



CHICAGO JOURNALS

Psychoanalysis and Education

Author(s): Bruno Bettelheim

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The School Review*, Vol. 77, No. 2 (Jun., 1969), pp. 73-86

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1084381>

Accessed: 26/10/2012 15:54

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The School Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The School Review

Volume 77 June 1969 Number 2

BRUNO BETTELHEIM

University of Chicago

Psychoanalysis and Education

Education is man's oldest and best means of shaping future generations and of perpetuating his particular society. Psychoanalysis is our newest body of theory for understanding and modifying human behavior. How strange, then, that we are still without any psychoanalytic theory of learning.

Psychoanalysis has a great deal to offer education and much also to learn from it. Unhappily the relation between them has been most neurotic up to now, like a marriage where both partners are aware of their mutual need but do not really understand one another and therefore cannot pull together as one. Disappointed, they come to ignore each other and go their own separate ways, though professing great mutual respect. The offspring of such a badly managed union might be likened to a bastard child. I refer to our present-day efforts at integrating psychoanalysis and education. Like its parents, this child is torn by the contradictions between them—too sickly to thrive, too schizophrenic to realize the inner split that ails it.

Now I could talk at length about the loss to psychoanalysis because it failed to enrich itself with the insights of education. But I think the reader here is more interested in the other side of the coin—in what psychoanalysis has to offer that education has not yet made its own.

Let me begin with a suggestion of Freud's that education never took seriously—one that psychoanalysis, too, has done little to support. What

Freud suggested, since the psychoanalysis of all children did not seem feasible, was that psychoanalytic insight be brought to all teachers. For the teacher, this would mean regaining her own repressed childhood memories, her reaching a better understanding of what shaped her in her own infancy and childhood, just as all children are shaped. Only then could she educate children in a way that was neither a repressive molding of the young nor an acting out on them of old fears and resentments.

The reason Freud's advice fell on deaf ears is that both the psychoanalyst and those educators interested in psychoanalysis have thus far been carried away by analysis as a method of treatment. What both have neglected is to take a serious look at the goals of psychoanalysis and the image of man they are based on. Because, while education and psychoanalysis may be similar in their aims—namely, to enable man to reach his own highest potentials, and in doing so create a truly human society—their methods and intermediate goals are very different and are often opposed to each other.

Perhaps the confusion arises because psychoanalysis is many different things, two of which count especially here. First, it is a method of treatment—and here the intermediate goal is to uncover the unconscious. But it is also a body of theories on human development, or more particularly on misdevelopment. Psychoanalysis is at its best in explaining what went wrong (and why) in human development. Education is very short on this but is at its best in developing the intellect when nothing goes wrong.

Even in the first psychoanalytic treatise on education, written in 1928, Bernfeld realized how different were the two distinct methods.¹ The educational process is meant to induce the child to accept and perpetuate the very best in existing society, whereas psychoanalysis (as therapy) is meant to enable the individual to fight free of much that society has imposed. That is, while education tries to perpetuate the existing order of the outer world, psychoanalysis tries to revolutionize the existing organization of the inner world. Hence their methods are opposite, though their ultimate goals may be similar.

Yet it is psychoanalysis as a method of therapy, a method designed for treating neurotic persons, that some educators and many psychoanalysts have sought to apply more or less intact to the education of normal children. If, instead, they had looked closer at psychoanalysis as a body of theory, one with a particular view of human development from infancy to maturity, both educators and analysts might have reached for their educative goals in ways more germane to education.

Freud himself stated clearly that the purpose of psychoanalysis is to see to it that "where there was id there should be ego." This basic goal, correctly applied to education, would have humanized and enriched it. Instead, and if anything of psychoanalysis was applied to education, it was

the model of how to uncover and free the unconscious, the id. That is, educators influenced by psychoanalysis tried to expand the relative sphere of the id instead of that of the ego. But while freeing the id may be a needed step in treatment, it is often contrary to the methods of education.

The resultant influence of psychoanalysis on education has satisfied no one, though the disenchantment of the educators is rarely openly stated or clearly recognized. Most of those who for one reason or another went on trying to apply psychoanalysis to education behaved as if to say, "Since our efforts at freeing the unconscious don't seem to do much for the ego, let's forget about the ego and just promote the id." It is an attitude that reveals itself most typically by finding laudable almost any disorganized thing the child does, because it reveals something. Or by viewing what he does as "creative," even when it is basically just an expression of the id—such as a smearing with paint, or a scribbling, or an outpouring in words of some formless inner pressures.

Now there is nothing wrong with the child's being able to mess and smear with paint, or to voice aloud his chaotic feelings. At the right time and in the right place, it may be very good for him to enjoy the chance to let go, be uncontrolled. It becomes damaging if the educator, who should know better, and should guide the child toward ego achievement, does the opposite. And he does that when he fools himself and the child into believing that if something has meaning as id expression it is therefore ego and superego correct (contains a meaningful message to others), though neither one is true. It is very much the task of education to see that the sphere of the ego should grow and be strengthened. But to do that, the teacher must know clearly what is ego correct and what is not. We stunt the child's growth if we view id expressions as creative, instead of being satisfied to recognize their possible value—that they may offer the child temporary relief and the teacher deeper insight into what is going on in the child. Thus, a dream may be very revealing of what is going on in the unconscious. But to dream it is hardly an act of creation, nor will it advance intellectual growth.

Even when later scribbling or drawing becomes more expressive, it is still solipsistic. It becomes meaningful to the child and possibly valuable to others only if—through a slow process of education, through observing and appreciating the efforts of others, through criticism, self-criticism, and the use of appropriate standards—his mere self-expression is transformed into a meaningful message to others, that is, becomes an ego achievement. The difference between an education that is informed by psychoanalysis and one that we might call a reactionary, authoritarian education is that the first one considers seriously the inner meanings of an outward-directed behavior. The second counts only the achievement, and never mind its inner meaning or its cost to the total personality. Not that the nonsense of

educational obscurantists really concerns us. Only our own does. And what I call our own nonsense is the belief, for example, that education (or psychoanalysis) can proceed without taking due account of where the pupil stands in his ego development. This same issue explains why some of the best educators who become interested in psychoanalysis stop teaching children and become psychoanalysts. Certainly that was true for the very first psychoanalytic educators—Bernfeld, Aichhorn, Anna Freud. Though inspired and inspiring teachers, they gave up teaching children once they became engrossed in psychoanalysis. To *practice* analysis and education just does not seem compatible.

Interestingly enough, the same seems to be the fate of recent educational reformers. To cite only one example, there is Kohl² who, as soon as he succeeded with some inspired teaching of his thirty-six Negro children, gave up classroom teaching. It was not (as he wishes to believe) because the existing educational system makes good teaching impossible but because (as I believe) he failed to understand the real problem. While he succeeded in interesting his pupils in some learning, the issue was not to get them to learn what he could make interesting to them—which he did—but to use education as a means of reorganizing their personalities so that learning would become a way of life for them—which he did not. In short, neither he nor we have yet solved the problem of how education can fortify the child's inner world to serve learning. But education cannot do this unless it applies the full psychoanalytic model of man and not just id or superego psychology.

How then does the child move from id expression to ego achievement? To begin with, let me stress that all efforts to educate have a great deal to do with the conscience, or superego. Children do not settle down to learning, do not sublimate because of ego tendencies alone, as we seem to want to believe. Witness the fact that our underprivileged children know perfectly well that it would be ego correct to learn in school if they want to get better jobs. But this they often cannot do. The reason is that in the arduous task of learning their ego lacks support from a strong superego.

What is overlooked is that much of learning is not just a pleasurable experience but hard work. And there is no easy transition from pleasure to hard work. If one has learned to enjoy both, then one can combine them. If not, one can do only the first and not also the second. Or to put it psychoanalytically: we do not reach ego achievements on the basis of id alone either. Id motivation gains us only what in some fashion pertains to the id.

While we can learn, on the basis of our emotions, what for one reason or another we want to learn, we can learn only that. Such learning can and does take place. That is why educators who reach their students this way, as Kohl did, are amazed at how fast and how much their children learn. It is also why they quit in disappointment when everything breaks down,

which happens as soon as learning can no longer proceed on the basis of pleasure alone. All other learning (which means most of it) can occur only when we have learned to apply ourselves even when it gives no immediate pleasure satisfaction—that is, when we have learned to function on the basis of the reality principle. Because learning that gives no immediate pleasure means having learned to accept displeasure at the moment, and for some time to come, in the hope of gaining greater satisfaction at a much later time. And with modern education, this later time becomes very late, perhaps some fifteen years later. Indeed, the more the reality principle is taxed, the more likely it is to give way. If it does, then the pleasure principle becomes dominant again—unless the superego is very powerful, which it no longer is for most of our children. That is why the longer the period of schooling, the greater the rate of the dropouts, even for our nice middle-class children, even for college students, and the more likely they are to seek the easy way out that drugs seem to offer.

Here, let us not forget that fifteen years not so long ago was half the span of a man's life. To be able to postpone reaping the harvest for such a span of time calls for a powerful domination over the pleasure principle by the sense of reality. And the longer the span of time spent on education, the more dominant the reality principle must be for any learning to take place. This, in terms of educational practice, is what is meant when teachers speak of the need for discipline, attention, and concentration.

Fortunately for education as it now exists, most middle-class children still enter school with the reality principle dominant, with the ability to postpone pleasure over long time spans well established. Because of it we can still believe that our system works and that all children are fed into it to their profit. And indeed it still works, but percentagewise for fewer and fewer, and their number is constantly declining. Partly this is because the time spent on education has so increased. But more importantly this is because we no longer live with scarcity but in theoretical affluence. When scarcity reigns (at least in modern Western society), the reality principle seems the only way of life assuring survival. But the image of the affluent society plays havoc with the puritanical virtues.

At a time when one's entire life was swept up in the idea of working now for rewards in the hereafter, as it was in colonial days, then postponement of pleasure was in the very nature of things. But even then such an overweening ascendance of the reality principle had to be supported by the immense pleasure satisfaction people expected to gain, in that era, for such tremendous postponement: only the promise of heaven made it possible to so prolong the waiting for satisfaction; as only the fear of damnation could account for such a powerful superego.

Obviously a valid application of psychoanalysis to education would require us to assess the degree to which a child coming to school today has

made the reality principle his own. And if he has not done so enough, then all educational efforts must be geared toward helping him accept it as more valid than immediate pleasure. So again: How do middle-class children make the transition from pleasure to hard work? The answer is that at first and for a long time to come, they do it with support from the super-ego—on the basis of fear. And the reason they need this support has to do with the slow development of reason, of true thought.

Because, while the ego is that institution of the mind which enables us to be rational, it is a feeble institution. And the younger the child, the feebler the ego. As Freud said, the voice of reason is very soft. It is easily drowned out by the noisy clamor of the emotions. Nevertheless, because it is weak, because the child knows himself unable to cope with full reality yet, unable to really do for himself, his fear of desertion by those who do care for him leads to the forming of a superego. This tells him he must reckon with and obey those powerful figures on the outside who will, in return, protect him. Thus the superego is first established to gain us safety from the external world. (And the same is true later on for the ego.) Typically it comprises the demands of our parents that we control our behavior in return for their keeping us safe.

Now at first this superego is unreasonably domineering and says “you must do as you are told” and not “maybe yes, it all depends on the circumstances.” That is why the small child who is taught to think (or whose life experience teaches him) that taking things without permission is all right on some occasions but not others will have a superego that is full of holes, one that will not later on support him toward academic achievement. To the immature mind the “maybe yes” and “it all depends on when and how” just means “I can do as I please.”

But our conscience, if well-established, will, in a slow process of learning and maturation, stop being so domineering and say more and more “I must do what will be best for me in the long run.”

That is, the initial conscience we develop at a very early age is largely irrational. On the basis of fear (not of reasoned judgment) it tells the child what he must do and not do. Only later does the mature ego apply reason to these do’s and don’ts and subject these earliest laws slowly, step by step, to a critical judgment. It takes mature judgment to be able to “do the right thing” though one is no longer motivated by fear.

So while conscience develops on the basis of fear, learning depends on the prior formation of a conscience which, in the process of learning, is more and more modified by reason. It is true that too much fear interferes with learning. But for a long time learning does not go well unless also prompted by some fear. And this is true until such time as self-interest is enlightened enough to power learning all by itself. But rarely does this

happen before late adolescence. But by that time, personality formation is essentially completed.

Now fear, according to Nietzsche, "is the mother of morality" and "morality is the rationalization of self-interest."^{3, 4} Certainly the psychoanalyst agrees with Nietzsche that all morality including what leads us to accept education is, if not mothered, so fathered by fear, and that (in the last analysis) the content of morality is self-interest. After all, it is self-interest that makes some persons wish for eternal salvation, just as self-interest makes others want to succeed in the rat race. The difference is that the first kind of self-interest leads to entirely different behavior from the second.

But as for morality being based on fear, we now want to remove fear from the life of the child. And as for the content of morality being self-interest, many feel that this should not be so. In short, we now want the child to obey a morality whose basic motivations we do our best to remove.

Our trouble is that we reject what all the generations before us knew: that one can live successfully in society only if one's growing up begins with a once-rigid belief in right and wrong based on a fear of perdition that permits of no shading, of no relativity. And when I speak here of perdition, it makes no difference whether perdition amounts to damnation in hell or the loss of parental affection. If, as modern middle-class parents are often advised, affection is guaranteed the child no matter what, they are correctly advised: there will be no fear. But neither will there be much morality or self-discipline. Only later, in the process of gaining maturity, does one slowly free oneself of some of the fear and begin to question its absolute tenets.

It was a Darwin, as well as a Nietzsche or Freud—these great reviewers of morality who were raised on stringent and absolute demands based on fear—who could later afford to question them ever more critically, without ever losing too much of their superego to go to pieces as persons, or to withdraw from the world in disgust. It was precisely the powerful superego instilled in them as children from which they later drew the strength to try to reshape the world by their more mature concepts.

What was wrong with old-fashioned (and authoritarian) education was not that it instilled a strong superego. On the contrary, that is what was right with it. What was wrong was that it disregarded the need to modify this superego in a continuous process, so that the motivating power of irrational anxiety should steadily give way to more rational purpose.

As a matter of fact, one primary motive for learning anything at all is precisely the wish to modify an irrationally demanding superego to make it more reasonable. If there is no striving for this, because there is no strong superego anxiety to reduce, a most important motive for learning is absent.

If we do not fear God, why learn about religion? If we do not fear the forces of nature, why learn about science or society? The detachment that permits hard study out of sheer curiosity, out of a desire to know more, is a stance not often arrived at till full maturity.

We no longer can or want to base *academic* learning on fear. We know how crippling a price of inhibition and rigidity it exacts. But my contention is that for education to proceed, children must have learned to fear something before they come to school. If it is not the once-crippling fear of damnation and the woodshed, then in our more enlightened days it is at least the fear of losing parental love (or later the teacher's) and eventually the fear of losing self-respect. That is why the modern way of trying to raise children—without fear and without respect for the external superego surrogates—neither equips the child to control his desires of the moment nor prepares him as well as it once did for acting on the basis of long-range goals.

Let me illustrate by means of our classroom reading which, instead of developing the ego and superego, caters only for some time to the id. In our children's stories there are no delays for good things to come, no severe hardships, no insoluble problems, no questions of good and evil. Everybody lives in Pleasant time, on Easy street, in Friendly town. Everyone loves everyone else, inside the family and out, and the future is always rosy and full of promise. Then abruptly, in the stories we give our youngsters in adolescence, there is only Present time, everybody lives on Deprivation street, in Ghastly town, or a yellow submarine. Everyone hates everyone else, inside the family and out, and the future holds no promise, is always dismal and black. In both cases we cater to the id: in our children's stories, to the pleasure id only; in the literature for adolescents, to the anxious, hostile, and persecutory fantasies of the id. Neither of the two literatures does anything to strengthen the ego, though it is the ego we expect the child to set to work—as in mathematics, for example.

The fictional world we create for our children is removed from all the realities of life. In the primers there is no need for the hardships involved in making a living. No delay, no work morality is needed to make a go of life. But having created for our children a world picture of easy life with no problems, this world is suddenly, in adolescence, made out to be the exact opposite—a world where all morality is sham, where everything is purposeless and vicious, where even the rigors of making a living are rejected as stupid. No wonder that with such an upbringing some of the young generation feel that those over thirty have nothing of importance to say to them. Having begun life in a dream world of unreality that demanded of them no sense of purpose, dedication, morality; having then been confronted in adolescence with a world picture where all morality is sham; it is a mystery to them how anyone can take this world seriously, in-

cluding his own place in it. Having failed to acquire a serious attitude to life in childhood, they feel un-serious or phony inside themselves and are convinced that so is everyone else. Above all, they feel utterly confused about things and desperate about their own inner emptiness. If, then, adult spokesmen proclaim this very lack of morality (from which, deep down, they know they suffer) to be the sign of a new and deeper morality, they are indeed lost. Because if what they suffer from—their lack of direction, inner strength, hope for the future, in short their lack of ego strength—if this is the new morality, then indeed there is no hope for them, and they might as well drop out or seek oblivion in drugs.

Even worse, if the emptiness they suffer from is also blamed on society and its evils, if their failures are ascribed not to inner weakness but to family or societal wrongs, then things are doubly hopeless. As long as they could hope to save themselves through personal striving, there was hope—and soon also the effort. But if all is society's doing, then there is no hope and no point in making efforts.

With such confusion about what kind of personality structure, what kind of commitment the good life requires, we create, from a very early age, the so-called credibility gap that we so suffer from between the generations. The gap reflects how differently young people were taught to see the world from the way mature adults see it and how different are the things they were taught to expect of their worlds. Eventually, it is true, the majority of the young still learn to shed their adolescent views of such a never-never land. But often only after a hard struggle that bruises them for life. Others never make it. By dropping out, they reject a world that failed to live up to their childish expectations.

Let me enlarge here on the problem of acquiring a superego and the difficulties it poses to modern children. First of all, and once infancy is past, the child's parents are not enough. He needs, in addition to his parents, superego representatives to help him build up his inner controls.

How difficult this has become for the child may be illustrated by that superego figure who aroused so much controversy last August—the police. For children, the policeman is the first and most visible symbol of social control. While restraining the individual at particular moments, the policeman is supposed to benefit him and all citizens in the long run.

Now nothing can so hinder us from forming and accepting a rational view of the police than to have built up in childhood an image of them that is wholly out of keeping with the functions they perform. Certainly the police are not maintained by society to find lost children or to help elderly people across the street. The function of the police is not to be everybody's friend. Their function is to see that law and order is maintained and the transgressor punished. If, then, the middle-class child is taught in infancy that the policeman is everybody's friend and helper,

while the reality that confronts him in the growing-up process turns out to be quite different, then the disenchantment is devastating. It leads to charges against the police which, while partly justified by reality, owe their special emotional venom to a reality that just does not conform to a childish dream one wants to hold on to. The strange result is that, because the childish image is clung to, the reality is viewed as persecution.

If, on the other hand, as is still true in England and was true in many European countries before World War I, the police are viewed as the stern but just organs of law and order who protect where protection is warranted and punish where punishment is warranted, then police reality does not contradict any childish image. It is just accepted for what it is. Since the police were always expected to be enforcers of law and order, they are first accepted and then internalized as such. But being accepted as such, they are implicitly obeyed, and they see no need to apply force in order to carry out their functions. Since they do not use force, they do not aggravate the resentment we all feel when we are forced to bend our desires to the common interest. Most of all, though, we never respect those who fail to live up to our inner expectations, however unreasonable they are. Large segments of the population—who could not exist for any length of time without the police—find them unacceptable because of unrealistic images formed about them in childhood.

The police, for their part, do not feel themselves respected for the service they perform for society. Those in the population who cling to an image of the police as everybody's best friend view them as callous brutes, as the enemy, the persecutors. Since the police cannot feel respected, they turn to force in order to gain some respect and obedience, much to the utter detriment of the entire population, including policemen themselves. Because only a police that is respected will develop self-respect. And because of it, they will behave in self-respecting ways that gain them further respect from all but the criminal elements of society. (If, as Mead⁵ has taught us, we see ourselves as others see us, then, given the way some segments of society view the police, it is amazing that they can restrain themselves so well from acting the way they are accused of acting when dealing with these segments of society. Of course, it could be argued that the police should have egos so strong that they resist viewing themselves as others view them. They would then resist the push to see segments of the population as their enemies because such persons see the police as their enemies. But I doubt that even in the best of societies the average policeman will have so strong an ego that the image held of him by those he deals with will not affect his actions, or his self-image.)

Since this is not the place to discuss how to reform our police, but how a superego is formed, it follows that the public outcry about the police is devastating to the small child's sense of security in this world. It not only

weakens his superego but, because of it, his sense of reality, his ego. Unfortunately, it is only a strong ego that would later enable him to work for the needed reform of the police.

I do not think it needs further elaboration to show how next-to-impossible we have made it for our children to develop an adequate superego since we have deprived them, one by one, of all these private and public figures who used to serve as figures to be internalized as superegos. This goes all the way from the President who is subject to vilification, to the police who are accused of venality and brutality, to the teacher who is criticized for not doing a good job, to the father who is ridiculed as incompetent on TV and in the comics.

If we want our children to feel that life in our society is worthwhile, we must see that it comes across to them, when they are young, that things are essentially all right, though sometimes difficult and in need of improvement. And it must come across to them through symbols like the President or the police, symbols they can easily grasp in visual form. (Here again we must not give the impression that society is just here to give lollipops to little children.) This may encourage them to want to grow up so they can try to effect those improvements that are needed. But if things are pictured as almost all bad, the task seems impossible, and they may as well give up trying—or just blow it all up. How, for example, can small children grow determined enough to develop mastery, to become competent enough to straighten out those things that need fixing, if from the start we criticize all symbols of authority in society?

Given all I have said about forming a superego, it should be clear by now why the psychoanalytic model is that of a slowly developing ego. It should also be clear how different that is from the model that reactionary educators seem to embrace nowadays—be it the model based on conditioned responses reinforced by punishment (which bypasses any ego development), or the other which holds that the best way to educate is to forget about ego and id altogether and put the child under the total domination of a rigidly construed superego. What is wrong with such a method of education is not that it relies on the superego for its ends but that its ends are a personality dominated by the superego. Because the goal of education ought to be a well-balanced personality where both id and superego are subordinated to reality, to the ego. About these reactionary efforts I shall say nothing more since the altering of behavior through punishment or conditioning is not what this audience believes in. But that they have any following at all can be understood in part as a reaction to the hedonism that attracts and disappoints so many who believed that catering to the id, that subjecting the child to no controls, would automatically insure the good life.

Nothing automatically assures ego growth, neither punishment nor re-

ward. The only thing that assures it is having the right experiences to stimulate and foster growth at the right time, in the right sequence, and in the right amount. And in the classroom, this can only happen if the teacher has a true understanding of the human personality, both intellectual and emotional, and of how and why personality is formed.

What I have been trying to suggest here is that while education in the past, and often today too, seems to concentrate on superego forces alone, lately some educators have erred in the other direction by stressing id satisfaction too much. Actually, sound education should utilize both forces—those of the id and the superego—in developing the ego.

So far I have dealt with this mainly in terms of two theoretical constructs of psychoanalysis, namely, the continua of id-ego-superego, and of the pleasure versus the reality principle. But there is at least one more of the psychoanalytic continua to consider, the one that is usually called the genetic premise of psychoanalysis. This premise states that each of the various ages and stages of development centers on a different developmental task, one that dominates our life until mastered. Or to use Erikson's concepts, these are different psychosocial crises that have to be resolved. In many respects, I feel that education has not yet made this body of genetic theories its own. It is true that education, more than any other social institution, knows there are sequences in development, that there is no point in expecting children to appreciate Shakespeare before they have gained sufficient mastery of reading comprehension. But our education, at home and in school, seems to be very deficient in applying this principle to anything but academic learning. We fail to apply it to the development of the emotions or (as I have tried to show) to personality formation, where superego learning must precede ego learning. Our schools expect both to be fully developed, without any need to promote their development. Our children are expected to have ego strength, to accept the need to work hard at learning, without the ego having been developed for the task, without the superego having been strengthened enough to support it.

I spoke of our primers in which everyone loves everyone else, including, of course, the new baby. I spoke of how, without any transition, we then read of how everyone hates his mother, his father, and everyone else in the family. Maybe if we were to recognize sibling rivalry and teach it as one outcome of our deep attachment to our parents, we would teach good and bad hand in hand. At least it would be truer to life than teaching first that all is rosy, and then that all is bleak.

Unfortunately, we make the same error in our teaching about society. Like the new baby, the policeman is at first everyone's best friend, and in the next moment is corrupt, if not utterly brutal. Why should a child spend a great deal of effort on developing a personality that will help him come to terms with reality if that reality includes organized brutality by the

very organ of society that is supposed to protect children? If that is how the world is, why waste one's energy? Why not drop out instead, leave the world and withdraw into oneself, or later into drug-induced dreams?

I have dwelt on the superego because of a common misunderstanding of Freud: the vague feeling among educators that children should never be made to feel frightened at breaking a moral command. Of *course* Freud stressed how damaging an overstrong conscience can be. That was where the shoe pinched in his time. But because of it he did not speak of the other extreme with its even greater dangers to man: that he will surely fail in life, and succumb to despair, if his superego is too poorly developed to back up the ego in its work of restraining the id.

In closing, I would like to stress that so far education has not asked the right questions of psychoanalysis. But neither have psychoanalysts provided education with the information it must absolutely have, if it is to make use of all the new findings of psychoanalysis.

I spoke of sibling rivalry, as an example of an overpowering emotion, and how our primers pretend it does not exist. I could go on with a catalogue of difficult emotions that haunt our children. But while the psychoanalyst tells the teacher they exist, he makes no suggestions as to how education could help the child deal with them. Consider violence, for example, since I talked of police actions in our city. What have our children been taught about it? Either to discharge it (as in competing for grades or in sports) or to repress it (as in our readers where violence just does not exist). But neither discharge nor repression teaches the child anything about his own tendencies to violence—what incites them or how to master them.

We are all familiar with the jealousy boys feel about the powers and prerogatives of girls, and the girls about the boys. We know too how anxious both are about how they will stack up as females or males. But where does education recognize these existential dilemmas? Where is it helping to guide children to master them? True, we try to teach what menstruation is, physically. But where are the efforts to explain the psychological anxiety it creates, both in boys and in girls? We teach why drugs are dangerous, but where do we teach for what psychological reasons people turn to drugs?

Essentially, progress in education has never been anything but a turning the lights on over the once hidden, of making it readily understandable to everyone who wanted to learn it. I think, above everything, the troubles of our young people show their need for being taught how to find their way in the hidden world they feel their own soul to be. This, as Freud said, cannot be done by analyzing all youngsters but by giving their teachers the wherewithal to do what the best of them long to do more than anything else: to help their children find their way out of the darkness in which they

hide their true selves, to help them toward a rational understanding of themselves and a world that they vaguely know exists but in which they remain strangers without the right travel instructions.

Now, this lifelong journey of discovery cannot be charted in three easy lessons. It is not a lesson we can program for teaching machines. It is not a pleasure trip either, but becomes as demanding of soul, even of body, as the search for the white whale. But no one will ever begin such a journey who is taught that the only trouble with the world is the way his parents or society run it, or that a better production or distribution of wealth will take care of the existential agonies of man. As I have tried to make clear, a better police force will not do away with the need for a better superego, though a better superego may very well lighten the work of our police.

I believe that what education needs most today is the conviction that, while each of today's different generations was fathered by society, present-day man must change himself in his innermost core. Otherwise he will father as imperfect a society as the one that fathered him. To prevent this is the task of education and psychoanalysis combined; neither one of them can do it alone. Together, they might well bring into being the better man who will call into being a new and better society.

NOTES

1. S. Bernfeld, *Sisyphos* (Leipzig and Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1925).
2. H. R. Kohl, *36 Children* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1967).
3. F. Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil* (New York: Modern Library, 1917).
4. F. Nietzsche, *The Genealogy of Morals* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1897).
5. G. H. Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934).