

Fourth Conference

(...) We have to keep to a single direction in education, in education as a whole, but above all if we want to take hold of and form the world of our young women. And what does this direction include? Two things: the direction in the educator, and the direction in the person being educated. In the educator this direction is *motherliness*, in the person being educated it is the *ideal*. In those two words you have a thumbnail sketch of all that can be said on educational wisdom and praxis. When these two directions are meaningfully connected and united - motherliness and the ideal (you could interpret the word 'ideal' either as a community ideal or as a personal ideal) - when this relationship occurs, when these two directions of motherliness and the ideal interpenetrate, we have the true and genuine educator. We will then find sureness of touch, a timely ability to form and adapt, combined with ancient, thoroughly Catholic and eternal principles.

Now let us try to follow up and understand these two directions. We shall remain today with the educator. To start with allow me to summarise very briefly what can be said from our perspective today about the genuine and correct fundamental attitude of a graced educator. It will become clear to us how strongly the human person is the focal point of our pedagogical course - both persons: the educator and the person being educated.

There is such a fullness of material at our disposal on this subject that I want to discuss it under two main headings:

1. motherliness in the light of our times,
2. motherliness in the light of faith.

Motherliness in the light of our times

As women who are leaders and educators we find ourselves presented with some surprises. When you look at what our present times have brought forward as achievements or the results of research, you will find that on the whole this research has concentrated on the education of boys and men and on the leadership of men. However, I would like to say that in essentials whatever can be said about man as leader, also applies to women as leaders. We must only find other concepts, and here and there also look for other applications of the attitude.

So to our subject: Motherliness in the light of our times.

I want to divide what can be said on this subject in the following way: First of all, let us take a look at the leadership of men as modern scientific research has come to understand it, and then apply this to the leadership of women. Once we have worked through this train of thoughts, we can then feel our way into the conflicting opinions about women's leadership today. So our first point will be to look at the leadership of men, and then in our second point we will try to analyse from inner sources what is the true and genuine leadership of women.

I have already mentioned the two big congresses in Marburg and Berlin. Both dealt with the question of true and correct leadership. In Marburg they consciously excluded Catholic priests

as possible leaders of the people. That, at least, is how the socialistic representatives see it. They call Catholic priests not the great leaders, but the great seducers of the people. In Berlin Professor Goldbeck spoke on the same subject - the psychology of leadership. He is not a Catholic, yet he presented the result of a lifetime of experience in science and praxis in the formulation: *The essence of leadership is to be found in priestly fatherliness.*

It is not my task to show you in detail what is meant by the concept 'priestly fatherliness', but I want to apply it directly to the leadership of womenⁱ. According to this point of view, what is true and genuine leadership in women? An educator is a leader, after all. We would have to say instead of priestly fatherliness that it is

priestly motherliness.

Now let us take the two words "in hand", as it were. Priestly motherliness! How is the word priestly to be understood? According to Professor Goldbeck doubtlessly not in the sense of the ordained priesthood, he didn't have this in mind in any way.

Every leader, whether in the political or anti-Catholic sense, must embody the basic elements of true leadership as a fundamental attitude, which for a man is priestly fatherliness, for a woman priestly motherliness. From this you can gather that the concept priestly is not meant in the sense of the ordained priesthood.

However, what was Professor Goldbeck aiming at? He was saying that true and genuine leadership has to proceed from a world that is founded on other-worldly, metaphysical principles. The true and genuine leader has to stand on a rock foundation. This does not have to be religion, but it has to be ultimate metaphysical truths in which the true and genuine leader is at home.

From this you can immediately deduce that youthful leaders will never be able to meet the demands of leadership in the full senseⁱⁱ. Why not? Because they cannot be sufficiently at home in this supernatural, other-worldly, metaphysical world. Their whole being cannot be hewn from rock, as it were. However, this is necessary for true leaders to be able to see their task and carry it out. We Catholics naturally find it easy to transpose these ideas to the religious sphere, especially where religious education is concerned.

So where must true, religious leaders be at home? They must come from a supernatural world. The true, religious leader must be completely at home in the supernatural world, in the world of faith. Every fibre of their being must be connected with it. This is where they get the strength to stand like a rock in the ocean. And that is certainly one of the essential elements of a true leader - a human being of stature who is at home in a supernatural world, which is like a rock foundation.

Later, when we discuss priestly motherliness in the light of faith, I will have to show that every Christian shares in the ordained priesthood, that we are all consecrated, that we have all received a priestly ordination, or, if you prefer, that we have all received a lay ordination. That is to say, we all have an ontological foundation for this educational application, for being at home in the metaphysical, supernatural, religious world. However, in this context we want to leave this aside. In order to keep the train of thoughts clear, we want to take a stand in our first point to the conflict of opinions today, and then set up central truths from which we can shed light on our own inner attitude, on the fundamental attitude of genuinely priestly motherliness.

Priestly Motherliness.

If we want to trace back the whole complex of questions and life situations that are involved here to ultimate principles, we will find that there are two. That is to say, two laws are at work here.

The first law is the *law of transference*.

The second law is the *law of detachment*.

When we talk about these two laws we do so in view of the person being educated. I am then the leader, I with my priestly motherliness, and opposite me is the person being educated.

If you want to find out if the laws are valid, you would do best to look at your own experiences in your own lives. Do you know what ultimately bonds the person being educated to the educator? Do you know what must ultimately regulate this bonding to the educator? These two laws.

The law of transference fosters bonding, the law of detachment loosens these bonds in the interests of a higher, third person - from our Christian, religious point of view this is God. The law of detachment loosens the inner bonds (the attachment) to the educator, and bonds and connects us inwardly, increasingly, more and more strongly, to the ultimate pole of our being, to the ultimate content of our being - God. This is expressed more in scientific termsⁱⁱⁱ

"The question that has been raised is identical with the other one: What can the educator do to ensure that the law of organic transference functions perfectly? Let us mention the means that have proved their worth over the centuries in good Catholic families. In essentials there are three in which the law of organic transference finds expression. A sound instinct and faithfulness to tradition play an equal role. The first means is: *pointing through word and being*, the second, *renunciation*, and the third *disappointment*.

In practice this means that from the first the parents point beyond themselves to God through their genuinely religious life. As the years go by they do so ever more completely, while at the same time teaching their children about God. They lead their children to give up many things out of love for God, whether this involves the physical closeness of the parents, a caress, or simply the enjoyment of created things. Sooner or later, whether they want this or not, they disappoint their growing children because of their limitations and faults and in this way promote the function of all created things to lead beyond themselves."

Perhaps we could penetrate somewhat more deeply into our own lives, into our own spiritual development. I would then have to ask: Have you met a real spiritual mother somewhere, at some point in your life? Or, if you want to apply the same to the man: Have you known a person who showed priestly fatherliness towards you? If you have, I can call you extremely lucky, humanly speaking. Whoever has not experienced this, either in the one or the other case, is - we can say this from the start - a spiritual cripple to a certain extent. In the normal course of events a person must have a graced educator, a spiritual mother or a spiritual father, in his life. Please do not misinterpret these expressions. Do you know what motivates a person most deeply, no matter of which sex, towards such an educator, and bonds them to such a personality? It is not a tendency to submission. Not at all. That would be to misinterpret the psychology behind it. It is *the need for security*. That is simply part of being human, whether we are a boy or girl, indeed it is true of grown-ups of both sexes. Everyone has this extremely strong need to feel secure.

If development is normal, this need for security cannot be sufficiently satisfied by the parents once puberty has started. This is normal in boys, in girls it is not so marked. However, today we

have to say that there are any number of girls whose need for security has never been satisfied, they have never had a normal family life. On other occasions we have put it this way: There are a tremendous number of girls today - let us leave the other sex aside for the moment - who have never been real children, children in the deepest and truest sense of the word. That is to say in practice: their need for security has never been fully satisfied.

Now follow the two laws, first of all

the law of transference.

Every soul instinctively tries to find something firm to hold onto, to find a person who stands there as though hewn in rock, but who is at the same time kind and able to adapt to others. The soul can only give vent to its need for security, it can only cling to and bond with a person, when it finds both qualities - this priestly strength which comes from another world, and at the same time the effort to be fatherly and motherly.

The law of transference.

What is transferred? Our need for security is detached from our natural parents and transferred to spiritual parents, to a spiritual father or a spiritual mother. Applied to ourselves this means - to me as the priestly mother of those entrusted to my care.

That is real leadership. If this inner bonding is not there, if there are only outward ties, a deeply penetrating education is impossible. If we cannot set up these inner bonds, we cannot think of true education. This is also true in religious life with regard to the superior. A superior has to be a leader in this way, she must develop priestly motherliness. If she does not do so, she may well have outward authority, but inner bonding will not come about.

This applies everywhere when we are working as educators. If these inner bonds are not there, we can forget about educational success. It might be possible for us to force the body to submit (to bow outwardly before us), we can pretend, but true education is not possible. Because genuine education is only possible if this inner bonding is there.

This cannot be measured. I cannot lay it down according to paragraphs in the law, I cannot learn it by heart. No, these are mysterious threads that unite us to one another. From this you can deduce: If I really want to be an educator, a leader, what a firm personality I have to be! Otherwise a person's need for security, their drive for security, cannot latch onto me. If I am a doormat, if I am a wimp, I can crack the whip as much as I please, inwardly no true education will be possible.

Please do not misunderstand me. I have said too much, or too little, if we only reveal this strong metaphysical security. There must at the same time be motherliness, or fatherliness, in addition to the strength. If there is only kindness, and if this kindness becomes wishy-washiness, there is no strength. You can do what you like, there will never be a sense of security. The law of transference will never become a reality in the long run. This can be beautifully illustrated in psychological terms. Of course, you must know actual life^{iv}

"As created beings we are 'in ordine essendi' perfect, personified dependence on God, the 'ens a se', the 'a-seitas', the 'actus purissimus'. That is why there is an indestructable urge in all of us, a mysterious restlessness, to become 'in ordine agendi' (according to the law of action) perfect, personified love for him - personally, but also to his commanding, counselling, ordaining and permitting will. We call this the disposition to be a child before God.

The mystery of our membership in Christ draws us mysteriously into the childhood of the only

begotten Son of God, of whom God himself testified: 'This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased' (Mt 3,17). Since this disposition is innate, since it is essentially connected with the creature and the member of Christ, it can be found in both sexes - in man and woman. If it is not developed, or if it is insufficiently developed, a person's character is damaged. An essential element is either totally or partially lacking ...

Masculinity without childlikeness becomes inarticulate, it easily turns into wild barbarism. This is true in the merely natural order. It is even more true in the supernatural order. Psychologists and pastors therefore like to use two expressions to describe the essential character of man: puer et pater. They see it as their task to develop both with great care - the child and the father in man and the young man.

The psychology of woman prefers to compare woman's character with a tree. The root is childlikeness, the trunk is caring and motherliness, and the branches an intuitive vision of the truth. The more sound and widely branching the root, the more healthy and strong the trunk, and the fuller and more fruitful the branches. Woman's greatness, therefore, is rooted in heroic childlikeness. This clearly indicates the direction for the education of women and girls."

You may be inclined to say: How dreadfully difficult it is to be an educator! Of course, it is difficult. To be an educator means having yourself in hand. To be a leader means working constantly on yourself. While I educate others, I must educate myself. If I don't do this, I will be faced with a fiasco. I will never be able to carry out my task clearly, surely and permanently.

So that is the law of transference. What is transferred? The sense of security, the tendency towards security, the need for security, is transferred from the natural parents to the supernatural, spiritual parents. Then

the law of detachment

must come into play. What is that? When the finest threads of my soul are connected with a strong personality, and if the person being educated develops soundly and normally, the law of detachment will automatically become a reality. That is to say, in favour of a third person, in our case in favour of God. This law of detachment must slowly and organically become a reality in the service of the personal and community ideal.

Now, please do not misunderstand me. You see, the things I am describing here as an ideal situation are in actual life such that we have to be terribly careful to avoid misunderstandings. The way the education of girls is undertaken today, people think that the law of detachment has to be there from the first. That is absolutely wrong. I warn you urgently against it, if you don't know exactly what has to be done.

Recently a religious told me the following. When he entered the Novitiate he tried to make contact with his Novice Master, because there is this need also in men. He received the brusque rebuff: 'What on earth are you up to? You aren't married to me!' He is now an elderly man, and yet as he told me this tears came into his eyes. At the time his whole life was ruined.

You may not touch these things in such a ham-fisted way. I am describing things as they should be. Unfortunately things seldom happen in this way, that is why there are so many people whose souls are ill - both among the laity and the religious - because these laws are not seen clearly, and because they are not lived properly. Therefore let me again warn you most urgently against this process of detachment. Whoever does not know these things down to the last detail should not attempt this process of detachment^v

"The inner connection between the first and secondary cause can be *habitual**, that is to say, it can be a natural and permanent state. It can also be a *potential** and an *actual** state. All these forms interpenetrate so that the fundamental attitude remains the same at all times.

The laws behind this process are the laws of organic transference and transmission. The two together are called the great law governing the world. According to it, God transfers rights and qualities to others. He does this mainly in the interests of the child. Vice versa, the child transfers his or her obligations towards God - respect, love and obedience - to the parents, but at the same time in them and through them to God.

It is clear that the law of organic transmission is automatically included in the law of organic transference, both as regards God and the child. Nevertheless special mention is made of the law of organic transmission 'per eminentiam' when one sees and loves not so much the person in God, as God in the person, that is, when the person has retreated out of the conscious soul life, although not completely, and God is more in the foreground, without the spiritual relationship being destroyed in any way. We are concerned here merely with the other side of the same life-process."

* Fr Kentenich is using scholastic terminology. Water, for instance, is *actually* water, but it possesses the power or *potentiality* of becoming steam. Every created thing or being is something definite, but it never exhausts its potentialities at once. Development is always possible. *Habits* are innate bodily dispositions which incline us to act in one way or another.

Do you know why you have to be so careful in this regard? Let me reach more deeply into practical life and put it this way: This extremely fine childlike relationship - because this is what it is ultimately - this extremely fine childlike relationship to spiritual parents (perhaps this terminology sounds rather strange to you) has a twofold advantage, a great and good advantage, which can be replaced by nothing else. (I am talking here merely as a psychologist and leaving the supernatural aspect aside for the present.) What is this twofold, irreplaceable advantage? Allow me to use the word "child" or "pupil" here.

Firstly, a child or pupil who has really experienced and savoured the parent principle, will see the whole world through the personality of the educator, that is to say, through the personality of the educator the child incorporates a whole world view.

Don't underestimate this! I can guarantee that if you have really become the spiritual mothers of the children you educate, you will protect your children from a whole host of problems with the faith and from moral crises, because all these problems have been solved for the child in your personality.

You may not think that these could be, for example, something erotic or sexual. I am not thinking in these terms. It is the soundest possible process. For a girl it provides the only element through which she can become sound. >From this you can conclude that the less something like this is experienced in life, the less sound will the nature of such girls be.

You may not overlook that such a childlike relationship includes a tremendous amount of suffering, that is, if the soul is bonded in this fine, God-willed way. I have said, it includes a great deal of suffering, especially for people with religious natures. If, for example, there is the fear that my relationship has been marred, you can easily come to the conclusion: So the heavenly Father doesn't love me! The Blessed Mother is no longer satisfied with me! These are the extremely fine laws. If someone has not seen and experienced them, they cannot guess how

profoundly penetrating the life process is. You see, this transition from the spiritual parents to supernature is so great that we have to be most careful in education to ensure that this very fine, inner and spiritual bonding becomes a reality one day.

How often we find the hidden fear: "Stop! Something is not in order! Stop! Here is a thread that isn't bonded." Then the soul, and in particular a woman's soul, is deeply unhappy. And that is healthy. It is a sign that a soul is absolutely sound. Of course, it can easily happen that you become afraid: "Stop! Now comes the detachment!"

Let me repeat: Please don't apply the law of detachment on your own.

That is the first, great advantage: The pupil sees the whole world through the educator^{vi}.

Secondly, the pupil always feels secure in this educator. Indeed, to put it this way, such pupils feel secure throughout their lives. Even after the death of the educator all problems are solved. Even after the death of the educator, pupils feels secure in him or her^{vii}.

So let me repeat, please be extremely careful with the process of detachment! If we don't understand it fully, we can spoil so much. Perhaps I may also say that seen and evaluated in purely psychological terms, an educator can be the spiritual mother or father of many spiritual children. We deceive ourselves if we think that spiritual childhood and parenthood requires a great deal of time and being together. That is not the case. Of course, there are times when it is necessary to be together, even if only so that this very fine, inner, spiritual bonding can take place. But the time will come for everyone when they no longer feel the need to be so much together. I then feel secure as a child, because I know that I have parents.

It could well happen that there is no contact for years, and yet the effects of parental care and spiritual childhood will be felt, until later on in life the broken threads are again connected with the physical parents, or the experiences with father and/or mother again make themselves felt. It is often the case that children have had very little contact with their parents, and yet they can say that they feel secure in their physical parents. The personality of mother or father has always helped them to see, explain and transfigure the great world outside^{viii}.

I don't know whether I have explained these thoughts clearly enough. They are of fundamental importance.

You will notice that our pedagogical course on general principles is not dealing with unimportant matters. It goes to the roots. We have to create a fundamental attitude in every regard. And the essential, fundamental attitude for every genuine educator of both sexes - to put it in modern terms - is either priestly motherliness or priestly fatherliness. That is the fundamental spiritual attitude of motherliness in the battle of our times.

Naturally, let me stress this point, we are drawing our conclusions from a study of man's leadership, but the concepts I have presented to you also apply in an eminent sense to woman's leadership in relation to spiritual children.

Let us remain with our starting position. Let us again refer back to the studies on the leadership of men. I mentioned a second point that we can follow up like a golden thread through everything. It is

a spiritual change of emphasis.

Do you know what I mean by that? Our young people today are again more interested in being bonded and less in the dynamics of movement^x. Do you know what that means? If we do not secure our own position very clearly, and if we don't emphasise the ultimate meaning of priestly fatherliness and priestly motherliness, we will educate a crowd wherever we are working. And that is the worst thing we can do today^x.

Let me take the next step in our considerations. You can conclude how clearly we are faced with this change in emphasis from the following. Recently I came across a short speech given by Dr Nattermann at a general assembly in Cologne^{xi}. He was talking about the association for apprentices. I only want to mention those points that illustrate the change in our young people today. They apply to our young men, but far more to our young women, because they are more inclined to want to be bonded to someone. It is part of the nature of woman. Hence it is all the more essential that we hold onto our pedagogical thesis: *our personal attitude as educator*.

Do you know what that means? Developing priestly motherliness and fatherliness! It means serving the individual character of another person in a selfless way. The more I am a genuine educator, the more I make myself superfluous. However, this does not mean that I have to detach myself roughly and crudely, with force, in a massive way. You may not do it on your own, or you will make a mistake unless you possess a very great sureness of touch. You need sensitivity for such a process. - If I don't forget it, I will later illustrate this afterwards in a few sporadic lines of thought which can only be reconstructed if you have observed life very sensitively.

To repeat, what is the essential point? The more young people struggle to be bonded, the more we have to create personalities who are prepared to commit themselves selflessly to enabling others to grow and become strong. You may not insist that the girls remain bonded to you. If you do so, you can be sure that a noble-minded girl will reject you. You can only do this for a short time, otherwise all will run away, and those who might remain are not worthy of being educated.

Let me show you briefly what is at stake here. "The dynamic young people of the past have fallen into the other extreme, that of blind obedience". However, that is not a virtue. You must consider carefully what is meant in ascetical books by blind obedience^{xii}. But we don't want to talk about that now. What is meant here is cadaver obedience, and that is also rejected by the ascetical writers. Whoever sees obedience in this way, has not understood what true obedience is.

This is how our young people are today. Naturally, the ideal I am showing you is tremendously high. But we have to strive to reach it. If we don't reach it, then let us at least reach up to it. We are not concerned here with things I have made up, but with ultimate metaphysical truths. If we don't manage to put them into practice, then let us be humble enough to say: I am not a born educator, but I am trying hard to become a good educator. I am struggling to follow this great line of thought. And if I stop striving, I am an pieceworker, not an educator in the truest sense. "For us education was and is nothing else than helping others to become independent." There you have it:

Helping others to become independent.

This is the goal everywhere, even in the convent. And if it stops, the education is wrong. "That is why I consider it the most important task of leading young people today, to preserve the vigour and strength of our young people from becoming emasculated. We want to emphasise freedom and action just as strongly today." These are things we must also emphasise in the Catholic

camp today. We may not think that this will put obstacles in the way of true authority. That is not meant at all. Of course, whoever manages to combine the two must be a master (in the art of education). And this is what we should all be!

I think you understand what I am trying to say. Since we are faced with a different youth - on the one hand, because young men are again wanting more bonding, and on the other, because young women are being pushed back to their primary domain - we have to work all the more consciously towards independence, towards selfless service, towards the correct attitude towards outward authority.

Do you know what is meant by *authority*? What is it? Auctor esse - to be the author or originator. That is the deep meaning - to be the originator of another, independent being. It is all too easy to confuse outward authority with inner authority. Outward authority without a corresponding inner authority can never educate, it can perhaps bring military drill into a community, but it will never create a community.

Now please do not misunderstand what I have said. You will probably be thinking: for heaven's sake, how can I do that? Now I can no longer "hurt" my children^{xiii}! A big mistake! Does true motherliness or fatherliness consist in constantly caressing a child? You must only keep one thing in mind: An honest young man or woman wants us to hurt them, if they have deserved it. You need only remember to wait until the inner bonding is there. To the extent that the inner bonds exist, you can hurt them, you can hurt them a great deal. Indeed, I may even say that the more you hurt them - but it has to be justified - the more your relationship will be deepened. So it is quite possible that I can stand there as an authority and may cause as much pain as another educator.

There is only one thing a noble minded person cannot bear - if causing pain is combined with scorn. We could also not have borne with that.

So, to start with, let us remember that priestly motherliness and fatherhood are an expression of strength, they can cause pain at the right moment. And if that does not happen, the inner bonding will gradually disappear. The pupil will not feel that there is a strong, supernatural world behind the educator. And that has to be there, otherwise their need for security will not be met.

If you have hurt someone, or if something is experienced as being the expression of contempt, there is only one means to solve the problem. Of course, I can say: "I count upon asceticism. They should fight the thing through and put up with everything." Of course, I can say this at times. But if you are not personally the spiritual director, please don't ever do it! Never count upon asceticism! For myself, by all means, I can put up with everything, they can "trample" on me. That is alright. Just try it for once! But I may never try to educate those entrusted to my care in this way, I must do so in a normal, sound and moderate way.

Do you know what the only means is in this case? That you allow the person concerned to give you a thorough telling off. That is the only way to make up for wounding someone's honour. It doesn't matter whether what I did was experienced by the other person as the expression of contempt, or whether it really was the expression of contempt. Very often something is felt as the expression of contempt although it was not the case. But the only thing that can relax the tension is if we allow ourselves to be given a thorough telling off. A time will come when this poison will cease of its own accord to have an effect. This naturally presupposes an extremely strong education for and through trust. Otherwise it can happen that a person is outwardly elegant, plays a part and is manipulative. How often that happens! But inwardly one thinks: "If only you ..." There is nothing firm and safe any more to which the children can bond, or which

holds them back.

Unfortunately the time is up! Please think about what has been said. Try to find out whether you have had the good fortune to set up these sound, inner bonds at some time in your lives. Most of you will have to say: No! And the effect on you should be: I want all the more to educate others in such a way that I can give them what I was not able to have. You may not complain and say: Lord God, that is why I am so ill, I haven't had all that! It may well be that this is the case. But we may not accuse God on that account. It probably happened so that I can all the more realise how necessary it is for me to give those entrusted to me what was denied me. This is how I can educate myself, and this is how God can educate me to become a great educator one day.

Have I said that we must constantly speak sweetly to everyone? No, a sound relationship will never be set up in this way. Have I said that we must constantly give big speeches? By no means. The connection we are aiming at can come about through some absolutely insignificant detail. Have I said that we have to say and remember all sorts of things? No. Often the finest relationship is there without one even realising it. Naturally, you have to see things as they really are. These are such fine and imponderable values, they cannot be described in massive terms or formulated exactly. We have only discussed what is generally valid.

Notes

ⁱ Refer to the 1950 Congress for Fr Kentenich's explanation on priestly fatherliness.

ⁱⁱ This answered the call of the youth movements of the time: "Youth lead youth!"

ⁱⁱⁱ The law of detachment is the same as the "law of organic transference", which Fr Kentenich repeatedly chose as the subject of his teaching and for discussion. In order to complement what has been said here, let us quote a passage from a study he wrote on the same subject in 1949:

^{iv} According to Father Kentenich our need for security, seen metaphysically, comes from the fact that we are created beings and members of Christ, as he showed in a study he wrote in 1949:

^v According to Father Kentenich we are dealing with a life-process that involves 'the organic connection between the first and secondary cause'. In 1949 he wrote as follows:

^{vi} The importance of the educator as a model for the person being educated has been demonstrated by Reinhard and Anne-Marie Tausch in their empirical study published as "Educational Psychology" (Erziehungspsychologie, Göttingen 1970/5).

^{vii} See 1951 Pedagogical Course, ninth conference.

^{viii} See 1951 Pedagogical Course, fifteenth conference, where these thoughts are applied to Mary, the Mother of God.

^{ix} Father Kentenich is speaking in 1931. As a result of the change in political and social conditions following World War I, young people were looking for order and stability. This is one reason why they fell prey to Nazi propaganda.

^x All individuality is lost in the crowd - which is then easily controlled by a dictator. Personal values, personal responsibility, etc. are easily absorbed in the faceless mass of a crowd, so that as part of a crowd people will do what they would otherwise never dream of doing.

^{xi} Sections of the talk were obviously read out, but are not recorded in the conference text. Only Father Kentenich's comments were noted.

^{xii} For Father Kentenich's understanding of obedience see "Workaday Sanctity".

^{xiii} When Father Kentenich uses the concept "hurt", he is not referring to corporal punishment, which had no place in his education theory and praxis, but to limitations placed on human nature in the service of attaining the personal ideal. He also called it "the sacrifice of nature in the service of perfecting nature" (see: What is my Philosophy of Education).