

**Quote- and Citation Fraud at the UiO**  
Chapter 2  
Self-Regulated Cognition according to Piaget -  
with 'The learning of value' and 'The connection to bullying in our schools'  
2015  
by Dr. Kai Soerfjord (Sørfjord)

© The author, Dr. Kai Soerfjord (Sørfjord), asserts his right to be identified as the author of this work.

Our minds' 1: 'letting impressions in' and 2: 'making them similar to existing schemas' are "necessary", "**constant**" and "**inseparable**" "criteria" of the "cognitive adaptation process" (the cognitive self-adjustment process), says Jean Piaget (1967:201-202 / 1971:172-173). It is **only** when these two – 1: our 'attaching the objects of our observation to -' and 2: our 'making the same objects surrender to, submit themselves to, our existing concepts/categories' – "**come together**" that 'awareness springs forth', says Immanuel Kant (1781:51). Kant also says a part of our cognitive structure is 'prior', that is 'given in advance', present before any experience that the individual has of reality, the **inherited structure** of sense, '**pure**' reason. And in this lies the idea of **sense** itself **shaping** the object of its observation, shaping it according to the given structure of reason. This is an active awareness-producing process, in contrast to the idea of the knowledge of things sort of travelling to and arriving at our 'sense' by the power of the inherent cognition-driving force of the things themselves.

Kant's thinking about this was essentially the reverse of the common thought – much like Copernicus' was when he 'moved' the centre of the universe out of the earth. But, whereas Copernicus 'moved' the centre in question out of the sphere of humanity, or further away from the human 'self', Kant 'moved' this other 'centre' from the 'things' we observe to the inside of the mind itself. It was therefore more of a 'reverse Copernican reversal' of thought (a reverse Copernican revolution), to be exact. It is not 'the things themselves' but merely 'what shines off from the things' that meets 'the sensitivity of the mind', its senses; which is to say the essence of a thing, the 'thing in itself', remains unknown to us. However, even though Kant does allude to Copernicus in the foreword of the second edition of the book (the B-edition, p. XVI), in no way does Kant insinuate that it is our '**opinions**' that define '**reality**'; quite the contrary – and he says so quite explicitly, already in the foreword of the first edition (the A-edition, p.XV):

"As far as **certainty** goes, I have uttered to myself the judgment that in these types of considerations it is in no way allowed to **opine**, and that everything that appears to contain something that {as much as} looks like a **hypothesis** will be forbidden goods, {goods} that neither can be for sale at the lowest price but must be confiscated promptly upon discovery." (see also p. AXVII).

And we see it implicitly in the foreword of the 2. edition, where he shows himself as an advocate of **objectivity**:

"And thus the **revolution** of thought that proved so beneficial to **physics** owes gratefulness only to the sudden idea of seeking in nature – according to what **reason** itself imputes to nature (**not poeticizes** into it) – that which reason must learn and would not know anything about on its own." – where the parenthesis is Kant's own (BXIII-XIV).

"Unconditional plasticity" of organic structures "under the influence of the environment" is 'pure **accommodation**' and impossible as a 'self-regulating process', says Piaget (1967:203 / translated to English 1971:174). He then explains how 'self-regulation' through 'unconditional **firmness** of form' within the structures, 'pure **assimilation** into **fully solid** structures', is equally impossible. Piaget says the solution lies in "a third possibility": We adapt by way of 'accommodation' and 'assimilation' constantly pressing against one another in an

**acutely varying** relation of forces that continuously re-establish “equilibrium”, that is “mutual annullment” (1967: 204 / 1971:174). We can model it visually as a closed cylinder filled with two different gases separated by a piston – a relation of constantly re-newed mutual annullment between two abstract functional ‘pressures’; a dynamic stabilization process in which variation in one of the two ‘pressures’ moves the point of equal pressure, which makes the piston find a new ‘point of balance’, or, more precisely, ‘point of equilibrium’. Both of them, Kant the physicist and Piaget the biologist, naturally, knew the principle quite well, a principle common to all of mechanics and biology. It is this **internal dynamic** that Piaget says is the driving force behind ‘the adaptation **process**’ (always singular form), where accommodation is “inseparable from assimilation”. Piaget says this about the species-specific adjustment of internal biochemical sequences (“**cycles**”) under the influence of changes in the environment; an adaptation he suggests has a partial similarity with that of cognitive “**schema**” – the quote rendered with my own text in brackets [...]:

“The constant functional requirements of the process are two by number – **assimilation** and **accommodation** – and their tight solidarity shall now be established” .. “But if the new element does not destroy the [organic process] cycle [, which in part corresponds to the cognitive ‘schema’], it may be that it modifies the cycle.” ... “**If** the assimilation of a new element .. did **not** cause **modification** .. it would only mean that a sufficient degree of modification occurred at previous accommodations into the cycle, but the assimilating cycle would nonetheless in any case have gone through **accommodation**.” (1967:201 / 1971:172) ... “Secondly, we must emphasize how **inseparable** they are, assimilation and accommodation, as constitutive conditions of adaptation – immediately necessary and **inseparable**. ... To sum it up: assimilation and accommodation are **not separate** functions; but are the two functional poles, in opposition to one another, of any adaptation [process]. So it is only by **abstraction** that one can even speak, as we have done and shall do again, of assimilation by itself as making up a function of essential importance ...” (1967:202-203 / 1971:173).

To adapt thus is to assimilate impressions into structures that “**either** continue as before **or** modify themselves **after accommodating** a new element”, (1967:200; cf. p. 203-204 / 1971:171; cf. p. 174); and these two – shall we call them ‘pressures’?: accommodation and assimilation – push in opposite directions, so that a variation in one pressure affects the point of balance (‘the point of mutual annullment’), its location between the two ‘poles’, pure ‘accommodation’ and pure ‘assimilation’. The point of mutual annullment by the two constant functional forces never moves all the way to one of the ‘poles’, because there is always a presence of ‘pressure’ from both of these subfunctions; not constant in value but **constantly** present, according to **Piaget**. And **Kant** said the same thing: it is only when the two “**come together**” that “awareness springs forth”, and they must remain active together in order for awareness to last, because with only one of them we either have “empty thoughts” or “blind observation” (1781:50-52).

We ‘allow’ the impressions because the structures ‘have room’ for them. The structures ‘give access to’ them and ‘allow’ them ‘to enter’ (accommodate them) without themselves necessarily having to move at all or let anything at all be torn down. The medieval quasisocratic dialogue (**the prayer house version**) is absurd and as anti-Piagetian as it is anti-Kantian and anti-pedagogical. It is medieval theorizing with a home made **political answer key** in hand, where the answer is the one wished for by the person in power, the answer that renders ultimate control over ‘the thinking individual’ – that is, over ‘the self-regulating individual’. It is an answer key that makes the self-regulating individual into the **group-regulated** individual.

Then, on top of that, a crime of forgery was committed against the original Piaget quotes that present the model, while silencing the true version of the model, not to mention the silencing of its origin, which is *Critique of pure reason* (1781). Even if Piaget had not read *Critique of pure reason*, which he did – and even if he had forgotten or did not understand that *Critique of pure reason* (the segment p. A50-52 / B74-76 by itself and the entire book with its main theme and plot) IS that model – Kant was actually the first to communicate it. The

origin of the model therefore IS Kant's *Critique of pure reason*. It is a source-related fact. What anyone may or may not 'opine' about it in this context is irrelevant.

### Threats in Norwegian learning-sciences courses:

The two mentioned 'opposing pressures' (we can think of them as opposing 'pressures' or opposing 'functional forces'), hence, are not at all 'phenomena', cannot be phenomena separate from one another; and only an astonishing level of irresponsibility, scientific neglect and institutional-political control over the human faculty of reason can bring us to the situation we indeed have in the domain of pedagogy and pedagogical studies; with the mass-production of textbooks built on false paraphrased quotes that all metapedagogical institutions impute to Piaget. In order for these institutions to become '**pure** education' they must be kept separate from the places of work; so that the **original theory** that teacher education is supposed to be built on, and claims to build on, is isolated from the 'employer's **will**'.

One must threaten, isolate and sift off – based on non-education-wise relevant criteria of expelling – teacher candidates who discover this truth. And threaten, isolate and sift them out they do. This is done by relaying to the teaching practice venue – the school where a given teacher candidate will do his or her '**teaching practice**' – a message relevant to the 'teaching practice evaluation form' to be filled out by the appointed teachers at each such venue, a message containing **an opinion** about the candidate, the Institute's opinion. The message is transmitted preferably before the teaching practice begins, or before the next practice period.

Naturally, the 'message' from the institute to the practice venue functions as a '**guide**', a code for 'beware'; and such messages between the institute and the practice venue, naturally, constitute '**favors**' and 'expressed **requests** for favors' that are returned within a mutually fruitful cooperation between the institute's control and the control exercised by the practice venue, the local schools 'in liaison with' the Institute.

The problem with this is that the control is exercised through the **trading of favors** that constitute the removal of rights that each individual has within the work environment and within the study environment. The 'Institute' – in this case "the institute for teacher education and school research", in Norwegian: "Institutt for Lærerutdanning og Skoleforskning", "ILS" – removes rights that the practice venue finds problematic, and the practice venue removes rights that the institute finds problematic.

In other words, what we have is a mutual trade of '**rights-removing favors**', and it is the rights of the **individual** we are talking about, rights that are constantly being removed from the individual as the individual relates to both of these institutions. Some of the rights removed in the '**favor-trade**' are basic human rights, while others are rights assumed by all relevant laws. '**The deal**' is not 'allowed by law', and the nature of the cooperation between the two controlling institutions are therefore not 'allowed by law' but, on the contrary, is 'disallowed by law', as in 'is **unlawful**', even though lawyers and judges have yet to understand that it is unlawful, and remains unlawful even without raising the level of specificity of any existing law.

Within the two categories of institutions, the '**Institute**' (metapedagogy) and the **practice venue** (pedagogy proper), administratives and members of the colleague-hood (who all administrate the adherence to consensus) all imagine one has '**the right**' to do this. And the strangest things happen when people in power think they are 'right': they tend to also think they have '**the right**' to deem certain ethical principles as being put '**out of commission**' by that '**right**', and are then more than willing to lie in documents in order to make '**what is right**' happen. One does it in the paperwork prepared by 'the Institute', paperwork designed to officially 'be right' before the university's process of 'internal review' – of itself (!), *self-review* of their own handling of 'annoying' teacher candidates, and that would include the type of teacher candidates who reveal

quote-falsification, which I did from the very first lecture onwards within the PPU-course given by the “institute for teacher education and school research” (“ILS”) at the university of Oslo (UiO).

These are institutes that allegedly are ‘**subordinate** to’ the larger entities they are located ‘within’, such as a ‘faculty of educational science’, which in turn is said to be ‘**subordinate** to’ even larger entities, such as the UiO. In reality, each of these institutes lives its **own intra-institutionally independent life** and confirms itself by the strength it gets from its membership in the group of similar institutes within the local group of institutes: the near domain-group, where the ‘ILS’ and the ‘IPED’ (the ‘Institute of Teacher training and School research’ and the ‘Institute of Pedagogy’) of the UiO function as members together with similar institutes in other Norwegian universities and colleges; and the wider domain-group consisting of institutes and similar entities within the science of education and the learning sciences in general, both nationally and internationally.

The top ‘academic leader’ of a university is not in a social position that allows having the bravery required to ‘be’ the top academic authority within the mass of buildings called ‘university’ or ‘college’, and neither is the average faculty-level so-called ‘academically responsible’ individual. It is the way it is in the school of small herring: everybody knows that the one who sticks out is plucked off. This is the way it is and this is the way it stays because the **central** authority, the governmental department, evidently does not want to be there and support the individual directly and immediately when its rights are being violated by the **Institute-situated** custodian, and evidently does not want to interfere in the methods of the ‘Institute’, not even when I produce evidence of quotation fraud and fraudulent custodianship of state authority in the assessing of teacher candidates, and not even when I evidently push the evidence into their lap.

#### The learning of value:

Administrators and lecturers within these institutes and similar institutions lack valid grounding for the control they execute on scientific facts, and – as I proved in my doctoral thesis and disputation in defence of the thesis in 2013 – systematically cheat with these facts. But the **cheating** is done **in flock**, by pack. The individual who discovers the cheating is therefore socially weak. Moreover, **the institute** actively teaches the flock-member-candidates **its** opinion about that individual. Whoever discovers the fact that the flock cheats is viewed as taking on the role that triggers, and the institute then removes that person with any means within its reach. At the same time the institute, through its lecturers and seminar teachers, teaches the entire class what to think of the person who says *“But Piaget said the opposite of what you now say that Piaget said”*. That happens in dialogue segments of the lectures and seminars: by body language, comments, disregard, intonation, evasion and discrimination (unambiguously treating an individual by different standards) – involving utterings of the sort **“but make it short”** (Øystein Gilje, teacher of pedagogy, in the ‘seminar class’ in Helga Eng’s building on campus Blindern, UiO; and May Britt Esse Berge, practice coordinator, as she requests comments from each participant, one by one clockwise around the conference table, in the ‘teacher-candidate-group’, *“the practice-group”*, at the practice venue Flåtestad /Flotesta/ secondary school 16 km south of down town Oslo, and **“we’ll talk about that in private”**, *“we already talked about that”*, *“you’re a trouble-maker, aren’t you”* etc., as in the situation we hear in the video clips: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1m6vsrCNvE4> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bA15UcOtCOE> (in Norwegian, recorded by myself).

This particular form of ‘imputed-value-teaching’ – indoctrination of the value imputed by the institute to the individual standing ‘on the outside of consensus’ begins with the body language of the teacher of pedagogy and his or her verbal rejection during full class dialogue whenever the individual who knows that Piaget said the opposite dares to say so in the middle of these full class dialogues. This is then followed by the institute leader’s (in the case of the ‘ILS’ Rita Hvistendahl’s) written and official **“invitation to chat”** (Norw: *“invitasjon til samtale”*) and **“summoning for meeting”** (*“innkallelse til møte”*) – where the spokesperson of the Institute (“study-leader” Kirsti Lyngvær Engelién, in the case of the ‘ILS’) brings her own **“protocol-writer”**

("protokollfører") who records her version of the 'proceedings' in the official 'log' by way of the laptop computer before her, for use as the official basis for their judgment.

The 'protocol-writer' sits next to the 'study-leader' (the interrogator), and off the other shoulder of the study leader sits a male teacher of pedagogy, **her witness**, and, obviously, her immediate reserve body guard – but any request or demand that the student might pose regarding the summoning of 'witnesses for the defense' is responded to with categorical rejection, as the 'protocol-writer'/'ex-cancer-research-statistician/lately-teacher-candidate-administrator' Ms. Mai Lill Suhr Lunde puts it in her emailed message: "The Institute **will absolutely not call in anyone else** to that meeting".

The two domain-housekeepers and, potentially, especially if the two are females, their male witness/bodyguard, typically sit behind a long oblong table with the other long side of the table being reserved for the "**invited**"/"**summoned**" candidate – clearly the '**unlawfully summoned**', **unlawfully so** even though the wording isn't necessarily, or isn't always "invite you for a chat". The first email is typically in "invite you for a chat"-wording, and the second or third in the "summon you for a meeting"-wording.

The letter from "the Royal Norwegian Department of Knowledges" (Det Kongelige Norske Kunnskapsdepartement) regarding this was sent much too late and after much reminding, sent from two rather reluctant officials:

" The Royal Department of Knowledges  
Kai Sørfjord  
10.16.2015

As far as your complaint about the academic content in the classes at the University of Oslo, we refer to our letter\* to you on February 9.2015.

The University of Oslo does **not** have **legal permission** for sanctioning a student who does not wish to take part in a chat about the content of the PPU-education. The person who is **invited** or **summoned** for such a chat is **free to decline** the invitation.

The Department deems this case to be closed and **will not respond** to any further message addressed to us **from you** about the same issue.

With regards    Anne Groeholt    (by authority) Director of Department  
                         Kasper Aunan    Senior Consultant "

(\* which says this is the responsibility of the university alone and that the government cannot interfere, even though the government actually can, and does when it suits government; and that I must debate this with the university, who promptly kick the debate out of campus and into the publications where the universities' professors control the review and editing panels.)

- where the text is veritably permeated by the intent to harvest the advantage the government objectively has and, naturally, subjectively sees in the '**Institutes**' being the executors of a type of power the governmental department would not itself be allowed to execute, on account of it being an unlawful type of power in any democracy or social system based on human rights, a power that circumstances leave **unbalanced**, allowing the 'Institute' the pleasure of serving as executor of Meta-Pedagogical will over scientific facts. In the '**Institute sphere**' no one dares interfere. Being near enough to see what the 'Institute' does almost always means finding oneself within relations that involve dependence on the Institute's goodwill.

- and where it is also evident that the governmental 'Department of Knowledges' **add vagueness** in their reply to the crystal clear question of whether these "invitation"-responses to well grounded written complaints implicate obligation to go to that 'meeting', and whether the 'invited' and 'summoned' author of complaints

can be sanctioned against for not showing up to this type of 'meeting' and not surrendering to the interrogator's (the institute leader's or the study-leader's) well-known wishes and points of view, implicit-premis-based argumentation and policy-promoting conclusions. The added vagueness in this particular letter is "about the content of the PPU-education", which makes it seem as if the 'chat-meeting' that UiO threatened me with from the third week of the course is not going to be 'about the **student's future** in the course and **future career**, a career the 'Institute' (the ILS) quickly can erase from the student's list of possible futures.

The two reluctant officials firmly hold that there is **no law-given** mandate for **sanctioning** a student who does not wish to take part in such a meeting – even though the two officials, while maintaining the non-existence of legal sanctions, suddenly begin to refer to the meeting as "a meeting about the **content of the course**", while the Institute eventually specifies the meeting as being 'about the **education** and its **practical training period**', a badly disguised code for 'a meeting about **your future** in the course and in the practical training period, a period in which all chances of appealing the instructor's thumb down to a higher authority have been institutionally closed – which is the reason why I secured audio records mainly of the entire process, including the sociability of the 'meeting' held in the 'interrogation room' at campus Blindern; with judge/leader of education Miss Kirsti Lyngvær Engelién, internal protocol-writer/co-judge Miss Mai Lill Suhr Lunde, and their own witness/body-guard and 2nd. co-judge Mr. Øystein Gilje (PhD in pedagogy) – none of whom, I expect, would even partially grasp the darkly humorous morbidity of the scene even if I had videorecorded the ordeal and played it for them, not just audiotaped it and transcribed it, which is a job I need to begin shortly.

It is a sad insight to gain, the realization that this particular level of competency seems to be the standard among the shapers of the learning environment designs that shape the teachers of our children – designs demonstrably shaped by bullies in office, designs that have for a long time been carried forward into the very spheres that indeed are presently virtually permeated by bullying against the children 'picked out' for it. One cannot discuss rationally with such servants of self-authored means-justifying goals. But one can expose them. They learn their leader-act on the job, in networks that make these offices uninhabitable by individuals who primarily relate to rational and ethical principles expected by society at large and, officially, by the state.

The fact that the law does **not allow** such sanctions would seem to imply that neither does the law allow 'pretending that one would potentially be allowed to execute such sanctions'; and it would then seem to be unlawful for the same metpedagogically administrative domain-office-custodians of delegated state power to lie about that, whether the lying is done explicitly or 'just' **implicitly**, by **pretending verbally** as if the law does allow the type of "invitation-summoning" that **would** involve the possibility of such sanctioning. It is nonetheless clear that scaring (whether intended or not) the teacher candidate (a student of pedagogy) through 'invitation/summoning to interrogation' is precisely the type of "summoning" that a mandate to sanction would form the basis for, which means that whoever does the "inviting-summoning" are in fact lying by the **implicit** transmission or mediation of the untrue message of a potential for official sanctions. That is, one lies by making the lie '**contained in** what is actually said'.

The transition between explicit and implicit speech is very fluid, to say the least; the two categories overlap and the gradual border constantly moves. It isn't the compositions of letters and syllables that count but, rather, the communicative conventions, that is the actual norms regarding assumed implicational awareness. It is these norms, not the periodical constancy of the assembled letters and syllables, that determine whether something is true or untrue. This even holds for the application of law, because the law is always interpreted by the application of **logic** on **premises**; that is, the logical application of the norms that count within the time, place and situation, the norms of communicative behavior; norms about the assumption of implicature and relevance and so on, without which talk would be nonsensical.

Nonetheless, the question of obligation to meet when the **'invited and/or summoned'** type of response is transmitted by the Institute has been settled in writing by the **government**-authored letter to myself. There is no such obligation – which means that neither does the law allow the Institute to **pretend as if one can** sanction the student in such cases. There is no allowance in the law for lying about it, whether explicitly or by a **'lie contained in the explicit'**, the so-called **'implicit'** lie. I suggest the question of whether it is then **unlawful** for the same custodians of state power to **lie by pretending as if** one has a **law-given** allowance for operating with that type of 'invitation-summoning' is a no-brainer. Intimidation by **'invitation-summoning to interrogation aka chat-meeting'** is a type of response that could be implicated by the obligation implied by a hypothetical mandate to sanction the absent unwilling 'invited-summoned teacher candidate'.

It is whenever the 'inviting-summoning' is a **response to** the invited-summoned's written **report of a flaw** within the course-design or the lectured citations of original scientific literature that we have the most serious cases of 'invitation-summoning for interrogation aka chat-meetings', which, regardless of the nature and seriousness of the reported flaws, is abuse in itself. It is abuse because it is abuse of power against individuals, and it is abuse no matter what the institute might say is the 'intention' behind such 'invitation-summoning'.

'Invitation-summonings' issued by the institutes of meta-pedagogy, therefore, constitute the corruption of the delegated custodianship of state power that has been invested in these offices. The teachers formed by that course-design element therefore practically by logical necessity have a **taught blindness** towards bullying – here 'bullying' in the properly wide sense that includes 'social exclusion' – even when it takes place right before their noses, precisely the way parents of bullying-victims keep telling us all the time. That **blindness** has a **generator** in teacher training, particularly wherever 1: peer-exclusion-threat pedagogy is a course design element and 2: unpleasant facts are discriminated when a teacher candidate calls attention to it. The two design elements appear to usually both be the case to the same extent. Where one is extreme, so is the other; and where one is moderately present, so is the other.

The 'invitation/summoning-to-interrogation aka chat-meeting' type abuse then serves as a tool in the abuse of science itself. The former type of administrative crime serves to hide the latter, in this case quotation- and source falsification of Piaget 1967; and the latter, the falsification, serves to connect key elements of the learning environment design with 'original theory'. When the original theory does not fit and has to be re-designed by falsely imputed quasi-paraphrases – as is the case with the relevant Piaget 1967-quotes, which in no way fits the common version of the so-called 'socratic dialogue' – the temptation to **cheat-in-flock** is sometimes too much.

The scientific and administrative cheating in flock is held together by so-called "**relations**", which then have to be made subject to sufficient Institute-internal sanctions. The professional **'title-ladder'** 'from *lecturer-to-assistant professor-to-professor*' (Norw: 'lektor-amanuensis-professor') is the most visible element of the administrative scheme that binds the individual to the **'consensual** cheating-in-flock'. Only when an independent researcher is there to reveal the foul play can the effects of these sanctions be neutralized. Among the more vulnerable 'authentically dependent', lecturers and teacher candidates alike, the expressed agreement with consensus is both a **criterion** of having a future within the 'Institute' and the rhetorical **justification** of consensus whenever consensus is challenged. The circularity of 'consensus must be right because all are in agreement about it' schema obviously has a lasting numbing effect on the mind when combined with the relentless awareness of the unobstructed nature of the salary that pays the mortgage that keeps one's family together.

### Objective threat:

It is the universal '**principle of charity**' (communicative benevolence) that manifests itself in the phenomenologically evident fact that each communicatively benevolent participating person recognizes and relates to the **mutual imperative** of expecting relevance. An uttering, hence, from the relatively strong participant (the government, from the national to the regional; the city officials; the university; the Faculty; the Institute) to the weaker participant (the individual) that 'one **wants to talk with**' the weaker participant is an **implicit message** of 'possible consequences should one refuse to participate', unless 1) the stronger participant explicitly adds something very similar to: 'but, naturally, such a meeting is strictly **voluntary**, and will only be arranged **if you ask us** to set it up'; and unless 2) the stronger participant also deletes the currently used forms I mentioned and which my analysis shows are implicit threats, threats that are 'logically contained in the lexically explicit syntax'. I am referring to the intimidation-oriented phrases "invite/summon you for a chat/meeting regarding your education" or "... regarding your teacher education" or "...regarding (your) practical training".

All of these phrases are actually still being issued by Norwegian institutes of Pedagogy. They were posted repeatedly to myself by email and manual post from "Administrative team leader" Mai Lill Suhr Lunde at the "Institute for Teacher education and School research" (*Institutt for Lærerutdanning og Skoleforskning*, ILS) of the UiO in the first half of the autumn semester of 2015. A '**true invitation**', on the contrary, will, in adherence to the principle of charity, always need to be expressed something like this: "We shall try to give you an answer regarding the things you bring up, and **if you wish** to set up a meeting to discuss it in person, feel free to contact us." I nonetheless propose this is the way to treat students of pedagogy, the professional and scientifically responsible way of doing it. The former is the unprofessional way construed by individuals I suggest need to be replaced by a better type of administrators, a type that emerges from an administrative education suited for the task laid forth by this article.

The 'invitation to chat'/'summoning for meeting' contains a **falsely insinuated** mandate, a **fictitious mandate** the institutes of pedagogy – in this case the "ILS" of the UiO by 'institute leader' Rita Hvistendahl – **openly lie** about in these 'summoning for interrogation' type responses to letters from students who bring up a potential flaw on the part of the Institute. The response **mis-**'informs' regarding the degree of obligation, hints at a **duty to meet before a panel to 'discuss one's own future in the course'** and is **threatening**. It constitutes **abuse**, and functions as a **replacement move**.

### The replacement move:

The **letter** or email where the student informs the leadership about a problem is replaced by a '**chat**', which is transcribed by the 'protocol-writer' of the Institute when she produces a 'written **log**' that pertains to the meeting, a 'log' that now functions as the official document instead of the letter, a document that now supports the notion that 'the matter has been discussed and rejected'. The administrators and dominant lecturers in the domain that daily works to shape Norwegian teacher education are thus **bullies**, and they execute their bullying in the name of the governmental power delegated to them by national government.

The 'chat' that the writer of a scientific-fact-based complaint letter is "invited" and "summoned" to consists of a quasi-socratic '**admit your fault and see our view**' type dialogue where '**or face the consequences**' is written between the spoken lines of the 'chat-meeting' between the three representatives of the Institute and the unprotected individual. This is not what you would expect of teacher education in a country like Norway. It is an element that sullies the suit officials dress it up in. I have embarked on a mission to tear the present pedagogically ill tree up by its roots.', and I have told the Institute (of the UiO) so.



But nothing happens without the politicians. I have to get them on board. Then the lawyers might decide to get on board too and admit the obvious: that it is in fact **illegal** this whole set of metapedagogical procedures currently and since long ago in operation at the UiO (University of Oslo), the UiA (of Agder), the UiS (of Stavanger), the UiB (of Bergen) and the UiT (of Tromsø), and all the detached colleges: the HiO (“the Higher school of Oslo and Akershus”) and so on; and has been **illegal all along**.

The **implicit imperative** to show up when “invited” or “summoned”, usually first “invited” and then also “summoned”, is thus a mandate the institutes **openly lie** about in implicitly threatening ways (in the ILS of the UiO case the threat is posed by “Institute leader” Rita Hvistendahl through her subordinate the “teamleader for the practical teacher training course” Mai Lill Suhr Lunde. This domain which day by day shapes Norwegian teacher education is thus ‘itself’ – the individuals who constitute its ‘staff’ are themselves – abusers of power, **bullies** in office.

They bully on behalf of the government who delegated the power of custodianship to them. They lie so routinely that they call it “**standard** procedure”. I, on the other hand, call it what it is: governmental **custodian fraud**, in a country that wants to teach the world about democracy and human rights. In this case the function of the custodian fraud is to cover up the quotation and source fraud I have uncovered.

The bullying tactics they subject students of pedagogy to will by necessity affect – is by necessity affecting and has for centuries affected – **the children** taught by the teachers who successfully graduate under such conditions.

The “invitation” or “summoning” (for a ‘chat’/‘meeting’) of a teacher candidate who has sent in a complaint in writing is unlawful because it constitutes an **implicit claim** of judicial mandate for potential official sanctions when transmitted by an Institute to an unprotected individual student. It is a mandate that is **not at all ‘granted by law’** but merely is **pretended** to be. And the staff of the ‘Institute’ uses the “invitation-summoning” as a power-lever against individual students they do not wish to have amongst themselves, among others individual students of pedagogy who do what the present article writer does with scientific errors: speak up about them and lay forth an apparently unbeatably valid argument.

The ‘invitation and summoning’-threats issued by the ‘Institute’ to the individual teacher candidate – in this case from the “Institute of Teacher education and School research”, the “Institutt for Lærerutdanning og Skoleforskning” (ILS) within the University of Oslo, UiO, an institute headed by Rita Hvistendahl, Kirsti Engelién og Mai Lill Suhr Lunde – **openly** convey the **‘implicit’** lie that speaks of a mandate to sanction. But the lie being ‘implicit’, **‘contained in’** the so-called ‘explicit’, does not make it inferior as transgression, as if in an ethical or legal ‘free-zone’, because all things **‘explicit’** are nonetheless dependent upon mutual understanding and says very little about anything without the conventionally preconceived (quite implicit) implicatures and the mutual expectations and demands (need) for relevance, the very norms that make a threat into a threat and a welcome into a welcome.

That lie has become so common in Norwegian institutes of pedagogy and the learning sciences that their administrators openly refer to it as “standard custodian practice”, with intent to justify it by the use of the word “standard”. I, on the other hand, call it what it is: fraudulent custodianship of governmental authority, Institute-situated custodian fraud, which is a form of corruption. In this case the function of the custodian fraud – the function of the ‘pretending to have more authority than is actually invested in the Institute’ – is to keep covering up the quotation- and source falsification I uncovered and simply get rid of the nuisance.

## The **interrogation** aka ‘chat-meeting’:

The two domain-institution-housekeepers (in this case two females) and possibly, as in this case, their male witness/ bodyguard sit behind a long oblong table, facing the ‘invited and summoned’ teacher candidate who sits alone on the other long side. The three domain-institution-custodians sit behind a long oblong table facing the summoned student, the teacher candidate. A full transcript of the (at the time of writing) most recent instance of that type of meeting in the case of the ‘Institute for Teacher education and School research’, the “**ILS**” of the University of Oslo, **UiO**, held Oct.7.2015 – in the form of a word for word rendition of my own secret sound recording of the entire meeting – will be published on academia.edu later.

The internally (among themselves) appointed “Protocol-writer” (*protokollfører*), who is also ‘department leader’ (‘avdelingsleder’ Mai Lill Suhr Lunde), sits right next to the ‘study-leader’ (‘undervisningsleder’ Kirsti Lyngvaer Engelién). At the other shoulder of the ‘study-leader’ sits a male teacher of pedagogy, her witness and, obviously, her immediately available ‘reserve-**bodyguard**’ – but the answer sent by the protocol-writer/department leader Mai Lill Suhr Lunde when the ‘invited-summoned’ demands witnesses to be summoned is: “Other participants will absolutely not be called in”.

The teacher candidate is for all practical purposes here ‘the **unlawfully** summoned’, even when the choice of words happen to be merely “**invite** you to a chat” and not followed, as is usually the case, by a letter or email saying “**summon** you for meeting”. The letter from the two reluctant officials of the governmental “Department of Knowledges” (head of department Anne Grøholt, e.f., og first-consultant Kasper Aunan in their letter dated Oct.16.2015, translated and quoted above) establish this: There is “**no mandate** to sanction” (**no legal mandate** to sanction) against a teacher candidate, a student of pedagogy, who does not wish to take part in such a ‘chat-meeting’ – which, naturally, means that neither is there any mandate for ‘pretending that there is or might be such a mandate, or other types of mandate, to sanction’, and it seems it ought to be a natural assumption that it would be **unlawful** for the same government officials, custodians of governmental power, to **pretend as if** one has the mandate to sanction, unlawful to falsely imply it, veritably in writing ‘dress up as if’ and thereby ‘**impersonate**’ the holder of such an ‘**interrogation-mandate**’. The equivalent of that is indeed the much hated act of impersonating a police officer, a violation for which strict penalties apply, generally everywhere in the world, in Norway too.

It seems utterly evident that it is **already unlawful** for these metapedagogically administrative domain-office-custodians of state power to **imply a lie** about a mandate to demand participation in such chat-meetings; unlawful to imply it, whether explicitly or ‘contained in the explicit’, so-called implicitly – by pretending that one has a mandate by **law** or **government-issued delegated authority** to be sending out this type of “invitation-summoning”; a type of “invitation” or “summoning” that only could be **legally mandated** when accompanied by legal **mandate to sanction** should the ‘invited-summoned’ not wish to participate in such an ‘interrogation’ aka “chat” (Norw.: *samtale* – “togetherspeaking”, a ‘chat’ based on a hostile variant of the socratic-dialogue, where the question-poser – the ‘Institute’ - interrogates by negative answer-interpretation and re-questioning with a critical implication based on a ‘received implicature’ that results from the violation of as many of the elements of the dialogic ‘principle of the charity’ (see Davidson) as necessary to get ‘the job’ done).

This is thus a mandate one lies about implicitly from the keyboards of the computers in the offices of the ‘Institute’ in what is deemed to be standard Norwegian teacher education. Medium to lower level administrators turn a handle and grind in implicit lies like these “invitation and summoning to chat-meeting”-threats, here issued by the ILS, “Institutt for Lærerutdanning og Skoleforskning”: “Institute for Teacher-education and School-research” (lead by Rita Hvistendahl, Kirsti Lyngvaer Engelién and Mai Lill Suhr Lunde) of the UiO – emitted to a teacher candidate that in this particular case has uncovered quotation ‘**errors with a benefit**’ to

be the order of things in all introductory lecture series in course programs in pedagogy. The public servants who occupy these offices fight against any individual who discovers one of the errors and thereby becomes a threat to its benefit. It is a fight fought 'on behalf of' the government branch that delegated and keeps delegating the power to fight that fight to the institute-situated – shall we call them – 'servants?'

### The ascribing of 'value':

The class' continued learning of the **low imputed** value of the 'annoying' co-student is accompanied by an unofficial message from the Institute to the practice venue, relaying the low value assigned to the candidate by the Institute – in the case of the writer of this article, a message to the 'practice coordinator', May Britt Esse Berge at the Flåtestad secondary school, saying: "The candidate **can be domineering**", according to the recipient herself, May Britt Esse Berge explicitly to my own self on the fifth day of the first week of 'practice', on Sep.18.2015, confirmed on the sound-recording of my i-phone on Oct.23.2015. In this case the '**tag**' was glued to a candidate who had addressed two problems: the quotation- and source forgery and the way their meta-pedagogical learning environment design enables **abuse power** by the socially dominant in obligatory group work.

So, in this case it is the one who protests **against** the **dominance** of the **domineering** who has this code being relayed regarding his person, and the code is transmitted by an Institute that dominates over original text, falsify the text, and then dominate over the one who saw it by transmitting a '**pre-evaluation** evaluation' of the candidate about to have his practice ('rehearsing') evaluated as it progresses rather than being affected by a pre-practice evaluator's guide to a correct evaluation of the particular candidate.

At the same time the Institute (here the 'ILS' of the UiO) begins an ad hoc upgrading of '**practice**' to '**exam**', 'teaching-**rehearsal**' to 'teaching-**exam**', during the 'practice period' – an 'upgrading' that none of the candidate's classmates are exposed to; a differential treatment that solidifies the learning of the low **imputed** value held by the 'annoying' teacher candidate to a lasting '**schema**', one that sticks to their consciousness and makes them happy for avoiding the same treatment; so happy, even, that they would not wish to have an opinion that would benefit the weaker party in what transpires before their eyes (see the youtube clips <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pYqoY8QpRM0&feature=youtu.be>, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZUhNfT0nds0> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DNp5LhHOzt0>).

This is the **penultimate phase** in the pedagogy class' learning of the low value ascribed to the annoying teacher candidate. The phase includes a sudden 'meeting' called for by the 'practice coordinator' (May Britt Esse Berge in the case of the Flåtestad secondary school just south of Oslo), a meeting with no witnesses, other than, in my case, the sound-recording function of my i-phone (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1m6vsrCNvE4&feature=youtu.be> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bAl5UcOtCOE> – links posted on academia.edu; updates of the links will be posted when needed).

The 'practice-coordinator' at the 'practical-training-venue school' now reveals what has been obvious to the candidate from the beginning: "the practice venue school **has doubt** regarding the '**suitedness**' of the candidate", "based on an assessment of **the whole**" – where "suitedness" is spoken with the Norwegian nouns "**skikkethet**" or "egnethet", equivalent to "talentedness" and "suitedness"; as in 'doubt about the candidate's **talentedness**' or '**-suitedness**', with the corresponding adjectives "**skikket**", derived from the German "geschick": '**equipped**', '**fitted**'; and "egnet": '**suited for**'.

The notification from the 'practice venue school' to the teacher academy, the Institute, that one has "**doubt** about the candidate **being equipped**" for the job as teacher, naturally, is the '**correct** response to the **code** that, in the very beginning, transmitted the **low value** imputed to the 'annoying' candidate by the Institute and

transmitted to the practice venue school. In my case the code was “he can be dominating”, and I am quoting Miss Mai Britt Esse Berge as she ‘confronted’ me with my ‘weakness’ the moment I mentioned that I was observing grave abuse of power in the ongoing obligatory groupwork isolated from the responsible ‘staff’, ‘staff’ being Mai Berge herself along with the designated ‘guidance-teacher’, Miss Maria Sofie Olsson).

Abuse of one ‘**pointed out**’ candidate is abuse of the whole flock:

The Institute-initiated **management-process** moves from the ‘transmission of a need’, the need to solve a challenge, here {a student whose arguments **dominate** any debate about Piaget’s cognitive model}, a ‘need-expression’ that has the social function of a ‘**favor-request**’ – unambiguously spoken by the transmission of a message, here “he can be **domineering**” – to the response, the the practice venue’s ‘**favor-follow-up**’ of the ‘**relation**’ the Institute warned them about, a ‘relation’ with a **name** on it, a specific teacher-candidates’ name. The rest is an institutionalized ‘given’.

Without the sound-recording of these **Institute-situated abuses** of ‘pointed-out’ individual (tagged) teacher-candidates (which indeed is abuse of the entire flock, the rest of which are formed by having to witness this, and learn from it, which they do) and without one foot semi-solidly planted ‘under cover’, with a research degree in the back-pack, the student candidate might as well pack it up. And they do, without wanting to cause the slightest fuss. They dissipate silently from the courses they are in, silently because they realize they have no documentation to oppose the derogatory nature of the report produced by the Institute in order to get rid of them. They do not usually produce extensive audio or video recording of the methods used against them.

The **last** phase is the continuation of the discrimination one immediately becomes exposed to in the **whole-class dialogue** segments when one notifies the Institute in writing about matters like ‘abuse of power in the group-work’ or an ‘academical/theoretical error one has discovered in the lecturers’ **references** to original theory – a discrimination I was able to retain brief instances of on video during the lecture in the Helga Eng’s building at Campus Blindern recently – on the 11. of November 2015, where the camera usage immediately was attacked and pointed to as the cause of the expulsion from the lecture hall (auditorium 1) (videolinks above).

The video-camera, incidentally, was used in this lecture only after the discrimination of myself by the female lecturer had lasted so consistently and to such an extent that it constitutes bullying. The university staff attempted to confiscate the video camera, as did the security guard that was called upon. The latter even followed me almost 1 km on foot after I exited campus Blindern, while he attempted to reach the police on his mobile phone in order to ask them to confiscate my video camera and the memory card I had removed from it and hidden somewhere on my body.

After each so-called ‘**listening-in**’ on what is supposed to be ‘**practice-teaching**’, but which are being upgraded to ‘Institute **evidence of unsuitedness or doubt about unsuitedness**’, a quasi-socratic ‘demolition-dialogue’ follows, in which the ‘observer’ sent by the ‘Institute’ collects – and keeps collecting for as many ‘listening-ins’ as it takes – until able to make the ‘log-entry’ that serves as the basis for the judgment “not passed practical training period” or “unsuited”, which finally institutionalizes the Institute’s assessment that the ‘Institute’, the ‘we’, is right and the annoying teacher candidate (the ‘he’ or the ‘she’) is ‘wrong’ or ‘speaks in the wrong way’ or ‘speaks at the wrong time’ and so on.

At the very end of it the Institute’s own “**Internal Revision**” (Berit Karseth and Line Sletten i the case of the ‘ILS’: ‘Institute of Teacher-education and School-research’ and the ‘IPED’: Institute of Pedagogy), who then evaluate whether it is really possible that UiO in the particular case at hand could be wrong; and, naturally, usually find they do not see the accusation proven by evidence and therefor cannot interfere,\* even if the

annoying individual has proven the annoying fact that made up the entire wistle-blowing affair – in this case the **quotation-** and source **forgery** – in international disputation for the defence of a PhD thesis, and the annoying fact therefore is scientifically proven.

[\*written right after the duo Karseth-Sletten 'took initiative to' terminate the 'case' on account of not getting a reply on their unexpected letter to myself containing, yes, precisely: an invitation for a "**meeting**", whereafter I influenced them sufficiently to set themselves in the motion that recently, without my participation in any such 'meeting' and, after my completion of this article (Oct.-Dec.2015) resulted in their official statement per letter, saying they and their "pani" "**cannot see** that any error has been committed" by the Institute.]

Only a political 'counter-pressure' from the top can neutralize the institute-situated power over scientific facts within Norwegian so-called 'educational science'. The unbridled king-power that is currently being delegated to the institutes does not function in Norwegian educational science. The laws formulated as "it is ...'s responsibility to ensure **good** ..." / "... ensure that the quality is at a **proper** level" / "... is **satisfactory**" and so on give the entire 'power of definition' – the power to define what is needed to be "good", "proper", "satisfactory" and so on – to 'the evaluating individual', meaning '**goodwill**' is naturally, contingently and fortuitously withheld when 'the person evaluated' does not please sufficiently. At the same time, **retrospectively non-transparent** evaluation is by logical necessity mainly and basically '**goodwill-dependent**', and no part of the evaluation of the teacher candidates' training in the 'practice-venues' is intersubjectively and retrospectively verifiable. A restructuring of all practical training is thus a necessity if we are to bring the molding of teacher candidates up to such a level, which is the scientifically proper level one must require in this as in all other 'sciences'.

It is not possible to avoid '**emotion-dominated**' evaluation without ensuring **rule-based** transparency – including **retrospective** transparency – in the entire evaluation process and in all of its 'departments', simply because the '**emotion-criterion**' is logically given by natural '**pleasure-conditioned** benevolence'. This is why all evaluation that isn't 'intersubjectively verifiable in retrospect' must be abolished in order for education to meet the demands of science and become '**an educational science for the future**'.

What remains available to us, then, is a written exam and oral/practical video-recorded practice-teaching in '**staged** group' classrooms consisting of co-students (fellow teacher-candidates), sensors and video-cameras; both as 'micro-teaching' of small groups and 'full class' sized groups (15-25 co-students), which will solve this in a scientifically acceptable way. Only then will the '**hiring-criteria**' have been removed from the examination process and from the practical training period, enabling the latter to be what it is indeed supposed to be: a 'rehearsal' period and nothing more than that. It isn't officially 'meant' to be or include a possible medium for **special sifting**-methods one has in reserve for '**special teacher-candidates** that one wants to remove' or that one would wish weren't there\*.

[\* and '**wishing**' an individual weren't there, when that individual depends on your rational benevolence, is of course the harboring of a 'wish' which one's subconsciousness makes sure comes true even when one's consciousness pretends as if it fights against its own wish.]

The 'Institute practice-venue' alliance is a useful but **unlawful** liaison as long as it allows the possibility of the **ad hoc** option of extra-examination that I have now empirically confirmed the presence of in the 'trade of favors' between the "Institute for Teacher-training and School-research" (Norw: *Institutt for Lærertanning og Skoleforskning*, ILS, of "the University in Oslo", UiO) and the Stovner high-school in the far North-Eastern part of the city of Oslo, Norway – an ad hoc option one may have up the sleeve, readily applicable to annoying or 'troublesome' teacher-candidates, among which would be the type of teacher-candidates who detects systemic flaws or who sees the systematic factual errors of the lecturers' paraphrased quotations of original theory.

An example of such systematic error would be any error similar to the claim about Piaget allegedly having defined ‘**accommodation**’ as ‘**modification** of existing knowledge’ in the sense of ‘**fault-finding** and -**correction**’, which is an objectively speaking verifiably untrue claim that regrettably make up the very foundation of a postmodern quasi-socratic ‘demolition-dialogue’, a ‘tearing-down-talk’ obviously derived from a nearly **medieval prayer-house** tradition. Teachers love to exploit it, and the teachers of teacher-candidates exploit it to a degree that no one else dare try. Parents of teacher-candidates have no say in what is being done to their ‘grown’ children in these courses. Only **extra-institute** researchers beyond direct and indirect influence of these ‘Institutes’ can have a say in this.

The ‘work-practice’ a teacher-candidate should or ought to acquire before one may call him or her a ‘teacher with practical experience’, in other words, must be moved from the sphere of the ‘Institute’ and the ‘course’ itself, from the sphere referred to as “teacher education”, to ‘the sphere of contractual employment’, which is the sphere of organized labor, labor rights, union membership etc.; and the ‘practice-guidance-**counselor**’ – in Norway referred to as a “*road-guide*” (“*veileder*”) – need to be replaced by a ‘more experienced **colleague**’ in order for the present ‘**pleasure-conditioned goodwill-conditioned passing grade**’ to be transformed into what these courses must be to enable the ‘Institute’ to satisfy the part of Norwegian law that imputes certain rights to the entity known as ‘the individual’; and to satisfy all the principles that are prerequisites of Norwegian law. Only then can the phenomenon ‘pleasure-conditioned passing grade’ be removed and the phenomenon ‘exclusively academic-competency-conditioned passing grade’ be introduced in Norwegian courses in pedagogy.

A large part of the curriculum of the PPU-course upholds the notion “scientific perspective” as one of the highest principles of the domain. This obviously has much to do with the emphasis in the ‘national teaching plan’ on “a **scientific perspective**” and the “Law for teaching §1-1 ordering teachers to “teach the pupils a **scientific way of thinking**”. But at the same time most pedagogy-lecturers – I tested this several times on Blindern, the UiO Campus, in the autumn semester of 2015 – do not see that all teacher-candidates must practice this very perspective themselves in order to enable themselves to teach the perspective to children, which they therefore do not, and which teachers therefore cannot, not today, not in Norway. This is a very serious deficiency, because without the so-called ‘**scientific perspective**’ and ‘- way of thinking’ it is the Facebook era’s ‘**likes-competition**’ that rules, where ‘**social-strategy-criteria**’ trump the ‘scientific’ perspective, reduce all of it to a serene euphemism that serves as ‘elevator-music’ to the noisy battles of pleasing babble and vote-collecting maneuvers (while potentially fencing off known backstabbers).

My conclusion is here as follows: The ‘social-strategy-criterion’ must be purged from teacher education in order for the ‘scientific perspective’ to be predictably possible, and being a realistic goal is so far from predictably possible that one cannot even fruitfully discuss it until drastic measures are taken against the mentioned ‘social-strategy-criterion’. Without such measures children simply aren’t learning a ‘scientific way of thinking’, not at all. It is more likely the opposite of ‘scientific’. They then have to learn it somewhere else. I simply suggest we make them learn it in school, from the very beginning.

It is the ‘**social-strategy-criteria**’ the ‘Institutes’ (the “ILS” and the “IPED” in the case of UiO) **teach** teacher-candidates when lecturers, as they engage the auditorium audience in ‘whole-class-dialogue’, take questions from everyone but refuse to take any question from myself, a fully enrolled student who happens to also be involved in research; and a lecturer like Øystein Gilje teaches bullying and limits himself to examples like ‘torn clothes’ etc. as the signs to look for as a teacher, but does not relay the fact that most serious bullying exclusively consists of various forms of **social exclusion** and near all physical bullying begins as precisely that: social exclusion – precisely the form of social abuse of power that the “ILS” itself commits when **refusing**, during August and September 2015, **to talk** about my quotation-proof of Piaget’s cognitive model, and **refusing to talk** about my recommendations regarding all mandatory group work, the first of which is: make

rules for good cooperation explicit from the very start; **and then**, between Sep.1 and Sep.18, right before the 'practice-period' begins or during the first four days of it, informing the practice-venue about the Institute's opinion about me as a person (relaying that opinion to 'practice-coordinator' May B. H. Berge at Flaatestad secondary school), in other words, relaying the Institute's **evaluation-guide** to the 'practice-venue', **which then**, on Oct.23, announces its "doubt about suitedness" and, through May Berge, who says the practice-venue is reporting that doubt to the Institute, whereafter the Institute puts into effect the mentioned repeatedly on-going **ad hoc extra-exams** aka "**listening-in**" events, again and again until one finally has **collected enough** 'errors committed' by the teacher-candidate during this 'training(?)' for the 'evaluation guide' (the personality-label) and the advance conclusion "unsuited" **to acquire** a hue of 'log-entered grounding'.

It is a process that, naturally, is helped to its goal by the exerted pressure, the pressure that always accompanies having such special treatment, such ad hoc extra-exams, resting on one's shoulders. It is a pressure none of one's co-students are subjected to – unless there is another one like you among them. This pressure is accompanied by the simultaneous pain one is being inflicted through the awareness that one is unwanted by the one who evaluates oneself as one engages in what is officially referred to as '**rehearsing**', an activity that is unambiguously treated as such when all the **non-ad-hoc**-criteria candidates engage in it, but which, for the **ad-hoc-criteria**-subjected' candidate, is a series of '**exams**', **extra** such, repeated until the one who evaluates the candidate sees what the 'Institute-emitted **evaluator's** guide', 'the guiding rumour emitted from the Institute by e-mail or telephone, said that one can expect to see. This, naturally, is nothing but 'evaluation-fixing'. It corresponds to '**match-fixing**' in football and boxing.

In this particular case the 'evaluator's guide' was emitted by "ILS" to the 'practical training coordinator' at Flaatestad secondary school, Ms. May Britt Esse Berge before the practice-teaching even started\*. Berge's own statement to me on on Sep.18.2015 was: "**ILS informed me** that you can be **domineering**" (that is, informed her before Friday afternoon Sep.18. The practice period began Sep.14, with a week of observation and familiarization), an obvious code that the 'practical training coordinator' understands. She says this as I am in the process of informing her that there is an ongoing abuse of power, bullying, in the 'group-work' among the teacher candidates stationed at that practice venue school; a situation where the 'group-work' is being dominated by one single member's continuous monologue she allows no one to interrupt; and no one else can contribute because she interrupts them in their first sentence with "No, I think ... ", and to such an extent that it in no way constitutes 'cooperation' of any sort.

[\* an evaluation that in a retrospectively non-transparent 'practical training period' only can be scientifically (or ethically or legally) justified if it only is 'formative assessment', that is if it is only assessment for the benefit enabling the forming of the training model itself, and for no other benefit than precisely that.]

When May Britt Esse Berge was "**informed**" by their contact person in the Institute (seminar teacher Øystein Gilje or 'practice administrator' Mai Lill Suhr Lunde, most likely the former), she understood perfectly well what was meant by the message. The morose demeanor of seminar teacher Gilje, rather gloomy, with intonations that spoke of aggression about to burst', his hesitation when I was the only student to hold a hand up after he'd asked a question – long after he'd asked it – and his "but make it short" when he finally signalled with his hand that I could speak, informed me he took it quite hard when he found out, the same morning, that I had submitted my written complaint to the Rector about the matter of 'informing' the practice venue that one of the teacher candidates about to begin his practice teaching "**can be domineering**". Hence, my impression regarding who '**the informer**' of May Britt Esse Berge at the practice venue might be, has its foundation.

The act of **'informing'** the office about to evaluate the candidates that one of those candidates **"can be domineering"** is a quite serious violation of the individual's right to be evaluated without prejudice. The act undermines the evaluation by affecting its supposedly neutral starting point. May Berge admitting it on behalf of the Institute (ILS at the UiO) was her way of countering my report to her of the ongoing bullying (classical non-physical abuses of power) in the so-called 'group-work', the 'domineering-bully-regime' of the chambers left alone by the metapedagogue (the teacher of pedagogy) or the 'teaching-practice-conselor' at the practice venue.

One would perhaps think such an administrator (the 'practice coordinator') would know better than reveal to the student the rumour sent in advance of his arrival, but May Berge did exactly that. She said it as I protested against the **freedom to bully** in the mandatory but unobserved group-work she is responsible for. My protest was accompanied by the recommendation that one issues explicit rules for good cooperation.

### The connection to bullying in our schools:

My point is merely this: the good principles that teacher candidates will be expected to teach to children **must apply** to the teacher **candidates themselves** in their 'group-work' situation. Otherwise they will not know them well enough to be able to teach them. I suggest **we must assume** that teacher candidates **taught to disregard** bullying among themselves can be expected to later disregard bullying among children.

Teachers being as blind to bullying as parents in Norway every now and then report them to be is precisely what we can expect from a teacher education where the bullying of teacher candidates in one's 'group' is met with **a blind eye** from the Institute administrators, an eye that turns inquisitory towards the whistle-blower instead of towards the bully when made aware of it, and **then participates** in the 'bullying', makes it officially granted 'social-strategy-criterion-based' exclusion-behaviour, the worst of the bullying-behaviours.

This is precisely the 'secret' of the insight that is missing wherever teachers are blind to bullying among children, meaning bullying by children against selected individuals among them. These teachers do not understand that 'bullying' essentially is **'social exclusion'**, that social exclusion is **the essence** of bullying, and that the Institutes actually teach blindness towards that self-evident detail.

This is the Meta-Pedagogy by which one allegedly hopes to be able to do something about the issue of bullying in our schools. More precisely put, it is on the condition that the Institute itself is allowed to bully 'annoying' teacher-candidates out of their education, that these Institutes are willing to see what they can do about bullying – *'ok, let's just get this annoying teacher-candidate with his 'scientific-perspective-obsession' and his "evidence" of quotation fraud committed by us, the lecturers, out of the way; and then we'll continue the lecture on bullying', or 'the lecture on the need for a scientific perspective' etc.* We see the Institute-held **shallow view** on **'bullying'** in the stereotypical power-point-slides being used every time peer-abuse is the scope of their lectures: **'torn clothes'**.

The biggest problem isn't the 'tearing of clothes' **that we do see** but all the social exclusion processes **one has not seen** and which the simplistic **'reduction-to-shared-reality'** (the Venn-diagram mediated part where **'mine'** and **'yours'** overlap – cf. Lisbeth M. Brevik, UiO) type metaphysics does not include in its taxonomically proper role, the role it has in the real world, as the very essence and therefore the taxonomically super-ordinate specific phenomenon: **'social exclusion'**. THAT is **what 'bullying' is**. We do not necessarily have a science-based education where we have a teacher-performed and teacher-authored *"science of education"*; rarely ever, I would say. The former dictates 1)that we keep 'the sphere of education' completely separate from 'the sphere of employment' and 2)that **'employment-criteria'** precisely in this manner, and no other



manner that replaces this manner, is institutionally prevented from mixing with or influencing the ‘**passing criteria**’ of any given course.

**Teachers** as ‘scientists’ cleverly device tools for the maximization of control, and, quite clearly, largely view science as abstract and treat it as a tool for the benefit they always seek: control. The issue of the Piaget 1967 quotes is a gross example of it. The mistranslation of Vygotsky’s term “zone of **proximal development**” to the Norwegian equivalent of “**proximal zone** of development” (Ivar Braathen & Anne Cathrine Thurmann-Moe, 1998) is almost equally gross. And both of these are examples of the blindness to scientific details of crucial importance that Norwegian teacher training teaches utter **blindness** towards; and not only blindness but **fear** as well. An acute emotional response was mobilized on the part of the teacher against myself in the so-called ‘seminar-class’ as I presented my insight on the Vygotsky-related translation misery to the 20 or so participants present in Helga Eng’s House on the UiO campus Blindern on 25.Sept.2015, followed by a class dialogue where the class, anxious on account of the ongoing emotional outpouring, turned numb towards the teacher’s questions, leaving myself as the only teacher-candidate who raised his hand to signal a willingness to answer, and long pauses ending in that teacher, in rapidly uttered words, going: “**but make it short!**” – an odd session indeed, and because of what? I had obviously called upon **Satan** in the house of the **Lord**, or something of that nature. And the priest was now measuring out his behaviorism-oriented response in order to get the needed collectively conditioned reflex; or, rather, to prevent the collective formation of the reflex I had already formed.

The same teacher had also recently found out I had sent a letter to the UiO Rector complaining about the Institute “**informing**” the practice venue (Flaatestad secondary school just south of the Oslo city limit) that I “**can be domineering**”. He had turned gloomy and silent two weeks earlier too, right after the first ‘group-work’ session, which he co-arranged in the classroom, when I told him he should announce ‘**explicit rules** for good cooperation’ to the class even before the ‘group-work’ begins. The hour of group-work we just ended had turned monotonously monologue-ish as far as the three-member group I was in, with one young female member refraining and, when I asked her to share her thoughts, deferring to – precisely – to the domineering young female who insisted on dominating and who immediately went “**No**, because then ...” the three times I tried to convey something. There is social aggression in such dialogically un-framed group-work. It takes the form of censure and alliance-collection. It is primitive and ugly, basically fear-based. It is not a design but the result of a design, a design based on metapedagogical ignorance.

So, this particular seminar-teacher, who, like myself, is a PhD of pedagogy, definitely found me to be utter **domineering**. And he should. I only wish he would listen to me. He should. He is therefore the individual most likely to be the ‘**informer**’ that Mai Britt Esse Berge (the ‘practice coordinator’ at the practice venue, Flaatestad secondary school) referred to when she said: “**ILS informed me** that you can be domineering”.

All things considered, the science-part is better left in the hands of ‘learning-**scientists** who intrude in the world of teaching’, forcing ‘**teachers**’ to adhere to the principles of science and walk the path of science. It is a path they have proven much too well that they refuse to walk voluntarily. That, by the way, goes for the teachers of teacher-candidates too, the meta-pedagogues, and to an even higher degree. But the Institutes of teacher education in Norway have ensured that all so-called “learning-specialists” are hired from applicants with minimum one year experience as teacher in a primary or secondary school, and with a favorable recommendation letter to prove their so-called “ability to take instructions”, in other words one’s ‘willingness to do as one is told without ever telling the boss she is dead wrong’. I, however, have learned that somebody has to. I learned it from the empirical evidence, the original theory they lie about during the first three weeks of lectures in all courses in pedagogy (the ‘Piagetian **accommodation**’ allegedly defined as ‘**fault-correction**’ or ‘modification of errors’) and then reap the domain-political benefit of it when they go: “You must show ability to **cooperate**” and “demonstrate self-reflexive capacity by **admitting** your mistakes” (the ‘admit-and-repent’

gospel), followed by a quasi-socratic dialogue in which the meta-pedagogue interprets whatever the teacher-candidate utters in a manner that allows one to see a 'lacking' or 'deficiency' of some sort, something for the teacher-candidate to 'admit' and 'repent' from.

The Institute then proceeds to exclude the teacher candidate who complains about matters that the Institute has already swept under the carpet. They do it by refusing to sign the so-called 'Practice-Card' – the document by which the teacher-candidates who do please the meta-pedagogues enough are being signed off with a 'passing grade'. This is where **the liaison** between the 'Institute' and the 'practice venue' proves its unlawful nature. It is where the '**failed course**' assessment is based on **non-educationally relevant** criteria, criteria that employers use when they decide who to hire among a number of applicants with similar qualifications. If an applicant is critical towards the employer, the employer plays it safe by not hiring that individual, even if no other applicants show up for the interview. In education, however, refusing to 'sign off' such a candidate is simply **unlawful** (cf. the soon to be posted "Unlawful evaluation method in teacher training" and "Unlawful trade of favors between Institute and practice venues", already posted in Norwegian - Soerfjord 2015).

All courses of pedagogy must instead have their own 'distinctly educationally relevant criteria'; and have no other criteria blended in, as they inevitably dilute the set of criteria according to the taste of employers. The set of 'educationally relevant criteria' ought to be **retrospectively** transparent in a way that is drastically different from anything that might be handed to us from the '**sphere of employment**'. One must, to satisfy the scientific and ethical criteria that in fact validly hold, remove the inscrutably uninspectable verily unverifiable '**personality-sifting-mechanism**' from teacher education.

This 'sifting'-compulsion is the old priestly function that our laws say we shall have no more of in our kongdom. We ought therefore to kick it back to the century it came from, the 11<sup>th</sup> or so. **Only the police** has the authority to sift out personalities. It is done by the production or non-production of a licence from the head-quarters of the police. All teacher candidates must have one upon enrollment or produce it the first month of study.

The existence of this **ass-kissing tyranny** in teacher education goes against every grain and every fiber of **science**. It excludes all teachers of pedagogy (meta-pedagogues) from serving in the role of 'learning-scientist'. Holding the title "scientist" or "specialist" makes you neither. Only doing 'learning science' does, meaning doing it without cheating (with quotes or anything else), and doing it away or while structurally screened from the environment where the employers exert their influence.

The scientific and ethical principles that hold for obligatory cooperation-oriented activities like 'group-work' will not unite with the principle of 'exams or obligatory cooperation without intersubjective retrospective verifiability'. Nonetheless, what we have today is just that, an unreparably inscrutable mechanism. This, therefore, seen through the scientific goggles of a true 'science of education', is a monstrosity that necessarily brings harm to this particular science, brings harm to the **metapedagogical** learning environment (the learning environment of teacher education), and by logical necessity therefore brings harm to the **pedagogical** learning environment that all of our children have to take part in.

End word:

Piaget's cognitive self-regulation is not 'cognition regulating knowledge' and not even 'regulation of one's own cognition', but simply 'cognition **self-regulating**', cognition as a 'self-regulating process', where the whole point is that cognition '**regulates itself**'. It is cognition as a living organ, and every living organ is essentially a 'self-regulating process'. This is not at all about 'regulating one's cognition', but about cognition essentially 'being selfregulated'.

The Institute-mediated version of Piaget's and Kant's model of cognition is a political tool, a 'pair of pliers'; and the Institutes have committed **scientific fraud** to produce it (they falsified the Piaget 1967-quotes). It (the Institute version) is of course utter nonsense. Its proponents want no transparent debate about this, no evidence-conditioned reasoning in which the premises are made to bear on the claims clung to.

The nature of their fact-defiant view can only be flushed out by the well trod path of science. Teacher education offices must be politically forced into that path. They obviously do not want to walk it on their own. There, within the frames of science, science will rid them of their borrowed cloak and the illusory cross they claim to carry for the benefit of the children. We must treat all of the institutes of Pedagogy the same in this respect, remove the special treatment they have taken advantage of and force all of them to steer along that path, whether they claim to 'already be doing it', 'having done it all along', or 'being perfectly capable of doing it on their own'. We must, because our governmental responsibility is to the individual child and the individual teacher-candidate, each one of them. We must protect them against the locally self-serving **group in office** that my research has uncovered.

Dr. Kai Soerfjord

Laura Gundersens gate 3, 0168 Oslo, Norway

[ksorfjord@yahoo.com](mailto:ksorfjord@yahoo.com) (feedback greatly appreciated)