

person who educates another always does so by virtue of a mandate. "Being an educator" is always characterized by the fulfillment of a moral mandate; almost always its character is that of fulfilling an official mandate.

When a child comes into the home, a specifically parent-child relationship develops. That relationship is not described by stating that the parents are obligated to educate and guide the child, for whose life they are responsible, merely out of social considerations. We may grant the presence of such considerations, but they do not reach the heart of the matter. We might state it as follows: Parents who do not think they have a calling to nurture and guide the child which they have engendered and brought into the world (extreme radical view), have no conception of their task and calling; but neither do those parents have this who regard their task to consist merely in sustaining the child's life and in aiding the child to make the most of itself, and that simply because the child owes its existence to them (bio-sociological view). It is all wrong to say that education (*opvoeding*: nurture) implies only: bearing the consequences of the fact that you have brought a child into the world; and that education is merely the natural consequence of being the biological cause for the coming into existence of another human being. If education was truly only the result of that fact, then those who educate could content themselves with sustaining the life of the child and forming and directing him in such a manner that presently the child could maintain his own existence; in that case education would signify merely activity within the biological sphere. Fortunately, most parents feel that they have greater obligations. The special tie between parents and children is much more than is comprised in the statement: parents are the natural cause for the existence of the child and therefore they have obligations.

We know the parent-child relationship in life is included in a special ordinance of God for life. That special ordinance

3

Authority, Discipline, and Freedom in Christian Education

IN SPEAKING of authority, discipline, and freedom in Christian education, we again come to grips with one of those typically pivotal questions about which the whole problem of modern education turns. Our discussion of this question will have to be as thetical as possible; for if, within the given time limitations, we wished merely to list all the opinions we must reject, we should not be able to set forth our own views. Consequently, I shall actually refer only occasionally to those whose opinions I do not share, even though their opinions are the background of what I say.

When we speak of educators, it stands to reason that in the first place we think of parents; in many instances we even think of them exclusively. Accordingly, the things I have to say will, as a matter of principle, apply in the fullest sense to both the parental authority and discipline, and to the freedom accorded the child by its parents.

In our approach to the problems of authority, we must begin by affirming that the authority to educate is always a derived authority. I have no right to exercise authority over a child which I encounter at random. The right "to be an educator" always presupposes a relationship of law to the one to be educated. This relationship to the young person to be educated is not in the first place the outcome of a voluntary decision on the part of the educator. (Sometimes it may be necessary to require such a voluntary decision, however.) But the

of God is linked up with the Covenant in which God includes both parents and children. And it is fortunate that thousands and thousands of parents still feel there is something unique about the parent-child relationship even though they may possess no knowledge of the Covenant of God. Many persons try to explain that uniqueness exclusively in terms of natural relationships. They say it is natural for parents to be fond of their children and consequently to desire to do everything possible for both the physical and spiritual well-being of their children. Those who speak thus think that the activities of parents, the educational or nurturing activity (in a physical and spiritual sense) is based on natural parent-child relationships.

I may observe, however, that this view of the matter merely transfers the problems to another area. Indeed, what is the cause of the love of the parents for their children? Why is there such a very special tie between parents and children? How does one explain the fact that these parents from the very outset feel responsibility toward their children; that their love impels them to such a degree that they can do nothing but seek that which is best for the physical and spiritual welfare of their children?

Everyone will realize that the simple fact of physical unity between parents and children is not enough to explain the parents' wish to educate. It has been said that the explanation must be sought in the fact that man is a rational being, and that this rationality naturally leads him to educate, that is, to bring up the child. I should like to make two observations against this view. In the first place, the spiritual education of the child on rational grounds as a rule results in bad education. When the educating takes place intuitively, it usually is better, even though it remains true that intuitive education of the spirit must be enriched by insight. But that is quite another matter. The point is we find it to be a fact that parental training which is based purely on rational grounds is worse than that based on intuitive grounds, that is, the inner com-

pulsion which motivates the parents in educating their children. And in the second place, it is a remarkable phenomenon, that when pure rationality governs life, the tie between parents and children becomes weakened and the parental urge to educate the child decreases. Cold rationality which leads men to act, because the actions can be reasoned out, as a matter of fact, makes the urge to act less and less in every area of life. Phenomena, observable in our own society, make it plain moreover, that rational insight can never be the basis—at least not a good basis—for educational activity.

In the relationship between the educator and the one to be educated—in so far as it relates to the relationship: parents-children—there is always a two-fold aspect: first, the educator's love for the child; second, the educator's awareness of responsibility toward the child of today who must become the man of tomorrow.

It goes without saying that these two elements of love and a feeling of responsibility must be present in educators. In general, and consequently also in them to whose care children have been entrusted.

This very typical element of the feeling of responsibility now leads us to the heart of the matter in our discussion of the task of the educator. Why is the educator conscious of his responsibility? Why does he know that he is responsible for what happens to the child? Surely, it is because he is aware of having a mandate. This feeling of responsibility cannot be attributed to a general feeling of responsibility present in the social community. That I should assume responsibility for a child which stands on the river-bank and threatens to fall into the river, while I am in a position to prevent that accident, is abundantly clear. In this case, however, my responsibility is of a general character. Whether it is a helpless child I can save or a drunken man makes no difference at all. What is involved

There are, therefore, two elements without which the educator cannot teach: love and a feeling of responsibility.

Now it is possible to relate the feeling of one's responsibility directly to a mandate. I am responsible for something, but also to someone. And indeed no responsibility is conceivable without this relationship to the person to whom I am responsible for something or for someone. The feeling of responsibility is determined by this personal relationship.

I intentionally did not speak of the authority of parents until now. Indeed, if we state that love and a feeling of responsibility are the distinctive characteristics out of which educational activity grows, then we regard the activity of the parents differently than if we say they are invested with authority. Moreover, it is not possible to equate love and authority, as though they were of coordinate importance. It is frequently done, but that does not make it right. Frequently one hears it said that authority and love are both necessary in education. Now in itself this is true, but you are making a mistake when you coordinate love and authority as two entities more or less independent from each other.

We now wish to address ourselves to the question: How are these two characteristics of the educator, his authority and his love, mutually related?

There is no easy answer to this question, the more so because it is evident that in the practice of everyday living there are such persistent misconceptions of this matter. For many people the parent-child relationship is such that parents should state: "It is natural for me to love you, and besides God has invested me with authority"; or else: "I love you and you are called upon to obey me"; or again: "I have been given authority, and you must love me, your educator, so that you may receive my love in return." This problem of authority in education we intend to examine more closely, noting particularly both the relationship of authority and love, and the relationship

is my relationship to a fellow human being. But when a person is the educator of a child or of a youth, then the relationship is a very special one. That special relationship may have a twofold character.

There may be a very specific relationship between this educator and that pupil, as in the case of a foster-father and a foster-son; or again between a teacher and one particular boy in his section who requires special attention. Furthermore, the relationship may be one of the educator's responsibility toward a group. But as soon as we begin to speak of the role of the educator, we shall always find a specific responsibility towards a particular individual under particular circumstances. This responsibility also has a permanent character. Otherwise there can be no question of educating. An official "who must look after a boy," is not an educator: he is a guard.

Accordingly, we observe that the element of responsibility always comes to the fore in education. But now it remains true that this responsibility can be realized only by way of love. If the educator does not feel attached to the child or young person he must educate, the task of educating will fail. Without this love it is not possible to understand the child. Moreover, the educator will lack the necessary patience if he does not have love. But the most important thing is this: without love there is missing in the education that unique quality which causes the child to respond to the educational process. Education without love is nothing more than the issuing of commands. But commands do not educate, they only drill; they can make of the human being a clever creature, which knows all the loopholes of the law, but they do not form personality. Therefore education without love—assuming for a moment that this were possible—is such a tremendous danger to the child and even to society. Education without love produces automatons or permanent rebels against the social order, or formally correct but inhibited persons who dare not express themselves, or other such types.

of that authority to the feeling of responsibility in the educator.

No one will dispute the following proposition: God has given parents authority over children, and therefore—stated otherwise—God has given particular parents authority over the young persons who are to be educated. If I state the proposition that parents (that is, educators) love their children and should love them, no one will object. Nor will anyone deny the proposition that God has entrusted the children (who are his children) to the parents for their education, and that therefore they are responsible for those children. Nevertheless, we are making a mistake when we continue to speak of these as three distinct matters: the authority of the educator, the love of the educator, and the feeling of responsibility of the educator. These differentiations which can so easily become differences have had many unfortunate results.

What is the essential character of being an educator? It is: "to fulfill a mandate." God has given the parents a mandate to bring up their children. That is a duty of the parents. From this follows their responsibility. To enable the parents to fulfill their obligation, God has vested in the parents that which they need for fulfilling their duty. And what is that? Is it possible in answer to say: on the one hand they are in need of authority and on the other hand they are in need of love? I hold that it is not so, and when I say this I know someone will wish to contradict me. But I also know that on the basis of God's Word I am convinced that I may not hold anything else. Authority and love are not a duality in education. Parental authority cannot be separated from parental love. In many respects they are even indistinguishable, because authority is love and love is authority. I would also be prepared to defend the proposition that good authority never can be divorced from love. He possesses authority who has the final say, who can lay down the law. But among human beings only he has the final say who is bound to his fellows by inner ties. Without this inner tie, authority becomes tyranny! Consequently, no

sooner does parental authority become dissociated from parental love in the consciousness of the child, or separated from the love which the child feels toward the parents, before the authority begins to miscarry. And the parents will have to understand and put this in practice every day.

Conversely, love can never be detached from authority. Love which is not at all times and in all places an expression of the task of the parents, who bear that authority, is not genuine love. Such love of the educator soon becomes coddling, soon becomes a soft-hearted indulging of the whims and wishes of the child. Such authority loses its connection with the law of God.

Here we touch upon another point which shows how harmoniously interwoven authority and love are. We now refer in particular to authority and love as they become evident in education. The concept of "law" is correlative with that of "authority." Authority demands obedience. Authority is related to the rule which we must obey, the law which calls for obedience. In the awareness of many individuals it is particularly this fact which causes an inner separation of love and authority. They say: the law commands, the law is severe, the law is cold. Love binds, love is compassionate, love is warm, and therefore the love-side of authority is evangelical. The law side of authority is legal, Old-Testament-like, and essentially it is a thing that has been transcended.

He who speaks so has no understanding of the essence of law. In our discussion of moral education, I hope to refer to this point again. However, I wish to make the observation here and now that the law of God is an expression of God's being, and hence also an expression of the love of God by which he is bound to His own cosmos. If the creature lives according to the law, the ordinance, the rule which God has laid down for His creatures, then all will be well with that creature. The creature of God will experience that the law of God is nothing but the expression of a rule which enables the creature to find and maintain its life. The law of love is like

the loving human hand which casts the fish which has floundered upon dry land back into the water; it is the love whereby one human being saves another from drowning. The law is not present to chastise us, to make us unhappy, to rob us of freedom, but the law is there to show us the way along which we can go to life, to the light. The law points us to the place where it is safe and where we can be happy.

To be sure, if we acknowledge the law in this sense, then we also presuppose that other function of the law by which we know our misery and whereby the law itself becomes our schoolmaster to Christ. But in Christ that law becomes to us a rule of life; the law becomes for us an expression of the love of God. Therefore the legal side of the authority is exactly the same as the love side.

But it is evident that on this view I cannot regard authority in education as something different from love. Indeed, the correct exercise of authority by the educator is only possible, is in fact only permissible, when carried out in love; but to this authority in love and to this love in authority there remains conjoined a responsibility. This is also true because of the fact that in bringing up our children, we are dealing with something which is not our possession, but God's possession. God says to all children of the Covenant: "You are my children," even when parents degenerate so far that they offer their children to Moloch.

Now, however, the question arises as to whether this authority of the parents, interdependent as it is with their love, and their love as well, are dependent upon the subjective recognition by the child. A parallel question is: to what extent does the law of God demand our obedience, even if we are not able to render that obedience out of love?

In answering the question as to the validity of authority, we must begin by declaring that the exercise of authority may never be such that there is a separation between love and

authority. If this unity is broken in the one who bears authority, then he is on the way to misusing that authority; and if he continues on that path, he will finally arrive at the point where he must be deprived of the authority. The fact that authority and love are one in education by no means signifies that the child or young person subject to parental authority now also has the right to reject the authority. He should obey his parents out of love. But he may not say: "If such love is lacking, I am no longer obliged to obedience, for in that case my obeying would only be a slavish obedience." If a young person were to argue in this manner, he certainly would demonstrate his lack of understanding of this relationship. The authority of love, which is exercised over him with loving authority, is balm for his loving heart; and if he obeys out of love, then all is well. But if he does not wish to obey, because he has no love, then authority remains, nonetheless. Authority exercised in the spirit of love—that most certainly is the essence of parental authority; however, this does not imply that the child who supposes he cannot respond in love by the same token does not have to acknowledge the authority of his parents. Every child must see the authority of his parents as representative of the authority of God. God's authority too is an authority in love. Therefore, rejection of that love is equivalent to defiance of God himself and consequently of his authority. Likewise, he who disclaims the love of his parents, attacks their authority, and hence the parents themselves. This also signifies that they who do not acknowledge the authority of love stand guilty before their parents, and that therefore by virtue of the parental authority and love they must receive punishment.

Accordingly, parents who understand their authority and the significance of that authority, will be expected to take disciplinary measures in due course when a child by disobeying shows its lack of love. Consequently the authority of the parents continues even when their love is rejected by the child.

And a child, therefore, who no longer recognizes the authority of its parents as an authority of love, can expect nothing less than to experience the parental authority either as a compelling authority or as a punitive authority. In such a case what has really happened is that the child who no longer has an eye for love and accordingly rejects authority in its further contacts with that authority no longer experiences the love which is present. And the child suffers punishment in the name of this authority (which nevertheless really remains an expression of love) in order that the child may come to acknowledge that authority as the authority of love.

Although we must regard the authority of the parents as the authority of love, yet we must not overlook the fact that this authority as such also results from a God-given mandate. We should not, however, regard this mandate as one which God, after giving many other mandates and talents, now adds as a special mandate, namely, that of authority over children. Indeed not. But it does mean that in the entire covenantal relationship, authority, love, and responsibility appear as a unity. As God is one in all his virtues, so in the relation of God to his children the demand comes that we in turn experience the unity of all those virtues which God in the covenantal relationship is pleased to grant his children for their covenantal task.

As far as our analytic reasoning is concerned, it may very well be true that there is a duality in authority and love, and that it is extremely difficult to think of these two as a unity. But as opposed to this, it is equally true that in a believing acceptance of the covenantal mandate these two are indeed one; and further that in their oneness with the feeling of responsibility they form a unity for the practice of life.

Authority and love, therefore, constitute a unity. The discipline which the parents exercise over the child stems from this unity. This exercise of discipline is first of all a question of the day to day attitude of the parents. The child of the Covenantant, who is to be educated in the way of the Covenant, must

continually be seen as a covenantal child. That is not to say that we should have to speak of the Covenant to the child each day. Indeed, this should not be done until the child has reached at least the years of discretion. But the attention of the child should be called on the one hand, to the love of God, to the love of Christ, who loved and still loves him; and on the other to the fact that he must now also love God, that he must realize his need for forgiveness from sin, and that he should ask God to love him in spite of the fact that his heart is sinful. In all Christian education this apparent duality is in truth a unity. And it is precisely the same duality and the same unity which the educator finds in his own life. It is the duality and unity found in the declaration: "all my sins have been forgiven" and in the petition: "forgive us our debts."

Now education must primarily be of such a character that the child experiences in its educators, hence particularly in the parents, the truth described above. The entire life's attitude of mother and father, of teacher and master should manifest itself to the child as a daily walking with God. That is something quite different from the attitude revealed by some Christians who represent God only as an avenging justice, whom the child must fear, and whom you must placate from hour to hour by taking care that you do not sin against his commands.

On the one hand, discipline has bearing on the fact that the parents, in particular the educator, and even more particularly the father and mother, must give guidance to the child in growing up. Discipline has reference to restraining or bridling, but not exclusively in a negative sense; discipline is also a bridle which steers in the right path. On the other hand, it is just because the right path must be travelled and because the direction of that path is determined by both the starting-point and the end-point, that discipline is also a means to attain that end. One aspect of discipline is always the desire to attain the ideal. That is the specific character of pedagogical discipline. But as a pedagogical discipline it also includes a third aspect:

its purpose to bring the child to the point where he no longer requires discipline by others, and where self-discipline will enable the child to be his own guide. That is, of course, self-guidance according to the norms laid down in the Word of God.

In discipline, therefore, there is a confrontation of educator, child, and educational objective. Discipline is a means of education. Really it can be said that discipline is the only means of education, if the word discipline is rightly understood. "Discipline" is something wholly different from what is usually designated as a "disciplinary measure." Every means by which a child is guided in the right direction is a means of discipline. If in teaching, we teach a child the most simple rules of arithmetic, this is a means of disciplining the native capacity of the child in arithmetic to the laws which hold for arithmetic. Likewise, it can even be said that a child who learns a series of irregular French verbs is being disciplined; for only in this way will the child be able to curb himself from exceeding the bounds of grammar when speaking French. Obviously, the word discipline is used here in its broadest sense. But we are deliberate in stating that this is all discipline. Indeed, in this manner we include under discipline the proper regard for correct social manners, correct speech, and correct behavior in society. Unruliness, that is, the want of discipline, usually begins at the periphery of human existence. This initial lack of discipline often is related to the lack of respect for the little things which make our societal life pleasant. People who always appear too late at meetings, who always speak a little longer than their allotted time, or people who go to bed boisterous and late while staying at a hotel, or who whisper during a concert, these people have not disciplined their lives. And as a matter of course, the attitude of such individuals finds its reflection in their children. In children, and particularly in the youth of our time, there is, generally speaking, a serious lack of discipline.

A want of discipline is not restricted to vandalism: the destruction of shrubbery in park or garden, or the smashing of windows; but a lack of discipline is also demonstrated when someone plays a noisy jazz record for hours in a rooming house full of guests, or when a group of campers troops into church just three minutes late. If parents and educators do not have an open eye for these matters, and accordingly allow children the so-called freedom to have their fling, with the resulting disturbance to other people in the community, then this points to a faulty conception of discipline and one which will have very serious consequences. Expressions such as: "Its nobody else's business," or "People shouldn't be offended so quickly," or "If I think it is fun, why shouldn't I do it?" reveal an attitude of mind which is basically undisciplined.

We do not intend, of course, to suggest that the child must be educated in a strait-jacket. Far from it. All education, also education in discipline, requires freedom. Discipline serves to protect freedom.

What is freedom? Freedom is not: "severance of all bonds." A fish is free only when it swims in water; it is bound to the water. A bird enjoys freedom only when it can fly in the air; it is bound to space. Accordingly, there are certain bonds which belong to the nature of every living being. As soon as we overlook this in discussing the concept of "freedom" we go astray in defining the character of true freedom.

A living creature lacks freedom only when it is bound by bonds which do not belong to its nature. A bird without air, or a fish without water, lacks freedom even though in all other respects it is free. They are free only by virtue of the bonds which belong to their nature. There are many bonds which do not belong to our essential humanity. If a man is bound by such bonds, he lacks freedom. But there are other bonds which are an essential part of our humanity. In the absence of

these bonds, man lacks freedom as much as the fish which is outside the bonds of water. Thus the human individual is bound by such clothing as befits the climate in which he lives. Man is likewise bound by certain social bonds. The child who prematurely frees himself from the parental bond does not gain freedom, but rather loses freedom; this is true because the bond between this child and its parents is a natural relationship which the child needs if it is to develop and give full scope to its natural gifts. Most human beings fortunately are bound to a person of the opposite sex by the very special bond of love. This being bound belongs to the nature of man and only in this restrictive bond can man truly be free; only in this being bound can he live his life to the full. There are a few individuals who are not capable of love. For them the marriage-bond means the loss of freedom. Likewise, the marriage-bond between two persons of opposite sexes which is not based on an essential compatibility of the marriage partners results in a loss of freedom.

Thus we conclude that freedom means: the rejection of those bonds which are foreign to essential nature; but that freedom also implies: the acceptance of those bonds which belong to essential nature.

Accordingly, we are now able to state that child-discipline has as its purpose the averting of all those bonds which are foreign to the essential nature of the child in general, and to this child in particular; but discipline must also serve to strengthen and fortify all the bonds which are inherent in the child in general, and inherent in any particular child. And this must take place in such a way that the child learns to be happy without those bonds which are foreign to his nature and happy with those bonds which are peculiar to his nature.

Now societal living is one of those bonds which is characteristic of the nature of the child. And the child can feel happy

only if his organic adjustment to society has been made in a harmonious way. Therefore discipline of the child also signifies that in all of his societal relationships, the child learns to live in a manner conformable to the nature of any given group or community, and so to reveal his membership in that community.

Naturally, this discipline cannot be achieved unless the child has experienced the "spirit" of a particular group. That is to say, that he learns to adapt himself to such an extent, that his feeling, the totality of his being is sensitized, as it were, to discover the *tendenz* which prevails in any particular locale. That is necessary if the child is to learn to shun any particular kind of fellowship which is wrong for him, or which in itself has a wrong purpose. Such a discipline must be practised with patience in quiet conversation with the child. But this exercise in discipline also implies that the child himself must learn to take a position with respect to the group or community. Although we do not wish to suggest that it is possible in the case of every child, yet it is the ideal of good discipline that the child learn not only to feel his way into the group or community, but that he also learns to maintain his personal independence and his critical judgment with respect to that group or community.

Moreover disciplining simultaneously has as its goal that the child may learn to restrain his inclinations, desires, passions, and instincts. It stands to reason that in relation to this objective habit-forming and habituation play an important part in the practice of living.

However, the principal goal of discipline is that the child may learn to subject himself obediently to the ordinances of God, and to do this in such a way that he daily experiences the law as love, also as love of God towards the individual child. Therefore disciplinary measures are justified only when the child experiences in that discipline the love of the disciplinarian. Every punishment given in a hot temper, every chastisement

that you can notice his embarrassment when he is forced out of it. Such a child obviously is completely different from the boy who immediately reacts to a humorous situation and enjoys it. Let us say the boy with a sense of humor has an inclination to grab a cookie; he follows his inclination, takes the cookie and quickly eats it, but he is caught in the act. Then one might very well remark: that boy has taken a cookie and consequently a punishment must follow which suits a boy who steals a cookie. The same thing could be said for the second boy, the schematic one, the boy who is much more rigid. But it would be foolishness to think that punishment is something which can be administered according to the book: "The punishment fits the crime." It must also fit the criminal. Even a physician varies his prescriptions to fit the individual make-up of the patient. And when parents resort to punishment, they should take into consideration the type of child they are dealing with.

However, it is characteristic of such situations that the parents of the boy who has remained the humorous type are as a rule themselves responsible for the fact that their boy has a sense of humor; whereas in the case of the other child the parents themselves share responsibility for the fact that their six-year old boy takes flight into schematization. Needless to say, these situations make the problem difficult in practice, for in all likelihood the latter parents will also be inclined to proceed too schematically in exercising discipline because of the cookie; whereas the former parents may have an inclination to be lax in their discipline because they cannot help laughing at the "funny face" their boy pulls in his wrong-doing. It is necessary for the parents of both children to realize the background of the trespass of their child. Let us assume (by no means unlikely) that in the case of the humorous type of child the background is as follows: An attempt to see how far the boy can go in playing a trick on his parents. The only correct discipline in that event is for the parents to disrupt at once and without much ado the general feeling of good humor existing between

administered in a fit of anger, every scolding resulting from irritation on the part of father or mother, and every snubbing out of self-preservation or nervousness, has the wrong effect, and is, in fact, not Christian discipline.

From what has been said so far it could be concluded that although the disciplining of children should conform to general rules, it is not necessary to make further distinctions. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Anyone who educates is dealing with a child who has particular characteristics, individual qualities, individual ways of reacting and individual talents. In the general practice of education and in the exercise of discipline in particular, the educator very definitely must take into account who and what the child is. The first requirement of good discipline is that the child, as he is, does not get a feeling of discouragement through the discipline because he does not experience love in discipline.

But the immediate implication of this fact is also that there must be a very great differentiation and variation in the exercise of discipline. In calling attention to the following examples, we emphasize that they are to be regarded merely as illustrations. A boy of six years, robust and strong, and possessing a genuine sense of humor, who at a given moment consciously violates a command of his father, must undergo a form of discipline which is quite different from that given another six-year old boy, equally healthy, but who lacks a sense of humor and is more rigid and schematized in his actions. Perhaps this rigid schematism in the boy is even to be attributed to his parents. But in any case there is behind this schematism in the little child a kind of fear for life, for what life may bring. Schematic people are after all always persons who take refuge in schematization because they have a fear of not being equal to life; they take flight into schematization out of ignorance, anxiety, or fear. Now schematization always has a negative cause. It is possible for a six-year old to reveal already a tendency to do everything in such a rigidly schematized manner

them and the child; and that they then say: "No, that is not nice, that is not funny at all; now you really are making a nuisance of yourself; that is naughty, and if it happens again, we shall have to punish you." This child must learn to feel what is the difference between a joke and something which is really wrong. But in the case of the second boy, the situation very probably is different. We will assume that the following condition is present: This schematic child who has in his background certain fears of life and certain inhibitions toward father and mother, has the tendency to create his own little world in which he experiences a degree of pleasure in a manner agreeable to himself. Perhaps feelings of vengeance also play something of a role. Now if this child is severely punished—and schematic parents are apt to punish severely—then the child's feeling of being isolated will be aggravated, and his feeling of vengeance will be intensified. And further, if the child is given a long lecture on the sin of stealing, he will again feel the punishment to be within the same schematization in which he has been trained all the while. Therefore, when mother notices that her child has helped himself to a cookie, it is quite possible that she would do best to put her arm around her son and say: "My boy, did you really want a cookie that badly? You may ask mother for one, but don't just help yourself; mother doesn't like that, and you shouldn't do it either. You know that, don't you? Tonight mother will give you another cookie." We have called attention to these two examples to demonstrate how the same offense may require different forms of discipline, even in the case of comparatively young children. The purpose of discipline is always to preserve, to teach the child to go in the right path. Therefore, the exercise of discipline surely does not always imply chastising, punishing. To exercise discipline signifies: to take that measure which is needed to bring the child to self-discipline. Consequently, the idea of some Christian parents who think they sin if they do not punish a certain violation of their child is wholly erroneous.

Sometimes to forgive is a much better means of discipline than to spank. That likewise depends upon the nature of the child and the nature of the wrong. In this connection it should be emphatically emphasized that in all disciplining and particularly in all punishing one must consider what the child has really done. We should not forget that we exercise discipline upon the child and not upon the deed of the child.

By discipline we must always attempt to reach the inner self of the child. Discipline must not be measured in terms of the more or less accidental external situation. Therefore discipline must always be exercised with much understanding of the inner attitude of the child toward his parents and toward the command, and thus toward him who gives the command. It is a serious mistake on the part of many parents that they do not have an eye for these matters. Perhaps it is necessary for us to admit that unfortunately the sin of many educators is their use of discipline solely as a ruler or measuring line which, moreover, is applied only to external situations. In this manner, however, discipline works inversely and accordingly the child develops a dislike for the commandment. For then he gets the feeling that the law is not love, but hate; that the law is not life, but the severance of life, that it is death to all that lives.

If discipline must be exercised in different ways for different children, then it also follows that in the form and content of disciplinary measures we should take into consideration the age of the children. The educator should possess, as it were, the gift of growing up with the child in the educational activities. The exercise of discipline here also comes into immediate contact with moral education, although not exclusively with it; in every branch of pedagogical activity it is always necessary to demand maximum achievement of the child when it is a question of the child subordinating his life to a form of self-discipline. When it is possible to persuade the child to do

something good or to avoid something bad from considerations arising out of the content of his own life, the discipline will possess far greater value, viewed pedagogically, than when the child has been obedient in response to some advice, to some rebuke previously given by the parents. There are very many extremely obedient children who are obedient until they are twenty years old, but who are of no significance for the rest of their lives. Whether it is due to innate disposition, or whether it is due to their education, they have not been brought to the point of confronting life as independent individuals. The exercise of discipline will always have to be directed toward enabling the child to make his own decisions. Not until this choosing of a position is clearly sinful, or is clearly harmful to the child, will it be necessary to resort to discipline.

It will be readily understood that in exercising discipline we must constantly keep in mind that the child is also a religious being. Discipline makes it final, if you will its highest, appeal to the religious nature of the child. This does not mean that the appeal consists exclusively in holding up to the child the command of God. Discipline makes an appeal to the entire personality in the totality of its attributes, characteristics, and qualities; and these are present only because the child is a religious being.

The various attributes of the individual such as trust, submissiveness, faith, devotion, control of natural inclinations, knowledge of God's will, awareness of life's potentialities, and experiential acquaintance with life — all of these must be viewed as an organic unity, proceeding from the ego and basically directed toward the service of God, but all of these qualities must also be incorporated into the life of discipline. The root of all discipline is to teach the child to understand "that you are not your own." That is one side of the matter. But there also is immediately and even simultaneously another side; not until our life is disciplined in submission to God and his service will our life be happy and peaceful; not until then can

we live ourselves to the full and do the things we really like; not until then will our life become one with the life of the people about us; in fact, one with the life of all creation. The purpose of discipline is therefore ever and anew to teach the child to experience the love of God which comes to us in the law and ordinances; so that we, living in discipline, may see the light and may be able to live happily and contentedly. Viewed thus the expression "to kiss the rod" is intelligible. This is not the cringing attitude of the individual who caresses the punishing hand of the master and thus tries to compel friendliness, but it is the grateful attitude of the person who feels again the love of the Father and who has been brought back into that framework of life in which he only can find happiness.