tend to see in this a utopia which is not only impossible, but also undesirable to achieve, as it pre-supposes the existence of slavery, or a group of people who would have to do the necessary work, while the others are free for the

pursuit of knowledge and wisdom. The complex nature of our society makes it necessary that each one participate actively and productively in the whole structure, be it directly or indirectly involved in the production of goods. Some would see a "purposefree" occupation with knowledge as unproductive and thus "parasitic". This is especially heard in a totalitarian state, but it is not uncommon in American work ethics. How else can it be that industrial workers receive higher wages than artists and philosophers, let alone the teachers? The view that leisure is rather the necessary counterbalance to work, in other words, that we are leisurely in order to be able to work again, is very common among our contemporaries.

These opposing views run through the philosophies of the past, up to our time. Our concern here is the question whether man is essentially a homo faber or a homo ludens, or whether he is both.

The history of mankind, especially the history of the city can give us some hints.
Earlier in this paper we discussed the concepts of culture and civilization in the context of the city's development.\textsuperscript{106} The central place of cult in the early cities, the Middle Ages, even through our times in some areas, can also illustrate the role of leisure in human life. There are two main elements which are both constituents of leisure and cult; in fact, one cannot really separate both. In virtually all cultures, be they primitive or highly developed, leisure is mainly "used" for worship or religious celebrations. "To celebrate" is one of these elements, which we will have to examine; the other is the expression of human creativity, as it finds its manifestations in man's leisure. Here too, the religious character of the expressions is an important trait.

Speaking of a "celebration" or of a feast, one thinks immediately of a special event or a person for whom man feels some gratitude, or which, at least, is commemorated with some affirmative attitude. The holidays originally were the days set aside for the expression of man's gratitude towards the divine powers. Work was interrupted and in various activities people brought out their feelings. One of these activities

\textsuperscript{106} supra, pp. 24 sq.
common to whole mankind is the meal. There is a strong symbolic value of communication ("communion") to the meal where people eat and drink together, sitting at the same table and sharing the same food. From the religious content to our secular feasts this expression of togetherness has remained a meaningful way of celebrating. It is based on what Josef Pieper would call the feeling of "being in tune with the world".\textsuperscript{107} This seems to be one of the most important factors in a genuine leisure, that man is "in tune", i.e. in harmony with himself and with the surrounding people. The medieval city can serve here as an example again with its many holidays, that celebrated the events of Christ's life or the saints. The whole population participated in the liturgy and the following secular celebration.\textsuperscript{108}


How this can be perverted is demonstrated by the "celebration" of May Day in the Communist countries behind the Iron Curtain: May 1, originally the "Labor Day" in Europe, was meant to commemorate gratefully the achievements of the workers under the oppressive system of early industrialism. It is still a day off in all European countries, but the "workers states" like East Germany and others demand that the people join the great parades which were to demonstrate the power of the "working-class", moreover, workers are made to "volunteer" for overtime and produce an Übersoll (an excess in the daily prescribed amount of production). This perversion is, unfortunately not limited to totalitarian states. Our American way of leisure is not far from it, when people spend their weekends or vacations with excessive activities, be it that they drive hundreds of miles, or working around the house, so that they return to work exhausted and ready for additional days off. If one cannot find genuine relaxation and the restoration of strength, there can be no leisure. This does not mean that re-creation for the sake of better work and higher efficiency be the purpose of
leisure! It is, undoubtedly, one of its purposes but not the most important one. Man cannot ignore his physique, but even less can he forget that he must be himself, or, at least, find himself, when work does not allow so. While man's workaday activities are mainly outer-directed, in other words, dictated by external circumstances, to a large extent, it is an existential necessity that he find room and time to express his own initiative, his creativity. This is now the second foundation of leisure. Here too, we see, that all of man's creative expressions have originated in religious practice: be it the arts or ceremonies, dances or sports games, they were cultic expressions of man's feelings and thoughts. While work is undoubtedly permeated with man's creative powers, this faculty of man appears in its pure form only in play. With this we see, finally the educational relevance of leisure: the question whether man is essentially a homo faber or a homo ludens. According to Friedrich Froebel (1782-1852)
"play is the purest, most spiritual activity of man at this stage (of childhood), and, at the same time, typical of human life as a whole -- of the inner hidden natural life in man and all things...

... The plays of childhood are the germinal leaves of all later life; for the whole man is developed and shown in these, in his tenderest dispositions, in his innermost tendencies; the whole later life of man ... has its source in the period of childhood, be his later life impure or pure, gentle or violent, quiet or impulsive, industrious or indolent, ... passed in dull stupor or in keen creativeness, in stupid wonder or intelligent insight, producing or destroying, the bringer of harmony or discord, of war or of peace..."109

It seems that this is not far from the view that conceives play as a preparation for life, as a rehearsal of roles the individual will have to "play" later in society. But there is an important difference between Froebel's and, say, Makarenko's view. The contemporary of Pestalozzi saw the roots in creativity, and thus play was primarily conceived

109 Friedrich W. Froebel, The Education of Man, § 30. (from Ulich, op. cit. p. 573.)
as inner-directed. Purposes are secondary in the child's play, just as it is unstructured. The concept of the Soviet educator of the twentieth century puts play into the context of social life, it is therefore to be structured and purposeful. For Makarenko "there is no essential difference between play and work... A good play is accompanied by active efforts of body and mind..." Thus the educator must guide the child from play to work. The child's interest should not be play but the "societal aims". While many insights into the psychological development of the child are found in Makarenko's works, especially as to the development of the virtues of punctuality, exactness, and discipline, his emphasis goes clearly on the practical quality of play. The mentioned virtues, for example, are to be developed in military plays, which Makarenko wants

110Anton Semjonovich Makarenko, Gesammelte Werke (German), 8 volumes. (Berlin: Volkseigener Verlag, 1956-62), vol. IV, p. 399.

to be an important practice of "organized play". With this organized play we can no longer speak of an expression of human creativity, however correct Makarenko's insights into psychological foundations of some of the child's play might be.

When the individual is already at an early age engaged in a Five Years Plan, and all of his faculties primarily geared to the fulfillment of such a plan, he is ultimately degraded into an animal. The existential freedom of doing "one's own thing" is the main basis of the child's play. The purpose-free play cannot be commanded. It is true, one cannot exclude purposes entirely! The child is, at the same time practicing activities, which later on are meaningful and useful. He uses the same mind and the same muscles for work later on, but it is a difference whether I let a child develop his potential freely, without much of an interference, or channel his energy so early into a

\[\text{111 Cfr. Erich Feifel, Personale und Kollektive Erziehung (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), pp. 168 sq.}\]
specific direction. For Makarenko the idea of a carefree childhood is a curse, from which the child ought to be "liberated". In a sharply contradictory position to this stand the concepts of a Josef Pieper and Johan Huizinga. Their discussions of leisure and the play element in culture point to the roots of many of our contemporary problems which lie in the emancipation of man's creativity from cult, and with this, the de-culturization of man's world. We may, in fact, even speak of a "de-humanization" of leisure at the end of such a development. When we conceive leisure as the place and time where man can be man, in other words, the typical human state, then a "dehumanized" leisure would be the same paradox as "dehumanized work".


114 Cfr. supra, pp. 44 sq.
Quite a few concerned voices point to the fact that many of our contemporary problems in society, such as juvenile delinquency, drugs, and violence may stem mainly from an inability to use free time positively and intelligently. It is significant that even medical researchers arrived at the same or at least similar conclusions. The book *Der Mensch ohne Ich* by Joachim Bodamer M.D. deals with the biological-medical aspects of leisure and recreation, which are relevant for us here. The physician describes how man's sympathetic nerve system receives stimuli through activity and thus provides for the necessary energy which is needed for a physical effort, by passing on the stimulus to the adrenalin glands which in turn inject their hormone into the bloodstream. The organism reacts with stronger heart-beat, deeper breath, etc., in other words, with an increase of energy and tension. The stimuli are, however, not only coming from immediate physical efforts; it was found out that the sympathetic is likewise aroused by light, sound, and by

---


the so-called stimulantia like coffee, tea, alcohol, and nicotine. What many people do, when they are tired and their organisms demand the relaxation after the long hours of excitation, is now that they take one or more of these stimulantia in order to stay awake for a couple of more hours. Bodamer shows the connection between the break-down of the organism in the "vegetative dystonia" when the organism has been whipped up again and again instead of granting the necessary relaxation. What once was a geriatric problem has now become common among younger people. Usually the symptoms of this break-down are described as nervousness, and especially in the extreme cases, as "heart condition". Bodamer points out that this does not occur among animals except for the laboratory situation where rats, for example, were exposed to the same conditions as man working with the accompanying stimuli of light and noise. After the animals showed signs of fatigue, they were boosted up again by stimulantia. After a short time signs of dystonia were present.

Experiments with school children, done in a course which the author took
years ago, proved also that much of the lack of concentration and nervousness, specifically the children's hyper-activity were due to the over-lit classrooms. It is not far to reach that the excesses of physical forces, as they are present in violence and destruction, are the release of the energy which has been stored up by the over-stimulated organisms.

While it is one of man's privileges to have a will that is able to control and even force the physique to go beyond its normal limitations, it can also lead to the destruction of the very physique. A human faculty, can thus be abused to de-humanize man. The extreme illustration may be seen in the use of psychedelic drugs.\footnote{The word, literally translated, means "destroying the soul".} Taken in order to find the deepest fulfillment of human existence in extraordinary experiences, they destroy very often health. One must have seen the addicts to understand to what degree man can dehumanize himself: the face of a young man who did not return from a "trip" with LSD..., or the inmates of institutions for extreme drug addicts.
Another aspect of dehumanization in leisure may be seen in the increasingly outer-directed activities of man's free time. The emptiness of work drives many people to find a compensation in some "fulfillment" outside. As there is more time available, and also energy, which has not been used up at work, people would have chances enough to be themselves and to do what they wanted to do. Instead of this, however, man gives himself away even more by letting the "hidden persuaders" lure him into even a deeper alienation than work's. This problem seems to be even more burning than that of work: what and how can we do that our young people make positive use of their free time, which seems to be more and more available in the future. Especially the fact that people have more money available, makes the temptation even greater to "buy" leisure, instead of "doing" it.118

Gabriel Marcel, taking up an idea by Bergson, discussed how the benefits of technology that make things easy for man, have to be paid for, somehow, somewhere:

"I am not sure that every kind of technical progress may not entail, for the individual who takes advantage of it without having had any share in the effort of overcoming difficulties of which such a progress is the culmination, the payment of a heavy price, of which a certain degradation at the spiritual level is the natural expression... Every kind of outward technical progress ought to be balanced in man by an effort at inner conquest, directed towards an ever greater self-mastery... In our contemporary world it may be said that the more a man becomes dependent on the gadgets whose smooth functioning assures him a tolerable life at the material level, the more estranged he becomes from an awareness of his inner reality. I should be tempted to say that the centre of gravity of such a man and his balancing point tend to become external to himself: that he projects himself more and more into objects, into the various pieces of apparatus on which he depends for his existence. It would be no exaggeration to say that the more 'progress'humanity' as an abstraction makes towards the mastery of nature, the more actual individual men tend to become slaves of this very conquest." 119

With a prospective increase in free time for the industrial population in the future, this will become even more of a problem. The International Labor Organization published statistics in 1965 which compared the average work hours of a worker in the early 19th century to the workers of our time:

According to these figures, the industrial worker of the USA worked 40.2 hours, the Japanese 45.4 hours, the German 43.9, and the British 46.4 hours per week (in 1965). The projections for the year 2000 are between 21 and 30 hours per week, for the average American worker. One must, however, realize that these numbers are only the regular work hours, without "moonlighting"! As soon as these hours are included, those countries with the lowest work-week report come up as high as 50 to 55 hours of total work hours, as most of the workers use the free time to do some additional productive work. Much time is also used over beyond the actual work hours for transportation, because a large percentage of the working people live far away from their jobs. There is then not very much time left for genuine leisure. Yet, it seems that this will be in the future: more free time.
Sebastian De Grazia showed in his discussion of the theme that the medieval society, and nowadays many of the so-called under-developed countries still have had more leisure time, especially with the numerous religious holidays. It is true that there the church or the religious leaders "organized" leisure time activities for the people: everybody had to participate in the cultic activities, in the following celebrations. Nobody could continue his everyday work, if he wanted. We may think of the rigorous enforcement of the Sabbath laws with the Israelites or in New England's Puritanism. One may be very fast with the condemnation of such an "authoritarian" guardianship, but regarding the fact that earlier the people needed guidance in their lives, also in their leisure, lets this authoritarianism appear in another light. The Church, for instance, claimed to be the Mother and Teacher ("Mater et Magistra") of the people, knowing what is good for them, and thus giving structure to their lives. The conditions in Europe during the early centuries of Christianity were, in a way, similar to the child's situation who has to learn certain behavioral patterns of the respective culture. Here too, the parents

120 De Grazia, op.cit. p. 82.
know what is good for the child. Nobody would object against our attempts to keep the youngsters busy during their vacations, in order to prevent boredom and even harm. Or is it "authoritarianism" when the Fire Department of Chicago organizes leisure-time activities for the children in the slums? When thousands of youngsters are sent to Summer Camps? It would be so, if we forced adults to participate in such camps; and this is exactly what the authorities of some Communist countries do when they organize the vacations for workers to the extent that the individual has to go to a particular place and spend his time there with a sophisticated program which is "good for him": regulated hours of rest and physical exercise, some political "freshening up" in lectures and meetings, a special diet, etc., etc.¹²¹ The reaction of the individual is usually an attitude that let these things happen, while, internally, he withdraws. This would then be the very opposite of leisure; maybe

¹²¹ Reports from refugees of East Germany confirmed this to the author. There are also programs for students which are meant to be "beneficial" for their social attitudes in so far as the conscription to industrial work would lead to "socialist view" of life without the disrespect for work.
what Thomas Aquinas -- and with him most of the ancient philosophers -- called acedia. The tractate De Acedia in the Summa Theologiae speaks of acedia, i.e. sloth and laziness, as "caput vitiorum"\textsuperscript{122} or "the beginning and source of all other vices". More specific is Kierkegaard, when he describes man's withdrawal in despair as a "passiveness", a refusal to be himself in his particular Dasein, a wasting of one's time in idleness and inactivity.\textsuperscript{123}

When man cannot find meaning and fulfillment in work he yearns for the time where he is free from this burden. But when this time "off" does not allow for such a freedom either, when he never can be himself, what else can he do but withdraw? The frustrated person has only the choice between plunging into even more work, or to reject any further attempts. Acedia is such a rejection which comes out of an attitude of apathy.

Returning to our discussion of cult and "organized leisure", one must state that cultic activities never were passive or just "joining others" in their essence. All religions see cult as a "Heilswirken",

\textsuperscript{122}Thomas Aquinas, Summa, 2,II,35.
in and with the community.\textsuperscript{124} The passive attitude, or the refusal to participate actively, is what creates in man the vacuum that opens him up for propaganda and manipulation.\textsuperscript{125}

The essence of leisure is thus the activity of the mind that leads to the awareness of one's self, to the critical mind that examines reality and reaches truth. This would point unequivocally into the direction of studying and philosophizing. It is indeed what Aristotle - and Kierkegaard - propose as the main activity of man: to seek the truth.

When one examines now the leisure time activities of modern man - both youngsters and adults - one cannot find too much of this criterion. Thorstein Veblen's \textit{The Theory of the Leisure Class} showed already in the last century how hollow much of the manifestations of leisure are.\textsuperscript{126}


\textsuperscript{125} "propaganda" = to "propel" people, to drive them.

Many of our contemporaries spend most of their leisure time hours — when not actively engaged in any form of work like doing the garden or painting the house — in passivity: listening to the radio or watching television, or seeing a ball game in the stadium. Even reading has become almost a "passive" thing, as one "has to read" this bestseller nowadays. With the question of how modern man seeks truth, in other words, how man goes out to find out how things really are, and how he seeks the meanings of these things, how he becomes aware of the relationship of the world of things to himself, then the answer is most disappointing in many cases: even the "educated" content themselves with second-hand information about the world, such as pictures, movies, stories, talks, etc... There is "no time", "no money", "no need" ... to go out and see things for himself, to experience himself. Travelling was one regarded as the educational activity: where people went to find out about the world. Today it is no longer an activity for many people, but a "passivity", as you can "be travelled" around the world by Cooks Tours or American Express without moving a finger.
The answer becomes devastating, however, when we look at the group of younger people who claim to be independent and detached from the "hollow traditions" of our culture, who want to be themselves and live a free life unhindered by the conventional and meaningless structures: the so-called "Hippies". While we can, of course, not decide how many of them really are consistent with their views and attempt a genuine simple life in order to find the truth, one cannot see much of this in those among them who ruin themselves by drugs or sexual excesses. Many of them come from wealthy homes or are otherwise supported, so they do not have to work. They stand for a "leisure class" that manifests the very perversion of leisure. (The problem is not new. Antiquity had the same type of such a leisure class, as the Roman writers like Juvenal, Petronius, and Horace had described.)

Is there a solution to the problem which obviously has bothered mankind centuries for ours? We see a number of educators and philosophers of the past who have attempted such a solution, that would lead man to genuine leisure. Sometimes the propositions are implicit in their ideas of an education for work, sometimes very explicit in clear definitions of leisure.
The following paragraphs will discuss a few characteristic proposals.

The Re-humanization of Leisure in Education

In the long history of mankind, many chapters are in the darkness of the era about which we have no written recordings. The early cultures' treasures of myths and legends are only traces of what had happened in these dark times. There can no longer be distinguished between truth and invention but there is always a core of truth in any myth. When, for example, the same myth appears in almost every culture's tradition, it is a hint towards such a core of truth. The myth of a paradise is known in all cultures; the various religions of man have based their traditions on the paradisic state of man which he either lost and tries to regain, or which is promised to him. What is common to the idea of Christ and a Lao-Tze is the promise of a state of eternal happiness at the end of the road of life of those who follow the "way".\(^\text{127}\)

Another point which is found in the various religions is the sharp contrast of the "essential" to the "world": man has to detach himself from the world and find the essence of all things and of himself in silence, solitude, and contemplation. The concept of ἔξολη in classical philosophy implies this promise of happiness through a contemplative, quiet life.\(^{128}\) It is, however, not the inactivity or total detachment of the Chinese, but the world-oriented ἐνδοειδεμὸς that leads man.\(^{129}\) So man can find himself in the world. This theme has become relevant again with Heidegger's philosophy\(^{130}\), but it has always been the concern of educators of all times to lead the young generation into the "world", and find happiness.

As we saw above the way of education towards this ideal was called ἔξολη; the development of the school appears as rather divergent from its original meaning, so that we doubt that we will ever

---

\(^{128}\) Supra, p.133.

\(^{129}\) Supra, p.23.

\(^{130}\) Martin Heidegger, *Platon's Lehre von der Wahrheit* (Heidelberg: 1945).
see anything else than "work" done in the school. This seems to be the cardinal difficulty, to reconcile the opposites of ratio and intellectus, the hard work with the effortless knowledge.131 Man shares the immediate, effortless activity of the mind with the Gods, but most of his knowledge must be acquired via the hard and tedious way of ratio. The intellectual life of the free in ancient Athens was still a studium, that is, the "industrious zeal", as the Latin word literally says; so was not the "easy life of idleness" but a high form of activity. One can trace this ideal through the life of the monks with their contemplative studies of God and the world, to the scholars of the Middle Ages and Renaissance, and even to our contemporary controversy about the Liberal Arts versus a vocational education.

131Cfr. the discussion of these concepts supra, pp. 134 sq.
When Aristotle was so outspoken about the "highest form of activity" which is, for him, contemplation in leisure, he must have seen already at his time that work did not allow man to be himself. It might well be that the example of some of his contemporaries showed, that not even leisure is always human in its full meaning:

"Anybody can enjoy the pleasures of the body, the slave no less than the noblest of mankind,... but happiness does not consist in pastimes and amusements, but in activities in accordance with virtue..."\(^{131}\)

The Christian way of life was a sharp contrast to some of Antiquity's lifestyles. It would try a synthesis of work and leisure, and we have such a unity in the Benedictine Rule (529 AD) with its **ora et labora**. Almost seven hundred years later, there is a new attempt to refresh the Christian view in the ideas of a Francis of Assisi (1182-1226). While we cannot claim the "troubadour of Umbria", as Chesterton called Saint Francis, as a philosopher in the academic halls of fame

nor as an educator who would appear in the books of pedagogy, he has nevertheless the traits of both. With his Franciscan order -- that means "a way of life" -- he influenced western culture in many aspects. This justifies to mention his philosophy as a "Weltanschauung" in our context, all the more as his view of life is characterized by the enthusiasm similar to Plato's: the relationship of man and nature on the basis of a λόγος which is immanent in both.

For Francis man lives in a world that is not so much inhabited by demons and hostile beings, nor in a world that is antagonistic to the heavens, but man is at home with brothers and sisters as soon as he sees his proper place in the cosmos. Man arrives at this view only when he can free himself from the ballast of the un-important. While many Christian thinkers of the early centuries conceived the whole material world as a ballast from which man should rid himself and withdraw into a spiritual world, Francis remained world-oriented to the point of loving everything that surrounded him: the animals and the plants, the earth... an idea that should re-appear in our times with the philosophy of Teilhard de Chardin.
Saint Francis was not a man of books and learning, but he did not demand the same attitude from his followers. How else could the Franciscan Order bring forth such eminent fruits like an Anthony of Padua, one of the great Doctors of the Church (1195-1231), a Raymondus Lullus (1235-1315) who was one of the most interesting figures in the history of education, and last, but not least, a Roger Bacon (1220-92?), the doctor mirabilis unequalled in his attempt to establish a "universal science" including all areas of human knowledge.\textsuperscript{132}


Raymondus Lullus spent almost a life-time for the idea of an \textit{ars generalis} (a philosophical system connected with early scholasticism) which he wanted to be realized in education. He also wrote a Utopia, Blanquerna, which in many respects anticipated the ideas of Thomas More.

Cfr. also Josef Pieper, Scholastik, Gestalten und Probleme der mittelalterlichen Philosophie (München: Kösel Verlag, 1960.)

We can see two main principles underlying Franciscan thought with respect to the re-humanization of leisure: the new concept of nature and the positive view of the world on one side, and the re-humanization of freedom over against the narrow view of an exclusively monastic asceticism. As indicated above, the pagan view of the world found its sharp contrast in Christian religion with its eschatological perspective that focussed more on the hereafter and eternal beatitude than on the this-worldly side of human existence. The monastic way of life had determined much of the people's religious attitudes: liturgy and personal devotions were modelled to a large degree after the monks' lives. Then, a variety of other factors merged with this development, above all Manicheism with its contempt for all flesh (especially sex), the influence of the Barbarians that flooded into the Mediterranean, and later on into the whole European world, mysticism with its roots in eastern traditions and Platonism... Man saw himself in confusion about his nature and destiny with all these philosophies.
It took the courageous enthusiasm of Francis of Assisi to show that man belongs to this world. Not a "return" to nature as a Rousseau would later on propagate, but a "turn towards" nature and the entire world was the aim. It is at the same time a reaction against the un-natural spiritualism of earlier ages, and against the intellectualism of Aristotle's few privileged "free".

The perspective of a Francis who calls animals and plants his brothers and sisters becomes even more relevant today as we fall into the temptation to "consume" nature in both work and in our leisure: the conditions in our State Parks after the season, and pollution of nature by industry illustrate the disrespect for nature, which is actually the alternative to Franciscan "brotherhood".

The second principle makes the educational relevance of Francis even more visible: freedom in human existence. St. Augustine's famous sentence "restless is our heart, until it can find rest in Thee" implies somehow, that man is on his way to his eternal home, in other words, that man is in exile as he exists in this world. Before he reaches his final destination, man is thus not free. One may discern
the Platonic "soul in the cage" in such a view, which had in fact become the perspective of quite a few Christians, perhaps up to our times. The moral teachings of the Church would, for example, emphasize the "askesis" (i.e. exercise) of the virtues of self-restraint and mortification as a preparation of the freedom in the hereafter. When Francis abdicates the riches of his father's house and decides for an "ascetic" life, he has the same in mind, but he does not go into an exile. He wants to be free, now and here; to be at home with essential things while he throws away the un-essential. There is nothing wrong with any of these things which he threw away, but he does not need them. He wants to be as free as man can be: not free "from", but free "for" something. This is exactly the relevance for us in the complex world of the late twentieth century: can education free man for himself? Modern man obviously has failed to free himself from many un-important things with no little guilt on the side of education that had burdened him with so much of ballast; but he failed even more to look forward, away from all that ties him down. The hilarity and fulfillment has gone with the freedom. Can it
ever return to the classrooms, to the children, when we present the world to them as a battlefield of competitors and the object of mere interest, that is a thing that can be used and abused? Or could not some of the genuine enthusiasm show to the young generation in any subject taught in any school, that this is our world?

It is a tragic in our history that the ideas of a Francis should become almost forgotten after the Reformation. He who was a true reformer himself, should lose against the "narrowers" or "returners" like a Luther or Calvin who would structure man's existence so narrowly that nothing of freedom and enthusiasm would be left. The American way of life, as it had been determined by Calvinist rigorism and discipline, could never consistently realize the ideals of freedom and human dignity even though they were the very basis of American democracy. From the beginning of America's history up to this day a disrespect for nature and human life has been manifest. The conquest of the continent with the extermination of the Indians, and today's problems of pollution and racial discrimination stand on the same roots as the inability to achieve
true leisure in the personal lives of so many of us. Jefferson's promise to guarantee to all the "pursuit of happiness" still has not yet been fulfilled. He saw this way to happiness in a popular education when he wrote:

"I look to the diffusion of light and education as the resource most to be relied on for ameliorating the condition, promoting the virtue, and advancing the happiness of man. That very man shall be made virtuous by any process whatever, is, indeed no more to be expected, than that every tree shall be made to bear fruit, and every plant nourishment... I do hope that, in the present spirit of extending to the great mass of mankind the blessings of instruction, I see a prospect of great advancement in the happiness of the human race; and that this may proceed to an indefinite, although not to an infinite degree."133

How this "great advancement" could be achieved is not in particular shown by Jefferson, but it is obvious that he wanted the state to leave enough room for the individual's own pursuit of happiness on one side, and on the other to provide the opportunity of getting an education that would open him the world.

of knowledge, and thus show the way to happiness. It is the time of the "Enlightenment" that emphasizes knowledge -- and Jefferson is a child of this era. His ideal is, in fact, not very far from Plato's or Aristotle's: both of whom he criticizes often: the enlightened citizen who knows.

The question is now what man ought to know in order to be happy. For both Antiquity and Enlightenment the ideal was a body of knowledge that would comprise the "necessary and the ornamental" as Benjamin Franklin put it. Whether one takes the *Via Lucis* of a Comenius (1592-1670) as an example, or the *Bildungsideal* of a Humboldt (1767-1835), it is always the demand for a *curriculum* -- that is a "way on which to run" -- a defined body of subject matter that is characterized by universality and totality. The two strands in the philosophy of education that come into view here, make up the main issues of the post-Reformation era: one camp of educators would emphasize aesthetic education as the main way to perfection; the other holds religious education as the most important. Pestalozzi may be an example of one who tried a synthesis when he spoke of the
task of education as "Hinwendung" to the beautiful. He emphasizes that this can happen only in silence:

"Silence as a means to induce activity, is perhaps the first secret of a school..." 134

The role of quietude in religion was unfortunately not often understood and utilized by educators. Pestalozzi bases his educational practice on the axiom that expression has to be preceded by impression. This is, indeed, the original meaning of the word "esthetic": the sensation, feeling, or experience of the world. When the scholastic thinkers insisted that "omne ens est verum, omne ens est bonum" (everything is true, everything that is, is also good), then everything can become relevant, valuable, interesting. It is only a matter of being sensible to the good and valuable. The grounds on which this sensibility is possible is silence, quietude.

---

134 Johann H. Pestalozzi, "Stanserbrief", in Gesammelte Werke ed. by DeGruyter, (Zürich: Rascher Verlag, 1945), p.23. The following quotes from Pestalozzi are from this edition.
How much has been sinned against this principle in our overlit, noisy, and crowded classrooms should need no further illustration. It is no wonder that we have not much time left for the "esthetic" in our schools, when these pre-requisites are missing. The concern of a John Dewey in this respect is clearly brought out in his *Art and Experience*. He re-emphasizes what Fichte in his *Reden an die deutsche Nation*, or a Schiller in his *Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung* had demanded in the century before,\(^{135}\) that there is no merely "objective culture" which I can watch as a "spectator", or "consume", but must be experienced in an interaction. Again, the Pestalozzian concept of *Anschauung*\(^ {136}\) is in place here: the quiet contemplative absorption of what


\(^{136}\) Cfr. *supra*, p.29. Fichte too, speaks of man's "selbsttätiges Entwerfen von innern Bildern"—a initiative in man to create inner pictures—when man encounters the world.
comes to the human mind.

With all these examples it should be sufficiently shown that leisure is in essence an activity, and never a passiveness. All of the educational philosophies from the Greek to our modern have somehow pointed to this activity and have warned of the harmful alternatives. One can ask with Pestalozzi, why educators have not all together listened to these voices and learned from them, from the experience of human history. Again and again it was promised that one could receive happiness, while it can only be pursued by the individual.

"Why are the greatest thinkers not concerned with knowing what their race is? Does a peasant use his ox without knowing it?... And you use man and profess that you guard and nurture him, do you care for him as the peasant cares for his ox? ... Does your wisdom help you to understand truly your race, and is your goodness the goodness of enlightened guardians of the people? What man is, and what his needs are, what elevates and humiliates him, what strengthens and what weakens him ought to be the most important knowledge for the rulers as well as for the humblest..."137

Do our educators nowadays really know what is good for man? With so many disturbed and frustrated personalities among our students, younger and older ones, the solution cannot lie in a better curriculum, or a different system of education, but in providing what these people need: a new -- no: the old perspective that sees man in the total context of the world, and which allows him to be himself in the first line. We can no longer return to the school that would mean the same as σχολή, but somehow will we have to lead the young people that they can preserve the capability for genuine leisure which they all had as children. This will not be possible without following the development of the personality from childhood to adolescence consistently: the child's attitude or Grundstimmung is the trust in a mother who guarantees security. The state of dependence and the attitude of confidence -- trust -- must balance each other to provide the healthy attitude towards the surrounding people. While the child will relate to persons in the first line, the adolescent and then the adult will shift his trust to self-
confidence and trust in others on a larger dimension: to society and the Absolute. Only when the child had the concrete objectives will he find to the abstract concepts like society, the state, and God. When we have the mistrust in both adults and the social structures in our young generation it stems from this point. Jean Piaget, the Swiss psychologist, has discussed this in his remarkable book *Le jugement moral chez l’enfant*.\(^{138}\)

A religious education, begun by the mother, and continuing through the years of childhood, will help the child toward this shift from the concrete to the abstract, as the abstract idea — in this context: a God — appears already behind the concrete image of a father and the mother. Human existence will so appear in its "*religio*", i.e. the "ties", to the Absolute, and become "religious". (It should be noted here, that this has nothing to do with a particular religious tradition when we speak of religion theoretically.

In the concrete Dasein of a person one will always find oneself in the specific structure of a religious tradition, or a church, with more or less clearly defined activities that express this religion. Even when a person decides to stay outside of the religious group with a critical attitude towards everything "religious", he nevertheless is tied in by the various patterns of behavior and thinking that are characteristic of the respective culture and which always have some roots in cult.) When some of our religious traditions did not really allow for the individual expression, it remains the idea of religion that it is entirely personal, in other words, that it is essentially the relationship between man and the Absolute which finds its valid expression in the initiative of the individual. As cult happens always in community in its visible manifestations, it is possible only when all contribute, participate; as soon as one would be forced to "join" this could never be cult for him. 139

It seems that we have here the basic pattern that underlies our cultural crisis, and the crisis in education: that for too long we have forced people to "adjust" to a culture and live in it, or imposed a standardized education upon people who did not really want it, thus driving them into alienation rather than helping them to be themselves. Brameld's demand that the schools should re-examine themselves and become aware of their role as creators of culture rather than reflectors is putting the finger on exactly this sore. Up to this day we have been satisfied with receiving traditions, learning about our culture, instead of contributing to, and creating and changing the existing culture. Whether the solution will lie in a possible "consensus (on the) institutional patterns needed now and in the future, in order that human beings may achieve utmost fulfillment of those values they possess most universally."

even though he might not at all agree on them, is a question which is raised by Brameld's critics. One is safe to say that our young generation is even farther away from such a consensus than the youth of the Fifties when Brameld wrote his book. What we see even more is the total lack of understanding of our culture in our young people. One cannot consent to what one does not understand, and one cannot understand what one does not see. Our youth had to grow up in a cultural vacuum: the older generation has betrayed the values of this culture which are all based on the one value of life. The wars, the reckless practices in industry and business, the criminality and the general lack of respect for life, all of which is reflected in our literature, in traffic, and in our discussions, all this stands in sharp contradiction to the "official" culture which declares man's dignity and ultimate value. Instead of introducing the children into the positive and truly cultural dimensions of life, they are given war toys to play with, crime stories to read, cruelties to see,
not to forget the bad example of
those who go to church on Sunday
and then fight and hate each other
on weekdays. No child can rhyme this
together without becoming confused,
if not schizophrenic. But we expect
our children to be law-abiding and
good citizens, who believe and con-
tinue the "Great Heritage" even though
we have not shown them a jot of it. 

The schools are expected to make up
very fast for the sins of the parents
by letting the children read the
Great Books, introducing them into
the world of Beethoven and Michelangelo,
while outside of school they still
get fed on Batman and rock music.

What the "average American" -- and increa-
singly the "average European" -- does in
his leisure time is just reflecting this
schizophrenia. Any re-humanization must
start with making reality into one
image in the child's eye, the congruence
of the "taught" and the "lived" culture.
It would not be possible, in such a
solution, that there be even a split
between work and leisure. Both derive
their meaning only from the very basic
value: life. The free human life.
Most of the philosophies of education discussed so far in this treatise have either focussed on the problem of work or of leisure, and proposed solutions for the one or the other. While a few attempted a synthesis of both, realizing that both make up human existence, these solutions were proposed for conditions which were different from our particular crisis, or, they were based on premises which we no longer agree upon. When, for example, a Thoreau or Emerson suggest that man return to the simple life in the woods, fleeing the city, we will no longer see this as a possibility. Our cities are growing, and the process of urbanization that takes place all over the world, can no longer be reversed, let alone halted. The city is man's fate, he cannot escape it. So we have to face it and make the cities into our cities.

The city is essentially a synthesis of work and leisure! From the first city
in the darkness of unknown history, when people gathered to build a wall around their settlement and agreed upon a structure of living together, to our metropolitan conglomerates of living quarters and working places, the cooperative efforts of the workers have also created the temples, the theatres, and the parks in the middle of the cities. The necessary and the enjoyable dwell together in the city. Yet, the unfortunate split into the two groups of the working class and the leisurely still has not been overcome, even though the temples and the parks are visited by both classes. It is imperative that this gap become bridged in our time. One should be aware of the quality of the world of work with its ramifications into endless branches of business and industry, that will always show the differences in talents and responsibilities. Only in cult where everyone is equal vis-à-vis the Absolute, and in leisure where each one can be himself and for himself, the differences do not count. This polarity seems not to be seen by those who have solutions ready for the problems of urban life.

There are, in the view of the writer, two contemporary philosophers of education
whose propositions are of eminent relevance for our problems. It is true, both of them are not philosophers or educators in the strict sense of the academic term; they would have rejected to be called so. Nevertheless have their thoughts a heavy bearing on education, and their perspectives are genuinely "Weltanschauung" and thus deserving the name of philosophy. As we can now integrate some of the ideas of the aforementioned thinkers, however they may appear as one-sided in the context of the respective philosophy, it becomes also clear that every philosophy stands on the shoulders of preceding thought. The two men whose philosophy we will analyse are Joseph Cardijn and Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. Both of them cannot claim to furnish a patented solution to all of our problems, their propositions appear, however, as attempts to consider the totality of factors that play a role in the problematic of human existence. It is not mere chance that the two were Catholics. While not all of us will agree on the Catholic view of man and the world, due to a variety of possible reasons, the meaning of the word "catholic" remains nevertheless to be "the view of the whole" : ἑνὸς ὅλου.
Joseph Cardijn (1882 - 1966)

This Belgian priest came from a family where the father was a janitor in a small flat. Originally he was expected to become a worker as soon as he was out of school to help the family with his income. But his desire was to study and to become a priest. For the parents this meant additional financial burdens but both father and mother consented. While Cardijn was in the seminary, he received the message that his father was going to die. He writes about this day in his book:

"When I entered the room where my father was lying, I knelt by his bed and received the blessing from his old worn-out hands of a worker. In front of this man who was so great and courageous, I swore to dedicate my whole life for the salvation of the workers...."¹

As a Chaplain in a suburb of Brussels he formed the first group of young workers that would grow into the world movement of the Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne (J.O.C.). His ideas were taken up later by Pope John XXIII into his encyclical letter Mater et Magistra², but what made Cardijn one of the most influential figures in the workers

² Supra, p. 98.
movement and the field of education is the growth of his Young Workers' groups into the widest-spread organization of young people in the free world. It can claim to have educated millions of young people - not in schools but right in their lives in the cities and factories.

Cardijn's starting point was the realization that industrialism with its impact upon man's life found man as an individual and mankind as a whole totally unprepared. Growing up in the world of workers he knew from first-hand experience what it meant to be a worker. His solution may be summarized in the following sentence that has become famous:

"If we are to humanize the world, we must humanize the world of work!"

This sounds similar to Marx. Indeed, Cardijn's concern was the same as Marx', but with the essential difference, that his solution was "radical" in the true meaning of the word -- to get at the roots -- while Marx proposed a Utopia.

Cardijn starts with an a priori: the real progress in the history of mankind was Christianity. On this he bases his

---

3 The JOC (Young Christian Workers) are represented in practically all countries of the free world, with some underground groups behind the Iron Curtain. The National Headquarters of the American movement are in Chicago.

4 Laymen into Action, p. 83.
"dialectics": "The thesis of this dialectic is that every man born into this world has a divine destiny and mission; he is God's apostle among his fellow-men. This fundamental truth... has given birth to the whole spiritual conception of life, inspired by faith... which draws all men to participate in the one and only apostolate -- that of Christ.
The thesis is inseparable from its historical antithesis, which is man's act of refusal to God's plan of love. This refusal is made up of ignorance, indifference, and an accumulation of opposition, struggles, difficulties, and obstacles that stand in the way of the realization of the divine plan, and play an important part in the history of humanity..." 5

The synthesis of this dialectic is then, according to Cardijn, in the "apostolate", that means the message consisting in

"building a world according to God's will, a fraternal humanity where the humble are loved and helped by their brothers,... the establishment of peace." 6

There is no promise of such a kingdom of peace, which would come all by itself in a dialectical process, but the demand made from each and every man to work for it and contribute by his efforts and sacrifices.

5Ibid., p.18.
6Ibid., p. 19.
Cardijn is also very critical of the proposals that would demand the "re-construction" of society, or the re-structuring of environment:

"It is not a matter of humanizing environments before christianizing them, nor of first changing structures. We are concerned with the christianizing of individual people."  

The first step is then that "each worker see his divine vocation and mission specific to himself, in his life, and his working environment."  

One should note that not only Catholics are addressed, not even only Christians, but "every human being"!

"Every human being is called by God, Christ, and the Church, because all men, historically, belong to the order of grace and redemption. Many do not listen to or do not hear this call, but nearly all have an intuition, a confused consciousness of it. No one is entirely cut off from it."  

This concept of a Church that comprises, or, at least is called to reach out to all of mankind made the JOC movement a truly ecumenic one even before this theme was appearing on the discussion tables: the Young Christian Workers of all countries have many non-Catholics, even non Christians among their members.

---

7Ibid., p. 32.
8Ibid., p. 33.
9Ibid., p. 34.
How should all this be realized? Cardijn points to three fundamental changes which will take place when the individual recognizes his existential mission and dignity: the transformation of everyday life, the transformation of the environment, and the transformation of the mass of workers.

With the perspective of the divine mission of every man the whole life has a spiritual significance. In his speeches to the young workers, he repeated it over and over again, that "while every day man is creating new material goods, his professional life is a prayer, a sacrifice,… an apostolate,… and work is not a punishment, a curse, or a kind of slavery, it is collaboration with the Creator and Redeemer!"\(^{10}\)

The writer has seen this himself, how this concept, the spiritual perspective has brought a transformation of the lives of young workers. Before, they saw themselves as "underprivileged" over against the rich and the educated, with an attitude close to despair; they realized that they were just born into this status and could never make it into a higher level. While they worked in the factories, the minds were in a world of dreams, which often was fostered by movies and cheap literature in the leisure time. And now they perceived that one

\(^{10}\)Ibid., p. 47.
cannot live in two worlds at the same time; in other words, that one cannot separate work from life, and a working life from religion. All the explanations of the psychologist who would see nothing but a sublimation or defense mechanism in such an attitude are missing the real point. It is so essentially human that man can look beyond the mere drudgery of work, that the Greek gave man the name ἄνθρωπος —"the one who is looking upward". The conditions in our factories and mines make people appear as machines and slaves. Undoubtedly many of the workers have been seen as such by their employers. But the awareness of the worker that he is not a thing, a machine, or a slave makes all the difference. (Even if it were a "sublimation", what would be wrong with it when it helped man to overcome the narrow walls of despair?) There is no denying the fact, and we see this clearly stated even in Quadragesimo Anno, that "dead matter comes out of the factories made beautiful, while men grow corrupted and degraded there..."¹¹

Changes will have to come in this respect. In this lies the eminent relevance of a

¹¹Quoted in Cardijn, op.cit. p.49.
Cardijn for our very own situation in the big cities with all their problems.

"The working class in its professional, family, and social aspects, corrupted by false ideas, loose morals, and the present system, has in its turn become a corrupt influence on all those who live and work there. It is useless to try to influence the workers in artificially created environments like schools, clubs, circles; if educative action is limited to these artificial environments, the working world will never be saved. It is only to be saved within its own, familiar, everyday environment; workers must be taught and helped to act there, they must transform this environment, conquer it, bring it into harmony with the providential plan. Now this transformation can only be wrought from within by those who... live and work there. Any form of external action will be useless unless it serves to stimulate and to nourish action from within!" ¹²

Here too, the writer could see with his own eyes how young workers had begun to apply this in the concrete situations of their lives in the factory and the living quarters: they learned to see the problems and to do something about them. The educational method of the JOC -- "See-Judge-Act -- is applied in every situation of life.

¹²Ibid., pp. 49-50.
There were young men who would see the inadequate safety devices in the factory and then advise the workers who had to run these machines, but also make the management to do something about this. The older workers saw, how newcomers to the plant were often confused and abused by others, so they stepped in and helped the youngsters to get acquainted with the job and find human contacts. The activities of JOCists in factories and cities all over the world have been felt in all areas of work and life: in trade unions, housing, vocational guidance, and even marriage counseling. The World Congress of the JOC Movement at Rome (1957) proved that the third transformation -- the transformation of the mass of workers -- has begun and is taking shape. It is true, mass manifestations are no proof. But what Rome showed was not the demonstration of a "movement" alone, rather was it the evidence of the fact that millions of workers, young people from all countries of the world (there were even groups from behind the Iron Curtain!) do something in the concrete life situations of their particular environments, do something for themselves and for others, and that
all this is not incited by propaganda or theoretical, purely intellectual methods from outside, but based upon a perspective of their own: they see for themselves, they judge themselves and act by themselves.

The question whether these young people really see and judge and act themselves, or whether Cardijn was not just giving them another ideology, is one objection that has been raised. Pointing back to Cardijn's statement that no one is entirely cut off from the consciousness of his divine calling, one cannot doubt that in each man is the desire to transcend his environment and his condition. Contemporary philosophers, like Camus, and scientists, like Freud, with all their disputable propositions, unanimously see this desire. Telling man that he is a "Sisyphos", or that he is driven by "libido", what else is this than an ideology? The perspective of the two vocations of man, the human which calls on man to continue the work of creation, and the divine that shows him the way out of his limited condition, is underlying all religions and philosophy.
There has not yet been one philosophy or religion which would have surpassed Christianity in its catholicity, i.e. universality of perspective. What could one then propose as an alternative to this Christian "ideology"? Has it not become clear enough where technology can lead man when it is not integrated into an "ideology"? The mechanization of work, the technicizing of agriculture, progress in medicine, and all scientific advances have not brought a solution to man's problem of hunger, war, diseases, but rather created problems that are even worse. Cardijn called this the "most shocking abuse and perversion of human progress." This is, unfortunately, not only true in the so-called under-developed countries, but even in the richest nations of the world. They are common to all of mankind, and the way out lies only in the common efforts -- in a "common faith", if one is allowed to paraphrase John Dewey in this context.

It is at this point where Cardijn's thought merges with Teilhard de Chardin's:

"Today the unification of the world is not only a technical fact, but something humanity is conscious of."\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 81.
The problem is only how to make this unification become reality in the concrete situations of our everyday lives. The paradox man faces is that the world in process of unification is, at the same time, a divided world. Says Cardijn: "The methods of thought and action which should tend towards and ensure unity, oppose each other, contending with a totalitarianism which is more and more intransigent. This dualism and struggle threaten the peace and even the very existence of the human race..."

... Fear and panic have invaded the world. The struggle no longer seems to be limited to objectives which can be controlled and foreseen; it has become messianic, redemptive, aiming at the salvation of the world through the victory of force and violence."\(^\text{14}\)

Analysing some of Cardijn's points now, we should see the deeper relevance of his philosophy for our present situation: The first is the perspective of the whole of one's life. It is in reality nothing else than the objective of man's existential attempts to give Gestalt to his life, to find meaning; the \(\delta\varepsilon\wedge\rho\iota\) as a supra-personal direction of life.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{14}\)Ibid. pp. 84-85.

\(^{15}\)Cfr. the books of Ignace Lepp, Victor Frankl, and Erich Fromm which deal with this problem in human existence.
When Cardijn speaks of the "divine destiny and mission of each young man, and each young girl, a destiny which begins not after death but from today, in the conditions of their everyday life," he points to the necessity of a fulfilled existence with meaning to the individual. While this meaning and fulfillment cannot be in life itself, it cannot be learned or received from outside. It is the person for himself and by himself who puts meaning into his existence. One may see a parallel between Cardijn and the existentialists. The essential difference is, however, that the Catholic thinker sees possibilities that, at least some can be learned for a "right life". With all the differences in human talents and potentials, man's existence is an "art" in the original meaning of the word, an activity that can be reflected upon, modified, even imitated. When it remains on the surface of mere imitation or manipulation, of course it cannot be existence in its fullest sense.

16Ibid., p. 18.
17Cfr., the discussion of the concept of Liberal Arts on p. 134, supra.
The self-direction must therefore remain the main emphasis in any educational objective.

The second of Cardijn's key concepts is the focus on the "here and now" -- the *Dasein* -- and a spirituality that considers the concrete situation. Up to this day we do not have a practical, clearly defined pedagogy for an industrialized, urbanized world. The problems of our cities that have come upon a totally unprepared mankind in rapid sequence since the turn of this century (they were present before but not to that degree), have challenged quite a few thinkers to propose solutions. But some of them were either aiming at an unrealistic return to previous stages, or promising a utopia. Others were too vague in their propositions and tried to exclude *a priori* some of the aspects of the totality of man's world. Dewey's philosophy of education, which is one of the great attempts to find a solution to our contemporary crisis, suffers heavily from the exclusion of a metaphysical aspect of reality.

In the Belgian priest we encounter the courage of a man, combined with competence, to show that the center of gravity in human existence must lie on the essential, but not aloof from the concrete situation of each man.
He does this in a language than can be understood by even the un-educated. This may account for the tremendous impact which his thought had on the youth of our time, as it could be tested out immediately in their lives. That the academic world did not take notice of this revolution is just another proof of their unrealistic perspective.

What seems to be at stake in our era is the "spiritualization and divinization of every aspect of human life". Even if one should not count himself to the faithful members of a church, he could not but subscribe to such a goal as Cardijn put it before the eyes of his young workers:

"Each individual must see and understand his own responsibility, and everything possible must be done to involve and sustain him in the effective realization of his duty in the life of the world..."

Could the educators, could we say that we have done, so far, "everything possible"? Is it, after all, possible what this priest demanded? Many have tried, and we see how numerous, yet uncounted young people have found out of their dilemma of a "meaningless life in an absurd world" -- through a faith that let them see the same world and the same life in a new light.

---

18 Cardijn, op.cit. p. 105

19 Ibid.
This is now, at the same time, the starting point for Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955). The Leitmotiv of this French Jesuit who was one of the authorities in the science of paleontology, and maybe one of the important thinkers of our century, was the sentence: "I can be a Christian only when I am man!"\(^{20}\)

The attempt of this scientist-philosopher, whose mother was a relative of Voltaire, to re-concile science and theology did not always find approval, let alone understanding with his superiors and the Church. Jean Lacroix describes Teilhard's attempt as "undertaking the task to make the universe to a temple again..."\(^{21}\)

This was, in fact an undertaking of a tremendous task. The crass anti-clericalism and hostility against religion in particular, as it grew since the French Revolution, and as it characterized the


\(^{21}\)Jean Lacroix, _Le sens de l'athéisme moderne_ (Tournai: - 1959).
social movements of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, brought the claim of politics and economy to be emancipated from the traditional values and morals, thus pushing back the religious view of life "to where it belongs: into the churches." In fact, the churches withdrew widely from the secular scene, when not officially, so at least practically. As we saw in the preceding chapters, this was the concern of a Kolping and especially of a Cardijn, to bring religion back into life. With Teilhard we have the same attempt from the scientific angle, and on the academic scene.

The Jesuit sees the whole universe characterized by a dynamic development which aims at the convergence, the reconciliation of the opposites. Such was already the dream of an Aristotle, a Plotinus, of a Nicolaus Cusanus, and a Hegel. There might be traces in Dewey's attempt to overcome the dichotomy of the practical and the theoretical. But here, with Teilhard, we encounter a totally new approach, which is practical, based on scientific views, and a cogent logic.

Human existence appears in the context of the "slanted plane" on which the universe has moved from its beginnings: each step
forward is at the same time a step upward. While the entirety of creation moved from the amorphous dead matter to the living matter, or, as he puts it, from creation to vitalization, from there to innervation on to hominisation, to Christianization, and now towards divinisation, until everything reaches its consummation in the point OMEGA. In this context everything that exists points upward towards this OMEGA:

"In a universe, where everything contributes to the gradual but steady realization of the spirit which God will elevate to its final unification, each act wins in its concrete realization a value of sanctity and community."

In this perspective, the most humble and simple work of everyday life becomes a contribution to the ascent of mankind. This is not really new in Christianity, "but the Church has often hesitated to comprehend the human courage and passion for research, both of which are the foundations of modern thought."  

---

23 Teilhard de Chardin, *Le Sens Humain* (not yet published; qu. in Wildiers, p.78.)
Work cannot be outside of human reality, nor outside of religion. Already in 1933 Teilhard wrote in an essay which has not yet been published at this time, "formerly, 'adoration' was conceived as something in which we preferred God to the things of the world, which we offered to him. Now 'adoration' is to dedicate himself with body and mind to the creative act by uniting onself with the world, which we want to complete by our efforts and research." This is a clear abdication to the old humanism that saw cult and culture in opposition to the practical and natural aspects of life. Not the mere intellectual life, free from the necessities urged upon us by the world, but both, the practical and intellectual activities, make up human life in all of its dimensions. The old humanism was characterized by the Κόσμος, the balance, harmony and beauty. This new humanism is dynamic, moving towards an asymptotic convergence of every thing: "A new humanism is emerging -- in the irresistible play of co-reflexion: no longer the humanism of equilibrium, but of movement. No value will remain on its foundations unless we assume an ultra-human future of cosmic dimensions and acknowledge the demands of such a future."25

24 Teilhard de Chardin, Christologie et évolution (1933).

Even though we cannot see many clear hints in Teilhard's work—except for occasional passages, like in The Future of Man—his thought in general and the concept of the "upward movement" are of eminent relevance for education. In his analysis which one might call a "phenomenology of the human act" he offers the foundations of an educational philosophy far superior to, say, the Marxist propositions. The faith in a God as the essential roots of man's attitudes can be a dynamic motive for man to fulfill his secular vocation as completely as possible. Work cannot alienate man when he sees it in the context of reality which comprises the concrete and the transcendent.

It seems—and there are many hints in psychology and psychiatry—that only the faith in a transcendent reality enables man to face and master the challenge of difficulties and obstacles which threaten man in his existence.  


The role of education would thus be to show this context, to lead the individual to a perspective that sees the relationship between natural and supernatural in the world, and thus to master life. "Our work appears to us, in the main, as a way of earning our daily bread. But its essential virtue is on a higher level: through it we complete in ourselves the subject of the divine union...

... Whatever our role as men may be, whether we are artists, working men, or scholars, we can, if we are Christians, speed towards an opening on to the supreme fulfillment of our beings...

We are led to the following observation: God is inexhaustibly attainable in the totality of our action...

God is not far away from us... from the world we see, touch, hear, smell, and taste about us. Rather he awaits us every instant in our action, in the work of our moment."\(^{28}\)

The main objection comes from people who cannot or do not want to accept this religious view. This is understandable. The question is only what they have as an alternative. When we cannot lead our youth to this "sanctification of human endeavour" as Teilhard puts it in one of his chapters of his *Divine Milieu*, what else will we do? The past

should have convinced at least the educators that not one of the enlightened and "scientific" solutions have changed anything in our problematic conditions. The rejection of a religious perspective as some sort of "opiate" for the people would throw man only into an objective reality where he can see nothing but the fact of work and toil to meet needs. It is, however, not only from neo-Paganism and atheism where the criticism against Teilhard comes from. The heaviest blasts came from his brethren in Christo. He meets their critique with the statement that they saw in Christianity no more than "an additional burden of observances and obligations, to weigh down and increase the already heavy load, or to multiply the already paralyzing ties of our life in society." 29

As a priest and member of a religious order he saw that "a large number of Catholics lead a double or crippled life in practice: they have to step out of their human dress so as to have faith in themselves as Christians -- and inferior Christians at that." 30

---

29Ibid., p. 70.
30Ibid., p. 65.
Teilhard is not pessimistic, however, just as all the obstacles which were thrown in his path by his own people could not discourage him. He sees in the future -- however distant it might be -- a time, "where will be little to separate life in the cloister from the life of the world. And only then will the action of the children of heaven (at the same time as the action of the children of the world) have attained the intended plenitude of its humanity."\(^{31}\)

But Teilhard de Chardin does not only talk about work. We discern in his thought a concept of leisure quite consistent with the original concept of the *artes liberales*:

"When mankind has realized that its first function is to penetrate, intellectually unify, and harness the energies which surround it, in order still further to understand and master them, there will no longer be any danger of running into an upper limit of its florescence ... nothing on earth will ever saturate our desire for knowledge or exhaust our power for invention. ... From this point of view, if we are going towards a human era of science, it will be eminently an era of human science. Man, the knowing subject, will perceive at last that man 'the object of knowledge' is the key to the whole science of nature."\(^{32}\)

\(^{31}\)Ibid., p.69.

How far we are from such a "unification" of the search for truth and the search for control! Our human problems have been studied by scientists of all fields. Can one say that their main concern was man? Have not most of our insights into the human nature remained within the walls of the academic institutions while people still died of diseases, wars, of violent acts, and nature died of pollution and reckless exploitation? The demand to achieve a "human science" has all of a sudden become outspoken as we realized the threats of natural pollution and violence. Teilhard wants to go much farther, however:

"Neither in its impetus nor in its achievements can science go to its limits without becoming tinged with mysticism and charged with faith". 33

There is not the anxious care that nothing of a metaphysics may stealthily slip into science. It has become more and more visible that science can no longer be conceived as the merely objective approach to reality. This view is passé since an

33Ibid., p. 284
Einstein or Heisenberg broke through the framework of the empirical with the emphasis on the theory: an approach in terms of Aristotelian ἐμπειρία\textsuperscript{34}, that would very often start with the theoria instead of the experimentation, and arrive at insights which transcend the mere observational, reaching deep into the philosophical realms, if not even theological dimensions. This is exactly what Teilhard points out:

"that religion and science are the two conjugated faces or phases of one and the same complete act of knowledge -- the only one which can embrace the past and future of evolution so as to contemplate, measure, and fulfill them."\textsuperscript{35}

With this, the scientific endeavor of man is categorized more as "leisure" than as work. While the latter remains most of the times in the necessary, science and the whole desire of man to know (and here "religion" is nothing else but man's desire to "know" about transcendent reality, to push back the frontier of faith!), is a fundamental drive from within, that develops only when man has the free room and the time to pursue this knowledge.

\textsuperscript{34}Cfr. supra, pp.17 sq.

\textsuperscript{35}Teilhard de Chardin, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 285.
How important this "free room" is became visible with the advent of the totalitarian states in our era, where both religion and science have been subjugated under the control of an "almighty state". The modern "workers' state" (all of our dictators liked to call their nations such) does not allow for leisure, it is even dangerous to insist on finding out and knowing the truth for oneself. Teilhard does not speak much about the political implications of his thought. He rather presupposes that this freedom is guaranteed for man in the future, where he "envisages a world whose constantly increasing 'leisure' and heightened interest would find their vital issue in fathoming everything, trying everything, extending everything,... a world in which, as happens already, one gives one's life to be and to know, rather than to possess." 36

Is this the view of a utopian? Some would affirm this and compare Teilhard de Chardin with a Thomas More or Marx. Or is it an eschatological view? Martin Buber would make the distinction between utopian and eschatological thought, pointing to the

36Ibid., p. 279.
theme of a completion or consummation of creation in eschatology, while utopia deals with the development of a social order already potentially present in mankind. With this distinction we would see both elements in Teilhard's philosophical thought. The same would almost apply for Marxism, if it were not for the promise that foresees an evolution that would eventually lead to the climax of human history, quasi all by itself. Here lies a fundamental difference to Teilhard: while all of the proclaimed utopians have promised a future where man is free from the tension of a polarity between human freedom and social consciousness, in most cases with an authority relieving man from this tension by structuring the entirety of life and society, Teilhard would never allow himself to promise anything. His philosophy is based upon the premises of human freedom as God-given endowment, and the dynamic agent at work in everything and everybody, the spirit of God. Progress is here not an automatism but the power to advance, the movement on the slant which man must freely join by a personal decision.
It is interesting to note that our contemporary literature did not produce any utopias for years. All the theatre plays and novels depicting the future are pessimistic and foresee only totalitarianism and despair. Orwell's *1984* and Huxley's *Brave New World* are only two examples out of many. It is no different with philosophy that is equally pessimistic and nihilistic: Herbert Marcuse, Bloch, Camus, Sartre... they all remain in the immanent without seeing a way up. Teilhard de Chardin seems to be the single exception with his optimism which is nevertheless realistic in its demands. Or is it so "utopian" to be an *λυπέρνος* -- one who is "looking upward"...?
V. Conclusion

"Τέχνη τεχνῶν ἄνθρωπον ἀγείν, τὸ πολυτροπώτατον καὶ τὸ ποικιλώτατον τῶν ζωῶν." ¹

This famous sentence from the mouth of an educator of sixteen hundred years ago comes to one's mind when the view goes back upon the discussions of so many aspects and problems of education, as in the present tractate. Even though we limited ourselves to two activities in human existence -- work and leisure -- the ramifications of these complex activities led into many side issues which open themselves up as soon as one examines them a little more closely. No wonder have parents and educators, statesmen and religious leaders attempted for hundreds, even thousands of years to come to grips with these problems. As they never achieved a lasting solution we find ourselves still struggling with the same issues.

Why is it so difficult to find a way

¹ St. Gregory of Nazianzus (330-390): "It is the art of arts, to guide man, the most difficult and versatile of all beings."
that would lead man to his fulfillment? Why do so many toil just to find enough food and a roof over their heads, while others seem to have everything and are able to lead a life of leisure? Why are neither the laborers nor the leisurely happy? These questions flare up with almost every new generation, and each time it seems to be more urgent to find a solution, a lasting answer.

But there is answer that can be given. The answer can only be found, by each one for and by himself. This seems to be ignored by almost all of our educators who tried to find a "formula". The very word education--derived from the Latin *educere*, that is to "lead"--gives the hint that the educator can only guide. It is not guiding or leading when someone is carried or pushed or pulled. This is exactly what education for most of us and our ancestors was. And yet, how far would we be if we never were compelled by the one or the other outside force? It is this polarity of freedom and compulsion which gives tension to human existence, and with it, education. The work of man and his leisure are only paradigmata of this polarity that goes right across all
dimensions of human existence.

As we have seen in the course of this tractate, the attempts in the various disciplines converge in the objective of overcoming this polarity. While most of the propositions are incomplete, if not one-sided, we can see in all of them an aspect which points to the solution of a synthesis. In fact, only a synthesis, not the emphasis of the one pole over the other, or the total rejection of one of the two, only the unifying of both freedom and constraint can be the direction where an answer can be found.

From all the educational and philosophical attempts to attain such a synthesis, there is only one which would consistently take into consideration the "difficulty and versatility" in man's nature, of which Gregory of Nazianzus spoke: the Christian approach with its emphasis on life as the highest and ultimate value.

From the simplest one-celled animal to the most complex organism, life is the dynamic value which is constantly expanding and which is preserved at all costs: man facing death will even give up everything
he has, even parts of his body, and so does the animal that struggles with all its powers and instincts to stay alive. (All religions have regarded life as the highest value; when some cultures sacrificed human lives to their Gods it was possible only because they saw it as the most precious which they could offer to the Divine.) Only in Christ's message, however, do we see the concept of life as the beginning and end, the highest and most precious value: "that they may have life, and have it abundantly..." If we had consistently followed this ideal and preserved this value, would we ever had wars and concentration camps, suicide and starvation up to this day?

With all our obsession on scientific endeavor and academic knowledge in both our schools and in adult lives we lost sight of the ultimate purpose of all our work and knowledge: life. Things have come into the foreground as values of primary importance, even though they could not make any sense without the basis of life: what is freedom, power, fame, money, social privileges without
life? Thinkers like a Francis of Assisi, a Teilhard de Chardin, even though hundreds of years apart, have pointed to this value. It seems that only there can education find its starting point and its end, when it helps, guides towards life. The polarity between life as a datum and the challenge to make it into one's personal life is exactly the tension that keeps education going, never really coming to an end. Maybe a John Dewey meant this when he insisted that there are no ends and aims in education? At least he was right in so far as we must admit that up to this day we have not yet arrived at the end of the educational enterprise. We will never — as the path of mankind continues. Gabriel Marcel speaks of the homo viator, man the wanderer on his way. It is meant to be a way up, and the task of education is nothing else than to lead man on this way up, be it by showing ways, or be it only by directing the view of man upward, that he be truly an Εινατός ... For some of the youngsters this way will be the road of work, for others the road of knowledge, in most of their activities of life. Yet none can be
confined to one of these tracks only. The working man will want to know, and the knower will often have to work. Both make up the road of man --- and education is one of the vehicles which he uses.

Among all of those concerned with man's life, the educator will always be the one with the greatest responsibility and thus the most deep-going influence. We cannot, however, limit the concept of the educator to the teacher. There are the parents as the first educators, and the various "authorities" whom man encounters in the course of his life, not to forget the "hidden persuaders" of our times. The criterion for the good educator is that he will, from the beginning of his interaction with the individual, have in aim to make himself unnecessary. (This is what ultimately makes one question whether the hidden persuaders are really educators, as they intend to remain influential upon the individual!) But this is possible only when his objective is the self-activity of the educand. Again, we see the polarity of life as a datum correspond to the educator as a datum for the individual. Just as
life has to become one's own life, so the individual must become his own educator. In this seems to lie the main difficulty of education: to enable man to take over by himself, to take his destiny in his own hands and be himself. For the Christian, this is possible only with the help of a supplementary strength which outweighs the limitations and shortcomings of human nature: grace. As to this, we may see in Teilhard one of the educators -- in its literal meaning: a "guide" -- for our generation who is troubled so much by confusion and frustration. We have tried to lead youth without a faith, by addressing ourselves only to their memories and intellectual faculties. We have forgotten the heart and man's subjectivity, and thus we lost one of the main attributes of man, his virtus. The English word "virtue" became a derivation of this Latin "manhood"; but it does not really mean something else. Virtues are funded in man's nature as a being that reaches beyond the physical dimension. It is one of the fundamental insights of R.M. Hutchins which points
into this direction:

"I doubt if any single man, to say nothing of the whole world, can practice Aristotle's Ethics without the support and the inspiration of religious faith..." 2

It has become obvious that neither work nor leisure can go without the virtues, unless man suffers degradation and alienation. May our young generation find the virtus, genuine manhood, in the future. That educators should be able to aid them towards this, by showing them a perspective which directs their view upward, is the hope of the writer.

---
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