

Ivar Bråten's **incredible 'REPAIR' of Lev Vygotsky's ZPD into PZD.**

- a ridiculous translation error

Jan. 2017

by Dr. Kai Soerfjord (Sørfjord)

(as appendix II in "Scared Stiff, a Documentary")

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

- **Ivar Braaten (Bråten)** has mistranslated Vygotsky's term "**zone of proximal development**", ZPD (the English phrase having been derived at by Vygotsky's Russian assistant in cooperation with U.S. PhDs), by making it into the Norwegian phrase "**den nærmeste utviklingssonen**", syntactically making it "the **nearest zone of development**", the "**proximal zone of development**".

Ivar Braaten has the modifier "**proximal**" qualifying '**zone**' instead of '**development**'. Rather than simply doing it the correct way and make it "sonen for **nærmeste utvikling**" or "sonen for **proksimal utvikling**", he makes it into something else, something distinctly less, each time he mentions the notion by that label, beginning in the article's heading.

He has thereby annihilated the key detail that in itself constitutes the core of Vygotsky's whole point with the phrasing of that concept. In his article or book chapter, with co-author Anne Cathrine Thurmann-Moe, he then uses two pages in the hopeless attempt to bring that core essence back into the understanding of what that phrase refers to.

But students of pedagogy, naturally, understand nothing of that core essence when they read it, having been derailed from the beginning by the heading: "Den **nærmeste utviklingssonen** som utgangspunkt for pedagogisk praksis", which actually means "The **neares zone of development** as point of origin in pedagogical practice {/practical pedagogy}", in *Vygotsky i pedagogikken (Vygotsky in the learning-sciences)* pp.123-143, Norway: Cappelen (1998). The horrible error is so obvious that one wonders about the intention by which they enter into their work in the first place.

The **aggression** on the lecturer's face - Dr. **Oeystein (Øystein)'s face** - both during my scheduled presentation of this article and in the rest of the so-called 'seminar'-class, the remaining hour or so of it, in October 2015, was printed in his emotionally inflamed face, just like his **visible rage** a month later, on 11.Nov. 2015, captured here by my Sony-cam during his mock physical assault on myself:



- hard to believe until you see it; a **rage** that bubbled into the **mannerism** and staccato monotone-sounding **speech** of an angry person, the sound everyone recognizes, between long pauses to *invite* class-participation, some response to the prepared questions for the topic he talks about; and getting absolutely no response from anyone except myself, no hands raised other than mine; everyone suddenly busy investigating Dr. Øystein's unusually monotone **intonation** and facially expressed aggression, **eerily announcing** to all that something very bad has just occurred. I was the only student tuned in on the topic he was talking about as he elicited response from the class. The entire seminar class had turned passive, about 25 teacher-candidates; everyone staring at his **visibly darkened enraged** face, then turning their heads in the direction of his gaze, towards me, then back to Dr. Øystein's face, wondering what the hell is going on. I observed the masses of **skulls swivelling** 60-170 degrees back and forth, and I knew they were **learning** something that would mark them for life, shape their whole professional outlook as academics in what to them is a science - Ed-Sci - put into praxis in a 'field' with its announced **direct connection to 'theory'**; the phrase "connecting the practical to theory" being an explicitly emphasized **ideal**.

Ivar Bråten

Professor - [Institutt for pedagogikk](#)



| | |
|--------------------|--|
| E-post | ivar.braten@iped.uio.no |
| Telefon | +47-22855282 |
| Faks | +47-22854250 |
| Rom | 327 |
| Treffetider | Etter avtale |
| Brukernavn | Logg inn |

| | |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| Besøksadresse | Postadresse |
| Sem Sælands vei 7 | Postboks 1092 Blindern |
| Helga Engs hus | 0317 OSLO |
| 0317 OSLO | |

Andre tilknytninger

[Det utdanningsvitenskapelige fakultet](#)

<http://www.uv.uio.no/iped/personer/vit/ivarbr/index.html>

A "**proximal zone** of development" is not what Vygotsky called it, because he called it a "zone of **proximal development**"; in the sense of 'immediate development' - possible **right now**, but only with the support of a particular kind of intelligent learning-environment design. I'd say the best way to translate ZPD is to **keep calling it** what Vygotsky called it - translate it without changing it (*Scared Stiff - ..., a Documentary*, p. 102).

Lars Løvlie's (UiO) **incredible 'repair' of Immanuel Kant
to fit Løvlie's
educational politics:**

Jan. 2017

by Dr. Kai Soerfjord (Sørfjord)

(as appendix III in "Scared Stiff, a Documentary")

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

Lars Løvlie displays the same tendency as Ivar Bråten, proving essences having passed him by without being grasped. Løvlie has Kant's "nature-given **desire** to be free" ("*von Natur ...**Hang zur Freiheit***", §5 *On Pedagogy*, 1803)*⁴⁹ as 'natural **capacity** to be free'; where Kant's *On Pedagogy* actually emphasizes the exact opposite: the human child's **inability** to be free **until** properly **formed** for that freedom (*Bildung* - forming), formed by being brought up, having been cultured, as in 'formed by culturing'.

Lars Løvlie extracts a particle, reverses it and then uses it to pay tribute to '**youth autonomy**', referring to Immanuel Kant's excellent and huge (little in word-number, tiny actually) book as a testimony of the human child's '**ability** to be free'. Lars Løvlie even conspires with a Swedish translator of the book, Jim Jakobsson, to commit **forgery** by doctoring the text in a segment where Kant gives an example of how to react to bullying. Løvlie comments on the segment in a 'Postscript' he added in the translation, published by Daidalos in Gotenburg. Details follow:

*⁴⁹ It is a book with a couple of weaknesses due to the time of its coming into being, but unclarity is not one of those two weaknesses. They are: 1) condemnation of merely almost all physical punishment rather than condemning all of it, and 2) a religious-culture-conditioned (culturally dictated) condemnation of masturbation among youth. Ignore the two elements and the book has perpetual validity. A third weakness is irrelevant: a mild inaccuracy in its references to non-human species and their upbringing - but only because he underscores the relative complexity in specifically human upbringing.

Lars Løvlie, I am certain, isn't a bad person outside of his work, but he fails his duty when he enters another field to extract something useful to him, rapes and plunders the other field, and then uses a particle to his own benefit in a way that is contrary to the scientific fact of the **rational range of usages** of that particle, which in this case blatantly and **patently excludes** the use he makes of it. It is a glaringly obvious fact to a moderately competent student of philosophy (even teachers of philosophy are merely students of it, though they flatter each other by calling each other by the label 'philosopher', and I think they ought to stop that habit). **Teaching philosophy** and **being a philosopher** are two distinctly different matters; and looking into philosophy as a resource-management or as a harvesting of premises for pre-fabricated arguments, is not even a way to learn how to study philosophy.

So, **Lars Løvlie tells a lie,**
a scientific lie.

He also quite evidently has **coerced Jim Jakobsson**, the official 'translator' into Swedish of Kant's book, into **forging Immanuel Kant's example** of how to react against **mobbing** or **bullying** so that Kant's example will look **as if it fits Lars Løvlie's philosophy of letting the socially aggressive be free to dominate less aggressive peers**. This is the "**self-regulating group**"-**oxymoron** ideology I address in teacher-training, an oxymoron (stinging stupidity) whether you look at the philosophy, sociology or psychology of it, on account of it being logically absurd, in every analysis of it; a logical perversion of the **individual's** right to

‘selfregulated learning’. It is essentially **unrestrained-group-internal-relations-**based team-work, where a dominant team-member can discriminate or threaten, even exclude, another member if the rest of the team goes along with it, by acquiescing or agreeing (cf. Appendix I). It is an absurdity even in a judicial analysis of it, hence an **unlawful learning environment design element** whenever participation in a team is mandatory to pass the course. That is **a truth lawyers do not understand**, not yet, which is remarkable; it speaks of ‘**forbidden areas of thought**’ in law, which points to the existence of organisations exerting social power beyond their legitimate range, totalitarian control within self-regulated partial anarchy.

That perfect fit of **the Løvlie-Jakobsson-doctored text-segment** is a benefit we need to look at in order to get over our benevolent doubt in whether anyone would actually be interested in doing such an absurd and scientifically unethical thing as forging a translation, and doing it with a motive, a benefit.

Lars Løvlie manipulates quote-particles:

The manipulation is in Løvlie’s “**Postscript**” of the publication containing Jim Jakobsson’s translation into Swedish (pp. 69-83), in Løvlie’s references to the content of *On Pedagogy (Om Pedagogik*, publisher: Bokförlaget Daidalos AB, 2008), where Løvlie **tells the reader, in Swedish, which I now render in English:**

“Freedom, to Kant, is obeying reason and letting the moral duties restrict one’s behavior. **This freedom** must also be for the child to have (idiosyncratic Swedish: *also be valid for the child*) before it reaches the age of reason, (and then Løvlie’s reason:) **because** it cannot become free as an adult if it has not already received this **freedom as a gift from birth.**”

In Norwegian (my translation of Løvlie’s Swedish):

“Frihet er for Kant å adlyde fornuften og la de moralske pliktene begrense ens atferd. **Denne frihet** må også gjelde for barnet før det når fornuftsalder; **for** det kan ikke bli fritt som voksen dersom det ikke allerede har fått denne **frihet som gave fra fødselen av.**”
(Løvlie/Jakobsson 2008:74)

As a guidance to students of pedagogy this isn’t very accurate. It is what I would call

a LIE ABOUT KANT,
because:

What Kant says in that entire book - which anyone who reads the book will know, Lars Løvlie too - is the exact opposite:

- a) that humans (‘man’) “**is the only species that need upbringing**” (in the sense Kant uses the word upbringing);
- b) that man “**has from nature such a desire [Hang] for freedom, that once he gets used to it he will sacrifice everything for it**” (§1-5) - a **desire/need/addiction** for freedom that is there **from birth, but not yet the ability** to be free;
- c) that humans therefore need “**caretaking and forming**” [*Wartung und Bildung*] - where “forming [Bildung] includes **restraint** [Zucht] and **instruction** [Unterweisung]” (§6) - to leave behind the animal in us and “become human” (§7); “make the good seeds grow” (§10).

He says “in the human child there are only good seeds” (§10), and “man needs restraint ... cultivation ... and discretion {sound judgment, ability to distinguish}, which requires civilizing {wisdom, politeness and **knowledge of how to go about things and how to treat people in order to do what you need to do**” (how to let people live their lives the way they want in order for you to live your life the way you want) (§18) So, Kant says, “more important than just training children is **teaching them to think.**” (§19)

After “the initial stage”, “the child should have **some freedom, but** under guidance of certain **rules.**” (§27) “How do I **cultivate forth freedom** when there is restraint? I make my pupil used to tolerate some **restraint** and at the same time **guide him into using his freedom correctly.**” (§29) The ‘positive obedience’ enforced in the “initial stage” of a child (§27) is for the child’s safety, “so it doesn’t get hurt”, and it must be **combined with** “perfect **liberty** in every way, **but only as long as it does not interfere with the liberty of others**” (§29), which is **rule one: restraint** and Socratic **dialogic guidance** in the right use of freedom. Rule two, as the child grows, is that “one’s goal can **only** be achieved **when one allows others to also achieve theirs.**” And lastly “one must prove to the child”- “as the third” {rule} - that “**restraint** is laid upon it {the child} in order **for that to lead to** the use of its own freedom, {and} **that one cultivates it** {the child} **so that it thereby may one day** {in the future} **be free.**” {daß man ihm einen Zwang auflegt, der es zum Gebrauche seiner eigenen Freiheit führt, **daß man es kultiviere, damit es einst Frei sein könne.** (§30)}

- where it seems that Kant, by ‘being free’, is also referring to the notion of man ‘having a free will’, hence being capable of being accountable for one’s actions.

**Lars Løvlie’s ideologically motivated lies
about Imanuel Kant is FRAUD**

What Løvlie says Kant says is that there is an inherent **capacity**, in children, to function as **autonomous** human beings, **but what Kant says** is that there is an inherent “**desire**”/“**will**”/“**need**” [“*Hang*”] to be autonomous, only to be followed by the corresponding “**capacity**” after long education - *Über Pädagogik* §5, 29, 30 etc., which means **Lars Løvlie** is cheating, committing what might justifiably be called academic **fraud**.

Kant’s inherent “capacity” is really merely ‘the **capacity to learn** how to be autonomous, or free’. **Løvlie says Kant** at the same time recognized the apparent **paradox** made up of this **capacity** coexisting with a **vulnerability** that requires guidance and education. This is what Løvlie calls “**the pedagogical paradox**”, and **Løvlie says** we see it in the way **Kant**, to every advice on upbringing, adds “**a tag that says caution**” - for example, **Løvlie says Kant says**: “impose **rules** on him” (the child) “**but remember to allow for his free judgment**”. **Løvlie says Kant’s ‘paradox’ is** “**constrain him but let him savor his freedom**” etc. (cf. Løvlie: *The Pedagogical Paradox and its Relevance for Education*, 2008).

But **Kant’s tag** is **OPPOSITE** of what Løvlie says it is. Kant explicitly says it much stronger and more to the point, and **in the opposite way: let the child be free, and feel free, but only as long as no other child is hurt by it** - *Über Pädagogik* §30, 95 etc.). So Lars Løvlie isn’t merely lying by omission, he lies by manipulating the original content he paraphrases, misrepresenting Kant’s theme and emphasis, reversing the logic of Kant’s clauses into another message.

And that isn’t all:

Løvlie stresses that “*all-important is the respect for the dignity of the child.*” But there is an angle missing within this perspective, and that is the quite rele-

vant application of the ‘pedagogical paradox’ (using the **free will but restricted by rules and guidance**) with its moderating effect to the issue of **choosing a method that maximizes the safeguard against social abuse** among students of all ages, **teacher candidates** and students of Pedagogy too - young adults in curricula that involve **mandatory team-work** (Norw. *obligatorisk gruppearbeid*).

Let them feel their freedom, but be there and watch, so that even the **weak** can **feel** his “freedom”, is precisely what **Kant** says in *Über Pädagogik*. Applying restraint to the freedom of the socially dominant requires **presence**, explicit **rule** and high-quality prior **instruction** in **healthy and efficient team-work and team-work ethics**.

Restraint of the socially dominant cannot be applied based on rumours about, or the voting on, who ‘the domineering’ is. And rumours is all one can have when team-work is conducted without explicit **rules that forbid exclusion-behavior**; or the team-work is started without the mentioned prior instruction; or the instruction not being followed up by the lecturer’s presence as a norm rather than the exception.

Add the notion of that team-work being **mandatory**, and what we have amounts to **opportunities for the socially aggressive** to operate censorship of a member, gather social alliance-partners and form **sub-team** entities that can dominate and threaten a non-allied individual in the team (cf Appendix I, dialogues 1 and 2). This is just unimaginably amateurish and a quite harmful stupidity, and it is the method used universally in Norway. Think about that mindboggling standardized foolishness. I suspect the method is standard in Denmark and Sweden too, and beyond. It is a dark secret the world has been unaware of and may not yet be ready to believe.

An in-team mob majority will vote on the victim of their mobbing to be labeled the ‘mobber’ or ‘non-contributor’ to be weeded out. Unimaginable incompetencies exist about this in the field of teacher-education, and unimaginably deficient thinking is taking place in the rhetoric we hear. There is simply no valid rationale available to argue the point of view that “teacher-candidates are adults and one must therefore assume that they know how to behave”. The facts are: they must be there to pass the course, and they aren’t being protected; hence they aren’t learning how to protect children. They are not even learning what to protect children from, in this regard.

And it is rather obvious: We **cannot** expect future teachers of our children to respect “the **dignity** of the child” **unless we** secure **the same “dignity” of each teacher candidate** and **each** student of so-called pedagogy - and **not merely the ‘dignity’ of these future teachers as a group**. What “dignity” means here is the “dignity of each as an individual, especially when in the “team” (group), and even more so when that ‘team-work’ is mandatory.

What Kant says about the dignity of humankind or the individual as a world-citizen who has learned how to think, and everything else he says about anything related to this, excludes any training schemata that even resembles the **divide into groups – work in separate chambers – exclude non-contributors paradigm**, which consequently needs to be weeded out of Ed-Sci or the teaching of pedagogy, and kept out. This is merely the obvious application of the minimum of pedagogic insight one needs to expect. Anything less is a numbing evidence of **the rule of ideology**, a tyrannical force irreconcilable with humanistic “science”. I therefore suggest the mere obvious:

Guarantee that every individual student in the teams (groups) has access to the savoring of **freedom** during mandatory team work, **but make sure the team or the socially dominant in the team** cannot attempt to operate a censorship or effectively eliminate the contribution of any individual; and allow no ‘voting’ on which contribution to exclude. It is the teacher of pedagogy’s responsibility to enforce the opposite:

the compounding of everyone’s suggestion

into new exciting wholes;

The allowing of a method (a learning-environment design) that makes it possible for socially dominant individuals - individually or in the alliances they form with acquiescing individuals seeing **opportunities to join a winning sub-team** - to dominate the team into making decisions that exclude certain contributions or one of the contributors in the team, **threaten** an individual dissenter, ultimately exclude a dissenter, or attempt any other form of **abuse**, is:

“the modern pedagogic perversion”.

Parliament needs to step into action here and stop this from continuing. The Minister of Education is presently hiding this problem, like his predecessors did before him.

Teaching the **‘team-host’**-duty:

We need a centrally emitted law or rule that expresses the imperative that **no mandatory** group work ever take place unless:

- a) solid **instruction** in **‘healthy and efficient team-work’** and **‘team-work ethics’**, has been provided **in advance** – an accompanying principle here being the lecturer’s presence in the room initially, with regular visits throughout; and
- b) it is conducted with a **scheduled rotation of ‘team-leader’ duties**; and
- c) where the operating definition of a **‘team-leader’** is **‘host’** - a host that makes certain that everyone in the team can speak without anyone in the team rejecting or down-grading the contribution, not even interrupting except to ask the team-member to repeat or clarify – a leader charged with the responsibility of enforcing an explicitly taught ban on taking over anyone’s flow of speech, this being one of the dialogic rules of operation.

The **‘team-host’** is a team-leader who secures everyone’s access to contribute, This needs to be universally taught as the main ‘team-leader’-quality, and it needs to be taught by way of **‘host’-duty rotation**.

The **team-host** rotation
exercise:

Using the operating definition of a ‘team-leader’ as **‘host’**, rotate the duty of ‘team-leader’ every day of the mandatory team-work. The lecturer instructs the team in the meaning of the definition of ‘team-leader as host’, then supervises a draw-names-from-a-hat type selection of the team-leader rotation. Avoid allowing anyone to ‘volunteer to begin’, and do not allow it if initiated, nor any other volunteered place in a sequence.

Avoiding all such will cause a gain in confidence that is minimally affected by the perception of fear associated with being the first to ‘lead’. All team-members then have equal access to healthy team leadership practice, and it will then be an efficient leadership-course in general.

The **‘host’-type leader** is a far healthier leadership-type than the belbin-type paradigm with its **negative** characterizations of many qualities that are rather **praiseworthy in any academic** context, except for the immediate-profit-dictated leadership environment that

Dr. Belbin works for, the latter, I say, being **decidedly unhealthy** among the future teachers of children, whom we ought to stimulate to curiosity and **the will to dwell** and look deeper into matters and relations than the simplistically defined role of Dr. Belbin's tyranny. I recommend placing **Dr. Belbin** in the **Dr. Mengele**-category and ban him from the classroom of children and teacher-candidates altogether.

The priority needs to remain on the **process** rather than on product. After an initial round of **1 day** per member **host-rotation**, raising it to a week per member the following round.

The method used in teacher-education needs to be the SAME METHOD that we want to be used among children. Methods instantiate principles and values, and teacher-education needs to **simulate the learning environment we want to make for children.**

There can be no healthy 'team-work' in seclusion in teacher-training without solid prior instruction in healthy and efficient team-work, team-work by proper ethical standards, and initially and regularly with a responsible and qualified PhD in pedagogy (not merely a teacher) in the room, able and willing to act promptly as I have indicated, never letting abuses, **exclusion-behavior** or **-language** or **threats** happen among teacher-candidates (cf. Appendix I); the lecturer never pretending to be innocent witness to it, or relating to it by appearing in the false suit of a Mediator when Instigator is the real role being played. The '**free in-team-abuse**' and the '**Instigator dressed as Mediator**' is precisely the standard learning-environment design used in Norwegian teacher-education. It apparently needs to be solidly ridiculed before the consensus-dictated are able to see the evil stupidity of it.

That method constitutes gross neglect. It is what I have called "**scaffolding for abuse**". It is in itself, before we even begin discussing the actual cases of abuse taking place, a violation of the human rights of the individual. It is betrayal of whatever measure of trust the socially non-dominant may have to school and to teachers of so-called 'pedagogy'.

Teachers of pedagogy leaving the room after telling the groups that "*Non-contributors are to be **weeded out***", is a **legal offence** in Norway's higher education, whether considered such or not. It is the social acts of considering that in this case are corrupt.

The **socially non-dominant** have the **RIGHT** to **NOT** be placed in a position where the socially dominant can get to them and damage their education, and that holds for teacher-education more than anything. Even without including the mandate/instruction to "weed out non-contributors", the presently used method is a **legal offence**.

The words "**weed out**" demonstrate the primitive and uneducated state of mind behind the madness. They were spoken in the lecturing hall of the University of Agder (**UiA**), with myself present and audio-recording. They were proclaimed three times in a 45 minute period, by lecturer **Tor Tanggaard**, and with hand gestures to emphasize the threat, "**the non-contributors...are to be weeded out**" – and **who decides who** it is that isn't 'contributing'? "**The team!**", says **Tor Tanggaard**, who apparently refuses to learn better methods, as they all do, seeing their internal "agreement" as a sign of good quality.

These are the academically deficient lecturers I contend **teacher training** and **pedagogic studies** need to be freed from, by anyone willing to step in. If the intervening agent is the **national** educational authority, then that means these civil servants (politicians) have finally understood their role and their duty: secure individuals' rights, and reclaim rights that have been methodologically annihilated by **domain-local** abusers of power occupying offices meant for

knowledge, offices presently **usurped for private economic gain**, in Norway of all countries, and, I think, in Denmark and Sweden too.

Pedagogues who do not see much wrong in the practice of autonomous groups away from the teacher's eye, without thorough and prior instruction in a)'**healthy and efficient team-work**' and b)'**team-work ethics**', and with team-work-rules consistently enforced, have failed to grasp the very essence of pedagogy. It is, I contend, precisely that serious, and it involves a particularly crucial **inability to be guided by rational argumentation** where facts impose on ideology and the ideology rejects them. We do not, as we believe was believed in ancient times, love with the heart and think with the brain. It is **the brain** that **loves** and it is the brain that ensures the corresponding behavior.

Just like loving our children, as I suggest, involves not ever leaving them alone among unknown peers or children older or stronger than they are, or even leaving them alone with anyone else, ever, I suggest loving our children must also involve loving the young teacher-candidates and students of pedagogy studying for teacherhood; and we ought to love our children enough to not leave their **future teacher** in an autonomous team that may cause him or her harm or cause him or her to learn harmful habits or values - whether it be by ignorant and immature aggressive behaviour in teacher-candidate-teams unequipped for healthy team-work or any of the socially more sinister versions of in-team abuses that such factual vulnerability in teacher-education opens up for.

Teacher candidates and **students of pedagogy** ought to be treated the way we want them to treat our children, simply because **whatever we do against** teacher candidates and students of so-called pedagogy will have an effect on the children **taught by** them. Lecturers who argue in defence of the 'self-regulating team left alone'-paradigm in teacher-training, without instruction in proper team-work-principles and without the enforcing of such principles, are hiding behind slogans that have no merit - for example the notion of letting the teacher candidates "grow into autonomous beings" or "realize their autonomous nature", where "their" means "it's".

All such are mere noise, because the 'team' isn't an individual, a 'he' or a 'she', it's an 'it', where anyone can take control by threatening a dissenting individual. Dissenting individuals may happen to be right, so we cannot have methods in teacher-education that open up for them to be discriminated against in pathological manners that harm everyone present. Children will somehow be harmed when taught by teachers trained to silently accept the threatening environment of a 'team' let loose against them, a team vulnerable to in-team discrimination by dominant individuals enacting socio-pathological forms of dialogue (cf. Appendix I). The very structure of a 'team' let loose against the individuals in the team, is harmful and contradicts §1-1 in the law for teaching, specifically its explicit orders for all instruction to enact and promote principles like "**critical thinking**" and "a **scientific way of thinking**" etc. (cf. Appendix IV).

There is in various parts of literature an expressed ideal or experimental notion of pedagogy **imitating the 'real' external world** beyond the school-environment of children, and the rationale is the need for the teaching of pedagogy (teacher-training) to therefore do the same. The answer to it is that the "**identify non-contributors and weed them out**" pathology may have originated outside of pedagogy, somewhere in **really** abusive parts of the '**real**' world outside of **the 'real' school** charged with the duty of providing an education with '**real**' virtues. But it was a **problem, not a virtue**, wherever it was taken from.

The problem picked up by confused so-called "pedagogues" in the Learning Sciences is now being poured into the minds of young adults as a **virtue** of social behavior, and has been for some time. But I contend it is the **OPPOSITE** of

a virtue. The “**let-students-weed-out-students**” pathology is not only unhealthy, I contend, it is a violation of both law AND human rights.

Again, I am only suggesting the obvious: It is up to a university and a teacher academy to do the “**weeding out**” that needs to be done, and do it themselves, without the help of co-students. This is a giant **legal matter**. Let us not wait the decades it takes for the courts to react. We must be much better than the players in society that only improve when driven to it by judges pushed to the limit of their resistance against it by lawyer teams paid to push, or when the majority consensus crawls along paths that the logical mind can travel in a minute.

Rejecting the ‘team-threat’ censorship of dissent, in mandatory team-work

- is a basic application of **Kant** in the teaching of pedagogy.

It amounts to **methodologically securing** the rights and the **dignity** of every single individual - most importantly of the individuals whose rights and dignity are being threatened, sometimes the academically more capable individuals, whose contributions tend to be censored by social power-grabbing individuals in the autonomous and secluded group, individuals who take the lead in the effort to define not only the “**group**” but also the less dominant group members, who otherwise, in the teacher’s presence, would be allowed to define themselves, enjoying their right to ‘**self-regulate**’ rather than ‘**be regulated**’ by a dominant team-member, a **copyright-operator** saying:

“You either agree with **me** or **we** decide that you are working against **us**” (cf. Appendix I, dialogue 1).

Anything less than this very practical application of Kant amounts to idle talk. Løvlie, in his 2008 essay, says “As we know, just as silence may speak, inaction may act”, and he says “The pedagogical paradox is for **self-reflection** rather than for therapeutic **intervention**.”

But Løvlie does not seem to realize that NOT applying the **rules-restrained freedom** concept as a **moderator** of the **strategies for team-work** in teacher training, and NOT establishing a set of mandatory rules for mandatory team-work that correspond to that insight, amounts to “**acting by not doing**”. It is the enacting of an environment that enables discrimination, and posing that as a threat against dissenters. That makes it an unlawful learning-environment design element.

By not enforcing such moderation nationally; by not establishing standardized rules for **inclusive group methodology**, Ed-Sci is **acting by not doing**, which means that what Løvlie calls a “pedagogical paradox” CANNOT BE ONLY “for self-reflection”. It MUST ALSO be for therapeutic, political, and legal intervention to free these courses from the special interests that presently holds it hostage, and corrupts Ed-Sci to make it look as if ‘theory’ back them up. This is a **legal matter**, a human rights issue. It is a job for somebody in Parliament, when they WAKE UP.

The act of **not disrupting** the methodological **scaffolds for social abuse** and violation of human rights that remain in the mandatory team-work method of a **colleague**, a **neighbor discipline**, **institute** or **faculty** of so-called Pedagogy, amounts to supporting the abuses being scaffolded for.

We need to ridicule the scaffolding for abuses.

This is NOT the type of issue where we can afford to let local lecturers of pedagogy in teacher-training have the ‘freedom of choice’. If team-work is to

remain **mandatory** in such courses, the method of conducting such team-work must be equally mandatory and standardized in a manner that is or CAN be healthy for every single individual.

Mandatory team-work needs to be structured so that it **proactively prevents** team-internal **social abuse**;

prevents acts of **censoring** or **excluding** individual contributions;

prevents the “**group-defining**” of individuals as “non-contributors”;

prevents the **threatening** of individual students with exclusion from the mandatory team, threatening their future career.

The very idea of **structurally enabling** that threat is Stalinistic, evil, simply stupid. We cannot have mandatory group work methods in “higher” education that allow these abuses to happen, which the presently practiced methods indeed do, objectively so, verifiably and irrefutably so.

And wherever the possibility of such abuse is allowed, the abuses tend to happen. I have seen it personally, and I have protested against it, then been threatened for protesting against it, in the UiA (2008) and in the UiO (2015). It is as real as it is stupid and unlawful.

So:

1.

If team-work is **mandatory**, it cannot be allowed to take place in seclusion without thorough **prior instruction** in ‘**healthy, efficient and ethically sound team-work**’, simply because seclusion (working away from the teacher/lecturer’s presence in the room) is **autonomy** for individuals who discriminate, which prevents the socially non-dominant from being **autonomous selves** together with some of the actively or passive-aggressively socially dominant who take control, even right before the noses of academically deficient lecturers who fail to understand what is happening.

Some of the **socially aggressive** that seek to these courses, as if drawn to them, are drawn as if to prove to themselves the possession of some misunderstood virtue they project to the role of “**leader**”, and have no conceptual clue about the ‘team-leader’ as a ‘**team-host**’ that protects everyone’s access to contribute.

The non-dominant have the RIGHT to be in the ‘group’ AND be guaranteed the opportunity to be **as much autonomous “selves”** as the rest, which means they have the RIGHT to be in the group WITHOUT having to yield to and be defined by the socially dominant. Ed-Sci, then, needs to change the present abstract quality of that RIGHT to tangible reality, and they must evidently be forced to do it, by **Parliament interfering in concrete ways**.

It is my distinct impression that the well-intended men and women who write and talk of “**selfregulated learning**” are referring to the “**individual**”, NOT to the “**team**”, especially when assigning the right to “**selfregulated learning**”. I have yet to see any sign of policies or published methodology bypassing the level of the “individual”, as if to impute such rights to the ‘**group**’.

2.

The **paradigm** of “divide yourselves into teams – choose a team-leader – **identify and weed out** non-contributors” is doing harm to higher education, harm to education in general, and harm to society. It is that paradigm that needs be “**weeded out**”, along with its confused (at best) persisting proponents. And if that can only happen through **central control**, then central control is a friend of the socially less dominant and a friend of higher education, regardless of the stubbornness of daydreaming lecturers of pedagogy educated mainly in one specific **ideology**, one that tells **lies about Piaget and Kant**, and even makes a mess of Vygotsky.

It is, obviously, in the usual case or even almost always, **local power** that directly violates the rights of the “individual”. In this case we have trusted civil servants (lecturers of pedagogy) who **methodologically** violate **the rights** of the socially non-dominant individuals, mainly their **freedom** to safely contribute in the “group”-situation, in mandatory ‘team-work’. The autonomous teams - secluded in separate chambers – have **individuals** in them who are **non-autonomous** on account of the socially dominant individuals **let lose against** them, **unobserved** by the responsible **Instigator/lecturer**, at the mercy of these socially dominant individuals **who make good use of their own** freedom, their freedom to violate the freedom of selected others and threaten their rights to realize their own ‘selves’ during their mandatory presence in the team.

It is a **violation orchestrated** in the so-called “professional” domain of “child-control”, with methods socially constructed by “**child-controllers**” who refuse to understand what they are doing. **National** educational authorities in this case did not orchestrate the abusive methodology insisted upon **domain-locally**, and these **national** authorities see themselves **too weak** academically to **weed** out the Instigators of the “autonomous-in-seclusion” and “identify non-contributors and weed them out”- syndrome.

It is a pathology of teacher training and courses in so-called “pedagogy” in Norway, a pathology that has been left untreated while pedagogic philosophers apparently have been busy elsewhere, which is a shame.

3.

Lars Løvlie^{*50} **cheats** when he **says Kant says ‘freedom’** is a gift from birth. It is ‘the **ability to be cultivated into** freedom’ that Kant says is a gift from birth. Løvlie has **cheated** and he is constantly **cheating**, by having students of pedagogy be formed by his manipulation of that quote. He cheats every time a student of pedagogy reads what he says about this and believes Lars Løvlie to be telling the truth about what Immanuel Kant wrote or meant.

Kant says the child and youth must be **restrained**, throughout, taught to **get used to** the restraint early on and **remain restrained until** proving the right use of freedom, free usage of one’s will, the presence of ‘free will’ in the functioning of one’s reason; which is proved by using reason (*Norw. fornuften*), reasonable thinking, in the presence rather than the absence of the pedagogue. This is the precise OPPOSITE of **Løvlie & company’s** practical pedagogy of ‘**leaving them undisturbed**’, and leaving teacher-candidates **alone in team-work**, and **expelling dissidents**; allowing and even **encouraging mobbing** of dissidents and the **labeling of dissidents** as ‘working against the team’.

This is the ‘Acquired Blindness to Mobbing’ - what I would call **ABM** if I didn’t think it would look as if I am making fun of the silly uses of acronyms in **Ed-Sci** to make things look complicated and make the ones who don’t know the spoken acronym look acutely stupid, which is instead precisely what the acronymically eloquent fools are themselves. There is a core compound quality about acts of structuring the learning environment so that it **enables mobbing in a team of teacher-candidates**, a distinct form of ignorance that is ‘**void of good intentions and full of self-preservation**’ - the Bible calls it by the word “**evil**”, but having fallen out of fashion lately, the outdated terminology of “good” and “evil” has dragged the concept of that very real ‘void-and-fulness’ with it into vulgarized oblivion.

So forget about finding out that ‘**good and evil**’ have no meaning in science or in modern academia, and hear me say this: that this particular referent, ‘void of good intentions and fullness of selfpreservation’, is a good enough definition of the referent of “**evil**” to me, and makes it **a useful label**. I’d stick it on the appearances of **Lars Løvlie’s** stealthy **co-translator-work** and his **pseudo Kant-mediator-to-Ed-Sci function** and not bother about what **Lars Løvlie** might be like in private, and not be blinded by his agreement-conditioned preacher-like sweet

smile either. I'd recommend anyone to follow suit. The facts prove him a liar and a fraud in office.

*⁵⁰ lecturer in UiO's "institute for Pedagogy", IPED

4.

UiA Lecturer **Tor Tanggaard's spoken** (in his lecture)

"Everyone must contribute in the team-work. **The one who doesn't contribute is to be weeded out.**"

("Alle må bidra i gruppearbeidet. Den som ikke bidrar gjelder det å luke ut")

- and his answer to the **spoken** question

"But who gets to be God? **Who decides who it is** that isn't contributing?"

("Men hvem skal være Gud? Hvem bestemmer hvem det er som ikke bidrar?")

coming from myself in the back row of the lecture-hall, **Tor Tanggaard** the lecturer of pedagogy, instantly and confidently, with a strong voice:

"The team !"

("Gruppen !");

- "calling me in", into chambers, a few weeks before that, with a female lecturer to back him up (if they need to lie about it) **telling me** that since I have English Master's degree, I am supposedly "**over-qualified** for the course", so **would I "consider giving my study-seat** to someone else on a waiting-list for that course?",

- Tor Tanggaard then **warning me "It's all about playing one's cards right in the team."** ("Det gjelder å spille kortene sine riktig i gruppe-arbeidet")

The quotes are from Sep.2008 - Jan.2009, uttered in my presence, by the self-esteem-wise eminent Mr. **Tor Tanggaard**. And one may wonder for the rest of one's life what might drive any mind to the base conceptual level proven by those words, not to mention his simultaneous (proving he can in fact walk and talk at the same time):

- **spacing** in front of the more than 60 teacher-candidates,
- **bending** over,
- **reaching** to the floor,
- doing a **gripping** motion with his right hand,

and on the **sputtering** forth of his "**weeded out**":

- **tossing** the imagined team-tagged as 'non-contributor' teacher-candidate up in the air and off to the right side of the field he simulates the 'plucking away of non-contributing growth' from;

or one may simply shrug it off as fruits proportionate to their source.

It is an **unlawful threat** that Norwegians have grown numb to and have internalized as a normal thing. But I think **Tor Tanggaard** and all **adult school-bullies** like him ought to be charged in court and put in prison for this sort of abuse and corruption, grave **mis-usage of public office**. Shall we say about 3

months or so in prison would be a reasonably lenient sentence, to set an example ?



(<https://www.facebook.com/tor.tanggaard>)
(cf.p 281-284 above)

The foolishness proven by the lecturer and his friends can hardly be remedied, but it can be harnessed, by a **Parliament** that begins to see that these lecturers - measured by the standard set by the concepts we find in Immanuel Kant's *On Pedagogy* (1803) - **have not yet been 'properly formed', that much philosophical culturing of their minds and methods remains, and that they do not yet possess the capacity for freedom from interference. As of yet, they do not even signal the presence of the capacity to learn how to be free. They need to be restrained until they one day prove they have learned how to think, become able to use their judgment freely; have become 'science' and stopped being faith while occupying space in offices that belong to science.** There is a serious truth in all of these mildly (sort of) humoristic applications of Immanuel Kant's well put phrases, phrases that all **unruly** adult but **youthfully aggressive faith-based forgerers of Ed-Sci** would benefit greatly from being forced to learn and memorize, and why not imagine it done by the physical discipline that Kant rejected but which I recommend in special cases like Løvlie, Tanggaard, lecturer Øystein etc.?

Tor Tanggaard, Dr. Øystein and the entire dual string of institutes in our faculties of Ed-Sci have pretended to have the capacity to use sound judgment in matters of theory and practical pedagogy for the last 50 years, have treated **the parliament** as fools, have **cheated with quotes, lied in harmony** and caused unspeakable harm. I'd slam that useful **label** I mentioned 1 ½ page ago on this forehead as well.

How do we stop them? - remove them? By letting time pass, but that is only half of it. A new structure needs to be set up, so that, while this pathological generation of the 'field' or 'branch' in question passes into nothingness, a **new and different** can simultaneously grow up next to but **shielded** from the rotten stalk, **unpolluted** by it. The first step is for our reason (*Norw. fornuften*) to form a compound insight, perform a fusing of known parts of the pathology into an immediately integral (*Norw. helhetlig*) entity, and deal with its structure. We must begin before we see 'the whole pathology', because we never will see 'the whole'. All we can do is begin with the structural parts we know, for example:

**The Lars Løvlie and Tor Tanggaard - type syndromes;
one and the same pathology.**

I think it takes a distinct lack of the ethical dimension of one's intelligence to be as stubborn about homebrewed ideas backed by forged quotes as these two and all their friends have proven to be, and it is quite astonishing the way they all seem to agree until death they part, married to their scientific deceit. The mob of **political agenda** equipped academics united by **faith** are ready to lie and commit acts of **state custody fraud** to keep their positions; acts like appointing **Dr. Polit. Eyvind Elstad** to answer my report to the UiO institute (ILS) in August 2015 about the fraudulent **cognitive science** quotes they use in the lecture-halls of the UiO to back a model of learning that stems from medieval times. **Eyvind Elstad the Dr. Polit.** is not qualified to answer that letter; and his rejection, in writing, of the matter of those quotes by concluding that they are "**not important**" amounts to **administrational fraud** and **misrepresentation of one's own academic qualifications**, which is a serious matter. The quotes forged in that case are the Piaget 1967-quotes. This is truly a dynasty-like corrupt mob that needs to be dealt with politically.

What we have before us is a **dual violation of public trust**: the theoretical forgeries and the enabling of in-team abuses, a dual dimension series of **misusage of public office**, and it is going on all over Norway; I am guessing in Denmark and Sweden too (and maybe in Island and Finland). The role-model university in Norway, the UiO, with its three 'Institutes' of Ed-Sci, is a major proponent of that practice. But they all do it, all teacher-educating institutions in Norway.

Few lecturers profess it as explicitly as Tor Tanggaard did in 2008/9. If they don't make it explicit, you still see it in their acts of **evicting victims of team-mobbing in teacher-education**; and we see it in the way **dissenters** become targets of this **during the mandatory 'team-work'**. Lecturers even signal to the teams of teacher-candidates who it is that need to be "weeded out" from among them, **weeded out by classmates, in teacher-education of all places**. You also see it in the incredible rationale they utter or write to defend it.

My Sony-cam has proved that UiO's lecturers and so-called 'administrators' in the institutes allow the **exclusion of mob-targets** and point out to the class who it is that is to be "**weeded out**" by "**the team**" or "**the whole class**", and encourage it; use it as a **weapon against dissenters**, especially the kind of dissenter who brings **unwanted evidence**. I have proved what we have all known for decades, but have called NORMAL. It is NOT 'normal' in the sense of 'acceptable normality' and it shows in **Lars Løvlie having to lie** WHEN HE REFERS TO Kant's *On Pedagogy*. Lars Løvlie **WANTS to use Immanuel Kant** but has to **FORGE the quote-references** to Kant to make things LOOK as if they go Løvlie's way. They do not.

Lars Løvlie's photographed smile invites us to think well of him, but one is always aware of the readiness to display the opposite when confronted with a forgery. One knows it well, the way the face twists into the pending rage that inevitably ignites, and one decides to keep quiet, and keep one's job. That is how their forgeries survive, corrupting an entire industry.

Lars Løvlie

English

Professor Emeritus



| | |
|--------------|--|
| E-post | lars.lovlie@iped.uio.no |
| Mobiltelefon | +47-40248461 |
| Treffetider | Etter avtale |
| Brukernavn | Logg inn |

Akademiske interesser

- Lars Løvlies arbeider har forholdt seg til noen sentrale begreper og problemer i pedagogikken og i pedagogisk tenkning. Det historiske stoffet er oftest uttrykkelig koblet til våre dagers problemere, oppfatninger og temaer. De er ofte utarbeidet med referanse til navngitte filosofer, som for eksempel Hegel, Kant, eller Dewey. Løvlie har tatt opp emner som den estetiske erfaring, eksemplets makt og bildets kraft, om det postmoderne selv i internettalderen, og om det pedagogiske paradoks; dessuten artikler om norsk utdanningspolitikk i forhold til læreplaner for grunnskole og lærerutdanning.

<http://www.uv.uio.no/iped/personer/vit/larsl/index.html>

Obvious coersion of the 'translator'

Lars Løvlie has obviously coerced the translator, Jim Jakobsson, to 'translate' the mentioned passage in Kant's *On Pedagogy* so that the example Kant gives in that passage matches what Løvlie says in the 'Postscript' to it and elsewhere that Kant says - which is that the allegedly 'restraint-free' "freedom" among modern youth is somehow defended by Kant. It isn't ! And how do we know Løvlie coerced Jakobsson in that particular segment? Because the evidence proves the segment is forged, and because it takes a motive to commit that forgery. Jakobsson would hardly have that motive on his own. It must stem from Lars Løvlie's implicit or explicit 'interaction'.

The 'Postscript' is a piece where Løvlie says we cannot understand Kant's *On Pedagogy* unless we understand other books Kant wrote. That is not true. *On Pedagogy* stands alone, but all the wisdom that Kant put into the other books, naturally, spills over and into this one, his last; leaks into it.

Students of pedagogy who see Løvlie saying we cannot understand *On Pedagogy* unless we study other books of Kant's are effectively told to take Løvlie's word for it when he tells them what Kant says about unrestrained youth using their god-given freedom, a freedom that is in fact stolen and often used to bully and commit acts of mobbing - which then would be something of

a 'colateral damage', supposedly, of a healthy pedagogic philosophy. That whole **quackery** is what Scandinavian (maybe even Nordic as a whole) students of pedagogy devour each semester.

But the worst part of this is that **Lars Løvlie** has talked the translator, **Jim Jakobsson**, into **FIXING the example** Kant gives on how to **react to bullying**, fix it **so it fits Løvlie's educational politics**.

And Jim Jakobsson does it. He does it by taking away Kant's reference to an intervention that **physical-force-wise** is equal to the partly **physical assault** in the example, the "striking with the hand" or "punching" that a child does against another.

Kant's '**verbal and physical intervention**' **translated** into '**verbal only**':

In that 'how to properly understand Kant's *On Pedagogy* crash course' he called Postscript and inserted in the back of Jim Jakobsson's Swedish translation of *On Pedagogy*, we have **Lars Løvlie's guide** to the immediately preceding Swedish version of §95 by the 'translator' Jim Jakobsson, obviously inspected and 'edited/approved' by Lars Løvlie. This segment (§95) - in which Kant deals with the child's **duties towards itself and towards others**, and "the **dignity** of mankind" - is discussed by Lars Løvlie on the tenth page of the "Postscript" he added (page 78 of the book), where the example is introduced by Løvlie with the words "**Let us look at Kant's example:**" and it is quoted by Løvlie as follows:

" "Om **ett** barn till exempel träffar ett annat, fattigare barn **och stolt knuffar undan detta, slår det osv.**, så får man inte säga till barnet: Gör inte så, det gör ont på den andre; Visa medlidande! Det är ju ett fattigt barn, osv.; utan man **bör själv bemöta barnet stolt och strängt**, eftersom dess uppträdande stred mot mänsklighetens rätt." (s. 57)"

- and this Swedish version means:

" "If a child, for example meets another, poorer child **and proudly pushes this child away, hits it etc.**, then one must not say to the child: 'Don't do that, it hurts the other; Show compassion! It is a poor child', etc.; but, rather, one **ought to oneself meet** the child **proudly** and **strictly**, since its conduct contradicted the right of humanity." (p.57)"

- where "merely" is obviously implicit, making it '...then one must not {merely} say...'

The only problem here is the last part of it, the words in red, but a small problem it is not, for Kant's example is, from the beginning of the paragraph:

"Die Pflichten gegen andere. Die Ehrsurcht und Achtung für das Recht der Menschen muß dem Kinde schon sehr frühe beigebracht werden, und man muß sehr darauf sehen, daß es dieselben in Ausübung bringe; z.B. wenn ein Kind einem andern ärmeren Kinde begegnet, und es dieses **stolz aus dem Wege oder von sich stößet**, ihm **einen Schlag giebt** u.z.w., so muß man nicht sagen: thue das nicht, es thut dem Andern mehe; sei doch mitleidig! Es ist ja ein armes Kind u.z.w., sondern man **muß ihm selbst wieder eben so stolz** und **fühlbar begegnen**, weil sein Benehmen dem Rechte der Menschheit zuwider war."

- which I think says, from the beginning:

"The duties towards others: The reverence and respect for the right of humans are matters that must be brought to the children very early, and one must thoroughly see to it that the children themselves bring it into practice; e.g. if a child meets another, but poorer, child, and he **proudly pushes the other [it] out of the way or from himself, gives it a punch** [/strike with the fist] and so on, then one must not {merely} say: Don't do that, it hurts the other; be compassionate! It is a poor child a.s.o., but, rather, one must **see to it that he is himself***⁵¹ treated just **as proudly** and {just as} **physically felt** [/as tangibly], because his conduct was against the rights of humankind."

- *⁵¹ where I indicate I think the reflexivity of “selbst” is not at all as translated by Jim Jakobsson (Løvlie looking over the shoulder), but quite another; where I see “ihm selbst” as an obvious compound pronoun in **Dative**, an indirect Object; one I recognize from my own native language, Norwegian, in the same Dative sense: “ham selv” as in “mot ham selv” (“himself” as in “against/at himself”), where the “against/“at” is **grammatically explicit sense** in German, sense we need to make **lexically** explicit in English, Swedish and Norwegian, which means we must construe a syntax that allows it when we translate. The Accusative case of it is “sich selbst” (‘oneself’ as direct Object, as in ‘sustain oneself’ - Norw. “klare seg selv”), where there is no difference in the degree of lexical explicitness in German, English and Scandinavian. But in Dative there is.

So I think “see to it that he is” or “cause ... to” or “make it so that” is obvious **grammatically explicit** sense, Dative case sense. In English, Swedish and Norwegian that sense can often only be made **lexically** explicit, and in such instances it needs to be construed with lexis, words, and the corresponding syntax that fits the use of those words; or else part of the sense that is **grammatically explicit in German** is lost and confusion arises, sometimes even, as here, leading to what I think - if I may put it this way - is an objectively wrong Swedish translation, verifiably and positively wrong about the **indirect Object** semantic function assigned to “oneself”, making it “himself” and “at himself”, not “oneself” as Subject in the sentence, the absurd way Jim Jakobsson has put it, obviously to satisfy Lars Løvlie and his positively radiant facially expressed mood. Why else? **That is how the consensus-mobsters get their will.**

It is a **physical** sensation Kant here refers to with the word “*fühlbar*”, quite obviously so, because the two halves of his phrase “*stolz und fühlbar*” refer back to and communicate logically with the corresponding halves in “*stolz aus dem Wege oder von sich stößet, ihm einen Schlag giebt, u.z.w.*” - respectively so. I colour-coded the obvious logical-poetic correspondences, where the **blue** leads to the **blue** and the **red** to the **red**. This is how Kant writes, it is the Kantian style I call ‘**poetic logic**’.

It is the answer to why key words in Kant’s sentences must be translated by preserving the words’ **semantic function** as metaphoric ‘**Vehicles**’, rather than ‘translating’ them into functional ‘**Tenors**’, and I suppose one needs a background in grammatic linguistics to immediately understand what the words ‘vehicle’ and ‘tenor’ mean in this particular context. In short, Kant’s metaphors, even the most everyday-sounding of metaphoric expressions, are **building-blocks** in his **conceptual composites**; and when we simply maintain the metaphoric functions of ‘**Vehicle**’, throughout, we see the conceptual structures form right before our eyes, as necessarily true **metaphorically depicted idea-structures**, described with everyday German metaphors.

And that is when we see that Kant for the most part describes the obvious, and that what he says for the most part is obviously true. It is when we maintain the functions of **metaphoric ‘Vehicle’** throughout all key ‘**logically-poetic**’ **verse-type** clauses that the so-called ‘Principle of Charity’ leads the reader to disambiguate all into the range of the **necessarily true**, not at all because they are vague or diluted in the course of a particular way of interpreting Kant, but because they are **accurate**. Wrong translations destroy that accuracy.

Readers and ‘translators’ blind to this distinctly Kantian writing style do not understand Kant’s work, nor its content, not fully and in some places not at all. It is a color-blindness or tone-deafness type state that can be educated away, but one that certainly does make Kant look ‘**cryptic**’ to translators inflicted with a measure of this type of **pattern-blindness**, when they try to ‘translate’ Kant. They cannot, not without creating chaos and what is widely described as a **mysterious***⁵² or **dreamlike**, even **self-contradicting** and **cryptic**, philosophy,

when it is actually the opposite of that. Yet, huge public funds have been paid to such 'translators', and their work is booked on course-curricula for decades into the future. It is a pity.

*⁵² Such 'translators' follow consensus-enforced pseudo-dictionary type rules-for-translating imposed by the brother- and sisterhood of consensus who rule the corridors, **engraved templates** by which they **make OLD translations LOOK NEW**; using the old **translation** as foundation rather than using the original, unpolluted by earlier translation-work. Through that **tax-funded** stage-play, in the corridors of the Georg Morgenstierne's Building on UiO **Campus Blindern** and elsewhere, they recycle 100 or **200-years-old** Norwegian lecture-notes that have Kant's "**Anschauung**" switched with an old Norwegian **derelict** word, abandoned and forsaken by the culture now expected to read the translation and understand it - and they choose that old word only because it is the ancient Norwegian form of the loan "**Anschauung**", the Norwegian form made from the German the first time somebody translated "**Anschauung**" into Norwegian.

The no longer intact German loan is written "**anskuelse**", and was in normal use, I suppose, when Norwegian lecturers first taught Immanuel Kant's **Kritik der reinen Vernunft** (*Critique of pure reason*), I suppose soon after 1813, in "**King Frederik's University**", before it was named "**the University in Oslo**" (*Universitetet i Oslo, UiO*).

Through the sum of its uses in the Scandinavian host language the last 100 years or more, the loan "**anskuelse**" has taken on a meaning that is now almost exclusively restricted to the purely **abstract** metaphoric sense that all words synonymous to "**Anschauung**" still have if used in such a context, '**thoughtful consideration**', with a transitive preposition ('of' or 'upon') added ('**thoughtful consideration of**'), the very same abstract sense that can be given to the English word "**observation**" if used in those contexts, indicating an 'observation of qualities that require the use of reason and sense of judgment', just like with the Norwegian form of that direct Latin loan (*observatio*), "**observasjon**".

So Kant's "**Anschauung**" had the **full dual-phora sense** in use, the same dual-phora that the **Latin "observatio"** loan forms "**observation**" and "**observasjon**" still have in English and Scandinavian, but which the **German loan "anskuelse"** does not have any more in Norwegian. So why would anyone in their right mind translate a word that has both levels of abstraction within reach in the source culture into a word that only has the more abstract half in the host culture? Is brain-capacity that impeded in consensus-defined cultures? I'm afraid so.

The specific question here is why would Norwegian translators of this particular book, or this particular author, think they must choose

a **German loan**
to translate this particular
German word - the word "**Anschauung**" ?

The obvious attraction to the appearance of a perfect philosophical fit between the German source "**Anschauung**" and the partly abandoned German loan "**anskuelse**" - surprisingly even in quite recent (2005) **UiO-produced, tax-financed**, translations - is, in one sense, accidental. That is, it probably is the etymological relation that has attracted Norwegian translators. But other cultures are messing up too, and not with a German loan, so there is **another underlying cause** at work, a shared phenomenon.

In English translations (Cambridge 1998-2009 etc.) they have made "**Anschauung**" into "**intuition**" - which in everyday modern English refers to something of a '**neurological hint**' from one's own subconscious, a sudden onset of 'knowledge based on **insight or spiritual perception** rather than reasoning' (Scribner-Bantam).

So, what is the common semantic factor in '**intuition**' and '**anskuelse**'; that is,

in 'sudden onset of insight or spiritual knowledge' and 'thoughtful consideration of something' ? It is 'thought', or 'mental process'.

And why is that

SUPERPROBLEMATIC ?

- a shot in the foot ?

Because 'thought' and 'observation' in Kant's model of human awareness are the minimally specific paraphrases of the two 'ground sources of human awareness', the two necessary and always active functional components from which knowledge ["*Erkenntnis*"] in the sense of 'awareness' "springs forth" (1781:50-52). In Jean Piaget's work (1967) they are the minimally specific necessary opposition in all organisms, the 'necessary conditions of' - in the sense of 'requirements for' - 'organic self-regulation'. They are the "two opposing poles" that Jean Piaget tagged with the biological labels he knew from his early work as a biologist and hypothesized fit on human cognition as well as on the evolution of the species: cognitive "*Assimilation*" and "*Accommodation*" (cf. *The Kant-Piaget-connection nobody wants to talk about*, Soerfjord 2015/2016).

Kant says the mind does two things simultaneously: it "*observes*", as in "*catching what is set forth*" ("*Vorstellungen zu empfangen*"), and uses its concepts to "think" the object "relative to that which is set forth". Only together, and only when together, do they cause "awareness" to continuously spring forth.

So, by translating one of Kant's TWO MAIN metaphoric 'Vehicles', the first in the "*Anschauung*" and "*Begriffe*" pair, into a synonym for the other, one of the pieces in the puzzle is put in the wrong place, on top of another piece.

We cannot translate "*Anschauung*" into '(sudden onset of) insight or spiritual knowledge' ("*intuition*"), nor into 'thoughtful consideration (of)' ("*anskuelse*"), nor any other word that primarily refers to 'thought', when Kant, as he does, uses "*Begriffe*" (concepts) to refer to 'what enables us to 'think' the object relative to what is "given" by "*observation*".

Kant says objects are "given" by "*observation*", and through the "concepts" they are "*thought*" (1781:50-52, 1787:74-76), even if we also 'think forth' an object from memory, or 'think forth' a sudden insight or spiritual perception. The word "*Anschauung*" allows for abstract or 'introvert' observation too, which is 'thoughtful consideration of' or 'meditation upon'; but Kant begins in the end of *physical "observation"*, and says what is "*observed*" by sensitivity is "*thought*" by concepts. The "*observed*" is "*thought*" into "*awareness*" of the observed. It is the *active mind* that forms the outline of "*what shines forth*" [*Erscheinungen*] - appearances in the sense of *emitted signals with form* - Kant is talking about. It is his 'turning around' of the relation between observer and object - while referring to the way Copernicus reversed the concept of stars travelling across the sky to the earth rotating (1787:XVI) - we have before us. This is Kant's description in his "*aesthetics*", his chapter on 'the awareness of forms', which logically is half of the dual theme 'physical form' and 'conceptual form': "*aesthetics*" and "*logic*".

Kant's "*Anschauung*" is a *metaphoric 'Vehicle'* whose *function* as 'Vehicle' is not to be messed with. Even in cases where Kant's word for "*observation*" is meant in the abstract metaphoric sense, we still need to translate it to "*observation*" in English and "*observasjon*" in Norwegian. UiO's - Steinar Mathisen, Camilla Serck-Hanssen and Øystain Skar do not understand this, and neither do the British translators Paul Guyer and Allen Wood in USA, Cambridge University Press (in 15 printings from 1998 to 2009). Imagine the kind of money that keeps rolling into this machine, and imagine their unwillingness to break loose from their friends within the pack of that consensus-mob.

The word "*observation*" 'translated' into an obvious synonym of "thought" is only the beginning of the giant mess they have made out of that book, *imagining*, as it seems they do, that *what is done by all cannot possibly be stupid*. I beg to differ. Exhibit 1: 'The flat earth'.

Jokes aside, this is how a modern society collectively commits the same idiotic error in a variety of ways, all producing the **mysterious** or **cryptic translated Kant** we see being taught in universities, enforced by a collective consensus that is **dead wrong**, voting into existence **a philosophy that Kant never wrote**.

The way to address it is by strategic coordination, a massive attack on the stupidity of **encouraging 'consensus'**, agreement. And "agreement" is precisely what schools like **Flaatestad 7th to 10th grade school**, 20 km south of downtown Oslo (**witnessed by me personally**) **teach all children** they get their hands on; burn into the minds of **innocent children** who deserve far better. They impress it upon them consistently and methodically, even spelling out the phrase:

"reach agreement with learning-partner"
(Norw. "Bli enige med læringspartner")

- with thick marker on the white-board, for heaven's sake, as one among a handful of **'commandment'** type imperatives.

They teach it to all their pupils, completely **contrary to §1-1 of Norway's Law for teaching**. That particular school south of Oslo (**Flaatestad**) systematically teach in blatant **violation of the law for teaching**, while at the same time not seeing the physical bullying I spotted and addressed on the spot. And no one in the so-called **Ministry** of Education seems to care when I report these things.

Why doesn't the **Parliament** react ?

It seems to think their job is limited to the writing of **principles** and not having to bother with or say anything about **methods**, nor about the local offices and their practice of issuing **'local law'** that **Parliament never voted on**. I think this is the Parliament sneaking away from its DUTY. It makes it really easy for lecturers of the mistranslated Kant to sneak away from their duty to MARCH INTO the lecturing halls of **a gravely disturbed Ed-Sci** and call them what they are.

(cf. *A gravely disturbed Ed-Sci hiding behind lock and bolt*, Soerfjord, to be uploaded soon)

Mistranslated philosophy is **damage that lingers**, and keeps giving. It is damage that reverberates. Universities do not let themselves be corrected, do not easily self-correct, not voluntarily. Its academically weak lecturers hide behind socially dominant mobsters, and together they **resist self-adjusting** even to known evidence that offers better knowledge, even evidence shoved down their throats while holding a **Sony-cam to their heads** and saying 'hands up, assholes !'.

The mitigating circumstance for some of the individuals that hide in their shelter but feel bad for doing it, is that within reach of **the exclusion-alliances** that guard **the consensus-brothel**, one is forced to agree and keep silent. If one cannot keep silent - cannot prostitute oneself for the sake of mortgages and car loans - one must find another venue, go around them and speak from without these public offices meant for better causes than what they are currently being used for.

With regard to **Kant's bully**-example,

I am merely suggesting the obvious: that Kant actually wrote that if the child in your care **strikes** another child, you **must** immediately **intervene to end the abuse**, but how? - by immediately returning the application of **physical force** on the victim's behalf, apply physical force against the aggressive child in your custody, both the **proud behavior** and the **physical use of force - even so hard**;

as physically felt as the child aggressor in your care made it physically felt.

Kant tells us to not waste the occasion by impotent talking, but simply let the **physically aggressive** side of the child meet itself as well as the **socially proud** side of the child. Løvlie understands that it is the indirect results of the impotency of the 'talk only' approach that Kant says needs to be prevented; the wasting of the occasion to **culture** the aggressive child; and Kant says it is wasted by not letting the **violent** side of the child meet **its own violent experience**, as is the case when ONLY the **proud** side of the child aggressor, not also the **'physically felt'**^{*53}, is aimed back at himself. Kant is saying "moral" punishment isn't enough in this case. The *'look of contempt'* from the adult is not enough in the case of **violence**, not even words of 'reason'. Kant said it, right here in §95. Løvlie and Jakobsson evidently do not like that fact, and **falsified the evidence** just to have it their way on the surface, as they preach their view and call it 'Ed-Sci'. Parliament ought to move towards a dismissal of proven evidence-forgerers among consensus-operators, and retraction of their home-brew based literature, partly Dr. Polit.-products, and clean house.

^{*53} The *"föhlbar"*, by the way, obviously here refers to **'physically felt'**, inasmuch as the 'non-physically felt' falls in the **'proudly'**-half of the dual-category division of ways to react to the bullying in the example. Kant's main resources against peer-abuse, then, are a) **restraint**, which includes immediate and forceful proactive intervention, and b) well thought out measures of **forming** the youth; never the implied and exemplified Lars Løvlie version of letting youth-**groups** and student **teams 'regulate themselves'**, a regulation-process that unavoidably manifests itself as **social mobbers that 'regulate' the socially non-aggressive, mobbers who themselves evade the ones who could regulate them; mobbers** who work in **'teams'**, verbally and emotionally attacking a person's humanity in reply to a logically valid argument; **mobbing trumping reason**, which of course is what adult **social mobbers** want too. They consistently preach the structures that protect such **mob-behavior**, saturate Norwegian teacher education with that kind of thinking; and fool the entire Parliament into imagining that they, the politicians, can 'guide' teacher-education by a **'law for teaching'** and a **'national teaching plan'**, while censorship-operating ideology-wankers do what they want in the lecture hall all along. We now have one result of it captured by my Sony-cam in auditorium 1 of the Helga Eng's Building on the UiO Campus at Blindern, Oslo, on 11.Nov.2015. It isn't a pretty sight.

One of the 'helpers' of these abusers, attorney **Bjørn Engeset**, employed in the UiO **"Section for custodianship of research and education"** is now engaged in various **acts of intimidation** on behalf of the institute I am exposing (Institute for Teacher-education and School-research, **ILS**, at the Faculty of Ed-Sci, **uv-fak. at UiO**) -

Bjørn Engeset

Advokat - Seksjon for forvaltning av forskning og utdanning



E-post bjorn.engeset@admin.uio.no
Telefon +47-22845917
Rom 416
Brukernavn [Logg inn](#)

| Besøksadresse | Postadresse |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Problemveien 7 | Postboks 1072 Blindern |
| Lucy Smiths hus | 0316 OSLO |
| 4. etasje | |
| 0313 OSLO | |

<http://www.uio.no/personer/los/af/sffu/bjorneng/index.html>

Notice he doesn't want **his photo on the staff-list**. He is one of the **'special-task'-agents** (a bit of a **'wet'-agent**), one who **does 'things' for 'the Company'** that make him think it would be unwise to show his face.

- behaviors that include attempting to discredit me personally in the eyes of the **University of Hong Kong**; lately (just before Christmas) by contacting the HKU, presenting themselves as an 'investigative body' and pretending that various circumstances give the UiO reasons to **investigate the authenticity** of my PhD-Diploma, which UiO has an electronic copy of from the application I filed for the pedagogic courses I was registered in as part of my research in 2015, research where my method is what I call:

'embedded empiricism'

- precisely the method that uncovers the wrotten apples we see in the left margin of "*Scared Stiff - ..., a Documentary*", a method that reveals the entire apple-field now has rotted (**it's time to move in the tractors**).

Kant also says this, in §85:

"Punishment performed with the showing of **work**-marks [/signs] of wrath **work** in a counterproductive manner"

["Strafen, die mit dem **Werk**male des Zornes verrichtet werden, **wirken** falsch."]

I challenge the reader to see the **poetic logic**, here too, in Kant's writing style. Ludwig Wittgenstein obviously learned this from Kant's writing, and this is how the complete blindness to this, in the mind of the translator Denise Paul (together with G. E. Anscombe's blindness), in 1972 virtually destroyed, as I suggest it did, **Ludwig Wittgenstein's** *Über Gewissheit/On Certainty* for the thousands of readers who every year attempt to read that little book in English.

Poetic logic became Ludwig Wittgenstein's best tool, in my view, and without reproducing it in the language translated to, at least in part, I suggest his work had better been left not tampered with by any so-called 'translator'. The poetic logic needs to be re-construed in the new language wherever it is possible without sacrificing the accuracy of the philosophy; and, wherever this is not possible, the key words need to be consistently added in the original German form, either [bracketed] and inserted in the translated sentences (my preference), or footnoted. It would be better for Philosophy as a whole, I think, if all philosophy students had to learn German, than having lecturers a.k.a. translators control the world by their internally learned consensus-dictated limitations.

Lars Løvlie, in his 'Postscript' to Jim Jakobsson's Swedish translation of *On Pedagogy (Über Pädagogik)*, says Immanuel Kant '**contradicts himself**' in that book. That claim is **verifiably nonsense**. Lars Løvlie uses Kant to stress whatever he, Løvlie, wishes to stress, just like some religious preachers do with the Bible. He goes shopping for fragments that he applies on his rhetorical path towards his main goal: the stressing of the virtue he calls "**freedom**", the way he understands "freedom" to apply to children; and on the way he pauses by the notion "**dialogue**", as if to validate the way he, Løvlie, **freely imputes unsubstantiated sense** (and lack of it) to Kant's text within his about to be announced perspective, within which Løvlie's mind sees Kant to be self-contradicting; and from there Løvlie skips most essences of Kant's, obviously moving towards his own (Løvlie's) essences.

In the second paragraph of this "Post-script" of his, Løvlie passes the following judgment on Kant's book *On Pedagogy*, saying:

"The first thing that strikes us is that the pieces of advice given **are being contradicted** either immediately or later in the text, and that the text does not give clear answers but asks questions *which the reader must answer himself*. The reader, in other words, is invited to a dialog."

my transl. of Løvlie's:

“Det första som slår en er att de råd som ges **motsägs** omedelbart eller senare i texten, att den inte ger klara svar utan ställer frågor som läsaren själv måste besvara. Läsaren inviteras med andra ord till en dialog.”

From here Løvlie flies to the next thing that supposedly “strikes us”, which, he says, “is **how sensitive the text is** to the student's dignity and integrity. The reason for that” [“the connection”], he says, is the **role of the subject** [“the place of the subject”] “in Kant's philosophy, the status as **independent individual**” [“statusen som **självstendig** individ”] “with a responsibility for one's own and other's lives.”

The first thing that ought to strike the reader of Løvlie's ‘how to read Kant’-script is that Løvlie sees **no contradiction** between Kant's supposedly “**independent individual**” **in the world of “World-citizens”** [“Weltbürger”] on the one side and on the other the 4-6 student unit called “**the group**” in Norwegian teacher training and courses in Pedagogy having the right to **exclude** the “**independent individual**” from compulsory team-work, team-work **without which the course is not passed**, as in ‘is **FAILED**’, by that single “**individual**”, but **PASSED** by the **rest** of that “team”.

All team-members pass the course, except the individual being mobbed by discrimination and exclusion, who is then evicted for having ratted out (Norw. *sladret på*) the ‘team’ to the lecturer, who demands the ‘team’ to ‘self-regulate’ and deal with all in-team abuses internally.

(cf. the Tor Tangaard lecture-dialogue transcribed above)

That, I suggest, is the **contradiction** Løvlie ought to have seen decades ago, mentioned in his “Post-script”, written angry articles about, debated and protested **loudly and repeatedly** against, until that pathology was removed. Instead, it is very clear that it isn't only his **acquiescing** that has cemented the problem, perpetuated it, but his **actively contributing to it** as well.

Only ‘**embedded empiricism**’ reveals these violations of reason and law.

Løvlie calls his generalizations “essences”, but I see Løvlie's ‘essences’ more as premises of Kant's essences, some of the premises. One need not understand much else in order to understand the need to see oneself as a “**World-citizen**” [“**Weltbürger**”], in §113, only 4 sentences from the end of the book, **in a list** of what we are to **direct** [“hinweisen”] **the youth towards**, beginning with:

“**joyfulness** of the heart” [“Frölichkeit des Herzens”], “**good** mood” [“gute Laune”], “**evenness** of mood” [“Gleichheit der Laune”], moving on to “always **seeing many things as duty**” [“daß man vieles immer wie Pflicht ansieht”], “having **love** for others **merely for being humans**, and then also towards a **World-citizen-like** state of mind.” [“Menschenliebe gegen andere, und dann auch auf weltbürgerliche Gesinnungen”], which makes a textual tie back to §16: “The draft [“onset of”/disposition] for a plan of upbringing, however, must be made **cosmopolitan**.” [Die Anlage zu einem Erziehungsplane muß aber **kosmopolitisch** gemacht werden.”]

Based on the evidence, the observable facts of *Ueber Pädagogik*, I am saying it is the **HOW to strategize towards that composite goal, and WHY**, that constitute the “**essences**”, the “**message**” of the book, and we really need to understand the text in order to grasp those essences, a text that is all about using the “**Vernunft**”, one’s ‘**power of reason**’, in order to **culture** the “**Vernunft**”, the ‘**power of reason**’, within children and youth in the “**forming**” [“**Bildung**”] of temper [“**Gemüt**z”] and soul – where the words “**culturing** of the soul” [“**Kultur** der Seele”] and “**This physical forming of the spirit**” [“**Diese physische Bildung** des Geistes”] in §63 are ways Kant talks about **the coming into being of intellect** - quite beautiful ways, ways that ‘translators’ and **ideologically motivated ‘re-editors’**, evidently, tend to not grasp.

There is a huge menu of Kant-defined “**essences**” (super-ordinate themes that define **timeless concrete ways of reasonable strategizing** in pedagogy, declared by Kant to be his **essences**) BETWEEN the two simplistically extreme ends that Løvlie reduces Kant to – namely between **1:) what Løvlie refers to as “methods of upbringing”** [“**uppfostringsmetoder**”] (p. 72 in the Jakobsson/Løvlie re-edited version of Kant’s book), or “**a methodology suggesting how one ought to perform the upbringing in concrete contexts**” [“**en metodlära som föreslår hur man bör uppfostra i konkreta sammanhang**”], and **2:) Løvlie’s hyper-generalizations (redundantly general, thereby trivial)**, the things Løvlie calls “**the essential** in Kant’s text” [“**det väsentliga i Kant’s text**”] (i.e. in THIS text, *On Pedagogy*), “**this essence**” [“**denna essens**”] (p.69), that is: what Løvlie refers to as “**the message of the book**”.

Briefly put: there is a huge menu of **Kant-declared essences** on how to **strategize** in pedagogy, essences that are BETWEEN the 1) ‘**concrete methods of upbringing**’ and the 2) **hypergeneral** that Løvlie is ready to commit forgery for. **Why Løvlie does not see the Kant-declared essences on how to strategize in pedagogy** is anyone’s guess; but whatever the reason, it makes him a **hostile custodian** of Kant’s texts. **Students** of Ed-Sci ought to ignore Lars Løvlie and look directly at Kant’s work, not even pollute their minds by the awareness of what Løvlie or Løvlie’s brothers in arms think or say, just **go straight** to the English translation of *On Pedagogy*, and **compare it with the German original text**. That is my advice. But there is translation-produced ambiguity in the English translation too, from a **pattern-blind translator** translating Kant’s metaphoric ‘**Vehicles**’ into ‘**Tenors**’. So keep the German original and a good dictionary open.

Løvlie’s reduction towards the simplistic and trivial culminates in: “**To summarize the message of the book** as simply as possible, the goal of pedagogy is to raise the child **for life in society, for culture and for morality**.” [“**För att enklast möjligt sammanfatta bokens budskap, så är pedagogikens mål att fostra barnet till samhällsliv, kultur och moral**”]. And here we have a trace of Løvlie’s confusion, inasmuch as I only see Kant’s “**kultiviert**” and “**Kultur**” in *On Pedagogy* referring to ‘**culturing**’ of the body and “**soul**”/“**spirit**”/“**intellect**”. Not one place do I see Kant’s message or essence being the raising of children and youth to a life with ‘**culture**’ as in ‘**theaters**’ and ‘**concert halls**’ and such, the way it appears Løvlie has in mind in this “**Post-script**” to the Swedish ‘translation’ (p.72).

Quite on the contrary, Kant warns against excessively fine clothes and outwardly fine habits (not at all inconsistent with his background as a student of theology - so, again, a **self-contradicting** Kant is **NOT what the reader is offered in the book *On Pedagogy***). And if Løvlie says that what he meant is that Kant by “**Kultur**” meant something like a ‘**modern civilized state of being**’, Løvlie is equally wrong, because Kant, by “**Kultur**” is indeed referring to the ‘**culturing process**’, as he is with the word “**Bildung**” - the “**forming process**” being ‘**education**’ metaphor. It is to the process of developing the “**seeds**” [“**germs**”] he is referring, all of which are good (§16).

Løvlie, two pages later in that “Post-script”, reveals a more serious side of his confusion when he says that Rousseau assigned to the child “**authenticity**, an inner space of freedom for the moral or religious self”, and adds: “Kant assigned **autonomy**, or **authority**, to the child.” – and then says that “both” (both Rousseau and Kant) “believed in **the ability to decide-for-oneself**. **Freedom**, to Kant, is **to obey one’s reason** and let the moral duties place limits on one’s behavior. **This freedom must also be for** [this claim must also *be valid for*] **the child before it reaches** the age of **reasonability**, for it cannot be free as an adult if it has not already received this **freedom** as a gift **from birth**.”

As I have established above, Lars Løvlie does not understand that book, and he makes a mess out of it when he tries to teach its content. He basically uses it to preach his political views, which makes him corrupt - even before we begin talking about his forgery of the bullying-segment he quotes in that ‘Postscript’. To me, Lars Løvlie’s forgery is as serious as the foregry of the Piaget 1967-quotes.

In the neighbor building on the UiO campus, UiO’s translators of *Critique of Pure Reason* - Steinar Mathisen, Camilla Serck-Hanssen and Øystain Skar - are slightly confused themselves about Kants *Critique of Pure Reason* (*Kritik der reinen Vernunft*), a confusion that multiplies in the minds of everyone who reads their pseudo-translation of it, especially when they see their confusion validated by Camilla Serck-Hanssen, in her ‘Introduction’ to the translation, saying she finds Kant’s reasoning to be somewhat “cryptic”. **Cryptic** it will necessarily be when the entire lexical **translation-vocabulary** used by these alleged ‘translators’ paid by our taxes is the one pre-set by long dead Norwegian academic ancestors who **re-modeled a native Norwegian-language speaking and Norway-born immanuel Kant that never existed**. But that is a story to be told later.

The Løvlie-case, nonetheless, goes to show **we need to keep them out of**
an
‘officially legislated application
of philosophy in pedagogy’.

That task must remain the responsibility and mandate of an independent Faculty of **Philosophy**. So let’s get Philosophy out of the garden where it is being forced to ‘play nicely’ with the rest, and where ‘nicely’ means ‘shut up when they **distort** and usurp it; make it theirs by **raping** it, then marrying it’. **It is the duty of Philosophy, rather, to aim for what Pedagogy is trying to acquire**, and do what Pedagogy has been doing for some years now in all the other domains in universities everywhere (cf. *Seeking Campus-Universal Didactic Dominance*, ... Soerfjord 2016). But the Philosophy-offices do need to improve their thinking.

Then there is this, which is directly connected with the need for improved thinking and less focus on the expertise in **scriptless talk-fluency** and **preacher-style charisma**: It is an **incentive to dilute** scientific concentration, intensity, complexity and accuracy, and aids the **structurally cemented tyranny of the consensus-mob** that now has a universal hold on campuses in Norwegian (even Scandinavian or Nordic) universities, specifically:

1) The **incest-like hiring-and promotion practices – inbreeding of PhDs** who then stand in line for promotion to ‘Professor-title-carriership’, **as if they are not ‘professors’ the very moment they enter a classroom as PhDs to teach** - together with:

2) **the liaisons between socially dominant academic appropriators of idea-wise monopoly** and (equally self-appropriating of public funds) so-called **'administrators'**;

a liaisons that **trade exclusion-favors** that both of these corrupt groups benefit economically from, is a huge part of the problem.

The **Løvlie-as-Kant-interpreter** problem boils down to Lars Løvlie apparently being **a teacher-trainer** but certainly not being a philosopher-pedagogue: **not** a moderately competent student of philosophy and **not a bridge-maker** from philosophy to pedagogy, in spite of his sweet smile. That smile, I suspect, becomes something else the moment I begin speaking to him about **the real Piaget-quotes** or ask him why he **'fixed' the Kant-segment**. He is of course free to contact me and try to prove otherwise, or **simply read my evidence** and admit the facts and all their implications for teacher-training. I'm not holding my breath, as they say.

Dr. Kai Sørkjord
Oslo, Norway, 22.12.2016

Lars Løvlie's acts of cheating can be verified by visiting:

Løvlie, Lars (2005), article: "Ideology, Politics and the (National) Plan for Learning" (my translation from Norwegian), published in *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift (Norwegian Journal of Pedagogy)* (2005 - Nr 04).

Løvlie, Lars (2008): *The Pedagogical Paradox and its Relevance for Education. / Har det pædagogiske paradoks nogen betydning i uddannelse?*, chapter in Lars Emmerik Damgaard Knudsen; Mattias Andersson (red): *Skab dig! Pædagogisk filosofi ("Behave! Pedagogical Philosophy"*. København, Denmark: Forlaget Unge Pædagoger.

Løvlie Lars (2008) "Efterskrift av Lars Løvlie" ("Postscript by Lars Løvlie" – postscript to Kant's *On Pedagogy*), in **Jim Jakobsson's** translation of Kant's *Ueber Pädagogik* into the Swedish *Om Pedagogikk*, Göteborg, Sweden: Bokförlaget Daidalos AB, (2008).

acknowledgement:

This documentary* was written and edited between May and December 2016, under the influence of minds that continue to inspire me. I continually think back and acknowledge the academic and ethical integrity of men like **Sigmund Ro** (retired lecturer of English at UiA), **Jan B. Ørmen** (retired lecturer of logic at UiA), **Paul J. Thibault** (lecturer of communication and linguistics at UiA) - these are men I admire - and I could mention other academics of both English and Philosophy at the UiA and many academics of Educational Science at the Univ. of Hong Kong (HKU). They are all people I admire and who have been an inspiration for me - HKU's Dr. **Carol K. K. Chan**, Dr. **Jingyan Lu**, Dr. **Mark Bray** and lecturer **Tess Hogue** to mention just a few of them.

The Faculty of Education at HKU has a level of academic and ethical integrity I have not seen in the corresponding institutions within Norway. Who would have thought Hong Kong to be a role model for Norway to follow? - an example for Norway to one day try to emulate, if they can? In the areas of **team-work**, **collaborative learning** and **evaluation** the Faculty of Education of the Univ. of Hong Kong is far ahead. I recommend anyone interested in finding out how that is possible, to look into the structure of **evaluation of teacher-candidates** within Hong Kong.

* "Scared Stiff - church-authored pedagogic faith and faithful brutes for hire, a Documentary"

Dr. Kai Sørkjord
Oslo, Norway, 22.12.2016