Formation of the conscience: pedagogic acting or bargaining?

Author

Dr. Leo W.J.M. van der Tuin (1946), assistant professor of Practical Theology and Pedagogic of Religion, Theological Faculty, Tilburg University, The Netherlands.
He may be contacted at Tilburg University, Theological Faculty, PO Box 9130, 5000 HC Tilburg, The Netherlands, email: lvdtuin@uvt.nl

Introduction

It all started with Adam and Eve, or rather with Eve, with the eating of the fruit from the tree that had been placed in the centre of the garden of Eden: the knowledge of good and evil. Man became an ethical being, with a conscience. This was, after all, formed by that knowledge. This is also when history began. Man became a historic being. History starts with the knowledge of good and evil. This is also where religion begins, because religion promises release from evil: salvation, victory, purification, becoming whole.
In the garden of Eden there was no (knowledge of) good and evil, no history. After all, history is going from evil to good, the realisation that it can and has to be done better. Man must work to satisfy his hunger, not only his hunger for food, but especially for triumph over his not knowing, his not knowing how to use his own potentialities. Slowly but surely, his conscience with regard to this is also formed. He begins to become aware of what he is able to do, and what he is not (yet) able to do (Kerkhofs 2002).
Ignorance, not making use of one's own talents and potential are an evil. The seven cardinal sins cover all human actions. But what is evil?

This is where my contribution begins. In our (post-) modern era, too, the question as to what evil is arises. And I ask this question as though I am not aware of what evil is. We know and at the same time do not know what evil is. Otherwise history would not be so full of evil. Otherwise people would not harm one another so much. Or is this assumption already wrong? That people do not want to harm one another? That I do not wish to do to another that which I do not wish to do to myself? Reality proves otherwise.

This contribution is to be about the conscience and the formation of the conscience, and therefore, about evil and good. Its is an extremely broad subject. I shall restrict myself.
First I enter briefly into evil and the development of the conscience in a historic perspective, as was customary in the Netherlands during the period of the rich Roman Catholic Life (Van De Plas 1969).
Then I will focus on the perception of what evil is in our time. Sin and sense of guilt have, in the course of time, undergone great changes under the influence of secularisation and individualisation.
Next I apply the issue of evil and the formation of the conscience to the world of adolescents. I take a glance at their world, which takes place on the Internet and TV. The world of chatting on the Net and video clips on the music channels MTV and TMF.
Finally, this leads me to the question as to what the formation of the conscience means nowadays. The formation of the conscience is an important aspect of the upbringing. And this can be done in various ways: in the way of passing on cultural achievements, in the way of allowing what is present in the educandus to develop, in the way of the communicative exchange of ideas and in the way of active presence close to the educandus.
But first a brief outline of the situation as it is in the Netherlands at present.

The Netherlands tolerant?

The Netherlands likes to promote the fact that it is an extremely tolerant country, and extremely progressive, too. It has felt itself to be a leading country with regard to all sorts of ethical,

economic, social and political issues. It was one of the first countries to protest against apartheid, against the war in Vietnam, against nuclear weapons, against pollution of the environment etc. (Kennedy 1995; 2005; Blom 1999).

It is interesting to know, for this contribution, that as far as ethical issues are concerned, the Netherlands has an extremely liberal legislation. Abortion, euthanasia, aiding in suicide, are no longer automatically penal offences or are even legal. Abortus provocatus is a legitimate way of birth control, euthanasia is permitted as an escape from unbearable and incurable suffering (Kennedy 2002), aiding in suicide is aimed at ending a hopeless existence. Of course, all of this takes place on extremely strict conditions, with various experts involved. In the area of drugs, there is a policy of acceptance: the sale of soft drugs is permitted in so-called coffee shops, on certain conditions. Soft drugs are used as medication in some cases. Hard drugs are, however, not permitted under any circumstances, although they are employed to regulate use amongst the heavily addicted, thus preventing them from turning to crime. Foreigners have always been welcome and accepted through the centuries. Prostitution has been legalised and is sometimes regulated by the government in order to avoid trouble. The homosexual marriage has been legalised. There is also great religious diversity and tolerance. Secularisation has penetrated deeply into society (Becker 1997). At the same time, the Netherlands has the highest density of religious groups. And those who are members of such groups are intensively involved (Janssen 1998). More about this below.

There is also a different side to tolerance: to tolerate (Grenzen aan gedogen transl. Verging on toleration 1996). The policy on drugs is an example of this. Production of drugs is prohibited, but you can buy it legally in the coffeeshops. In the social sphere, we also tolerate a lot from one another. Thus tolerance is interpreted as: legally it is prohibited, morally it is reprehensible, but a strict enforcement of the ban causes more problems than turning a blind eye. This policy of toleration has got out of hand. It brings with it inequality of justice and legal insecurity, as a result of which there is a corruption of norms and values.

"*I say what I think and I do what I say*", was an expression used by Mr Pim Fortuyn[1] that led to relations becoming harsher. No one minced matters anymore. Politics hardened. Political statements that used to be considered as discrimination were adopted by the established parties. Violence in schools increased, or became more obvious.

Since the murder of the right wing populist politician Fortuyn in 2002, this image seems to be changing drastically in a number of ways. This has been even more strongly emphasised by the murder of the filmmaker Theo van Gogh in 2004. The right wing government started a counteroffensive. A discussion on norms and values arose, on a European level, too.

The policy of tolerance is being altered to zero tolerance; entertainment districts are monitored by cameras; asylum seekers who have exhausted all court proceedings for a residence permit are deported via so-called deportation centres; crime is more severely punished and there is an increase in the number of lifelong prison sentences; so-called coffee shops are curbed; imams and certain mosques are closely monitored for statements contradicting Dutch norms and values, or that form a terror threat. The fight against terrorism seems to be a cover-up for the fight against foreigners, especially those with an Islamic background. Fear for terrorism seems in this case to have become fear for foreigners. It is in this context of, on the one hand a hardening in the way we treat each other, a hardening of the standpoints in politics and the call for reflection on norms and values, against the background of the historic image of 'The Netherlands A Tolerant Country', that the rest of this contribution should be read. After all, it is under these circumstances that the conscience of adolescents is formed now. They see and hear and experience what tolerance and toleration is. They learn to be tolerant, but also to demand tolerance, they learn to tolerate, but also to be tolerated.

Denominational society

---

[1] Pim Fortuyn was a right wing populist politician who was murdered just before the parliamentary elections in May 2002. He had many supporters amongst both right and left-winged voters, from all sections of the population.

The Netherlands is known as the most secularised[2] country in Europe (Halman 2005; Greeley 1995; Janssen 1999). This has not always been the case. Up till the sixties of the last century, the Netherlands was a denominational society (Post 1989; Thurlings 1978). The large ideological movements in the country each formed a world of their own. There are three large socio-political groups: the Roman Catholic, the Protestant and the socialist. One's whole existence is allowed to be guided by the individual principles, faith and ideology within the socio-political group. All social and cultural life is centred on this. The Catholics live in the South of the Netherlands especially, the Protestants in the middle and North and the socialists in the big cities in the West. Holland, as the part of the Netherlands above the big rivers the Rhine and the Meuse is called, is of old a Protestant nation, since the iconoclastic fury in 1566, when many Catholic church treasures were taken by the Protestants and icons in the churches were destroyed. At that time it was only possible for Catholics to practice their faith in secret. It was not until 1850 that the Episcopal hierarchy in the Netherlands was restored and Catholics began their fight for emancipation. They were given back their own churches and also built many new ones. They established schools, built their own hospitals, had their own newspapers and later their own radio and television broadcasting corporations and of course, their own political parties, which gained more and more power. In the Netherlands, the confessional parties have almost always participated in governments. The most significant struggle was the school funding controversy that was not settled until 1917, through the complete emancipation (pacification) of confessional (Catholic and Protestant) and public education that was equally financed by the government. This system is still in existence. Approximately 60% of schools are confessional, in the meantime expanded with Jewish and Islamic schools (Dijkstra & Dronkers 1997).

The religious education of children was at that time the task of the primary school. The school was often connected to the local parish church and so the chaplain or priest gave confirmation lessons at school. The chaplain was often also the moderator of the local football club and scouts and band and rifle club. There was a high level of social control within this denominational community and the power of the church was clearly visible. The parish priest saw to it that many children were present and also recruited candidates for priesthood from these families. The seminaries were full. There was even a surplus of priests, who then also travelled the world as missionaries. On the one hand, life was simple because it was clearly structured and organised, and on the other, it was also extremely confining due to the lack of freedom it offered.

During the sixties the first cracks in the socio-political groups became obvious (Thurlings 1978). Increasing prosperity following the period of recovery from damage caused by war and the authoritarian structures and increasing materialism of society evoked protest amongst the post-war generation (the so-called baby-boomers) growing up. They had a nice life, were given a good education and became more and more aware of new developments in science and technology. The church and religion were no longer necessary for a life of freedom and happiness. Socialism proved that these institutions were sooner an impediment to development. In this way the socio-political groups were gradually broken open from the inside and out. Initially, the Second Vatican Council brought freedom and openness, but at the same time it revealed just how oppressive the structures of the church had been. And when the aggiornamento in the Netherlands did not happen fast enough and was again hindered by Roman authority, many left the church, disillusioned. To start with they sought an alternative in leftist socialism, later, when it turned out that this was also not able to offer what they had hoped for, they became lost and philosophically individualised.

The church was no longer needed to clarify and solve social issues (salience), it was also no longer needed to experience meaning and be happy (meaning), and finally it also no longer provided a social safety net (belonging)[3].

---

[2] The term secularisation is used here to indicate that the institutionalised form of faith and religion (the church) is disappearing. This does not yet mean that religion and faith disappear as a form of giving meaning. With the term post-modernism is meant the new form in which religiosity occurs in society (Van Harskamp 2000; Swatos 2000; Davie 2000; 2002).

[3] The terms meaning, belonging and salience have been taken from Geerts (1975; see also Van Der Tuin 1999). They stand for a functional approach to religion. Meaning means that religion provides an interpretation for the ultimate questions of man as to meaning, suffering and evil (cfr. Tillich: ultimate concern); belonging means that the church provides a religious, legitimate social relation; salience means that the church is significant for social issues.

Things have moved fast in the past half-century. Figures are proof of this. In 1958, 24% of the population stated that they did not count themselves as belonging to a church or religious community. In 1999 this had increased to 63%. Of the generation born after 1960, this is at that time 73%. Prognoses point out that in 2010, 67% of the population will be non-religious. Since 1958, the share of Catholics among the population has decreased from 42% to 18% nowadays to an expected 13% in 2010 (Becker 2000). Within the churches, too, much has changed. Religious participation has drastically decreased. In 1970, 63% of Catholics attended a church service at least once a month, in 2005 this is only 12%. At the same time, it seems that the number of people who attend something resembling a church service is increasing. In 2003 this was 23% of the population and in 2010 this is expected to be 35% of the population.[4] Evidently, people search for other ways to express their desire to experience meaning. This coincides with the fact that the teachings of the church are also being questioned more and more with regard to content (Becker 2000).

During the denominational period, Christian churches had great influence on the development of the conscience and also the perception of meaning of adolescents. At school, in church and in daily life they were confronted with statements from the church on what was good and what was evil. In 1954, the Dutch bishops made a statement in the political area, which forbade Catholics to vote for socialist parties, read socialist newspapers and listen to the socialist radio broadcasting corporation. The importance attached to statements made by the church is drastically decreasing. In 1998, 77% of the population believes that religious leaders should refrain from making political statements, 70% believes that politics and religion do not belong together, that in the choice of a school the religious basis only plays a third of a role. Of the church members, 58% believes that they are not obliged to obey church regulations. As far as anti-conception is concerned, figures are much higher. When considering the subjects on which the church should comment, then its own members feel it should make itself heard on poverty and discrimination, but that it should remain silent when it comes to personal moral issues (euthanasia, abortion, sexuality, divorce). A mere 29% of the population subscribes to the remark made by Dostojewski that without God there is no morality (De Hart 1999). A study conducted in 2003 among adolescents, shows that there is very little confidence in the churches, together with politics they come last, whilst there is much more confidence in Human Rights groups and in the police and newspapers (Van Der Tuin 2005).

There is a shift taking place in the bearers of morality, - these are no longer the churches -, it is more and more often – in this post-modern society - the individual himself who forms a conscience from various bearers, just as he patchworks a philosophy for himself from existing philosophies(Alma & Janssen 2000).

Sin and awareness of sin

So there was a time when faith seemed to be simple and it was especially evident what good and evil were. One knew what sin was and therefore, also what the formation of the conscience was. This knowledge was shared by the whole religious (Catholic) community, as it was enforced and monitored by the clergy. And in addition, there was also the all-seeing eye of God that was everywhere. For this reason, sin was experienced especially as going against the authority of that clergy. However, on a more theological basis, sin is a disruption of the relationship with the higher power, with God. It is an infringement on that relationship (Depoortere, 1984). This relationship with God is one of service and veneration. Sin is failing in this service to God and in following God's plan with the world and with myself, not realising my calling, when I do not or cannot fulfil my being called by Him (Pohier, quoted in Depoortere 1984).

Thus sin is at the same time also an infringement on the mutual relationships of people, because, after all, God shows himself in these relationships: it is abusing relationships. It is not giving the other space, it is a disturbance of relations (Van Heijst 1995).

And finally, sin is also an infringement on the relationship I have with myself, I disappoint myself, I am not who I thought I was, namely stronger, able to resist doing evil.

All of this became concrete in the lists of sins one could commit. A distinction was made between daily and cardinal sins. Daily sins include: 'breaking the laws of God in a *small case*, or breaking

---

[4] Figures taken from the Central Planning Bureau in the Hague that gathers periodic figures on socio-cultural developments in the Netherlands.

the laws of God in a *big case but without actually realising it or not of one's own free will*.'
Cardinal sins as described in the catechism include: 'breaking the laws of God in *a big case, purposefully and of our own free will*' (Catechism 1955).
And the laws of God are made up of the 10 commandments and the Christian virtues that are distinguished in the divine virtues: faith, hope and love and the cardinal virtues: cautiousness, justice, strength and moderation.
But the catechism goes on, does not leave us in uncertainty on what these breaches actually are. To this purpose there is a list of vices. These are characteristics that every person possesses, but that are not actually practised by each person. Therefore, there is a distinction between the vices inherent to us and the sins we commit if we act on our vices.
There are two lists of vices: one of seven and one of eight. I give the list of eight with a reference to that of 7 (Nauta 2002). Therefore these concern characteristics we all have and that are forces that lead to sinning. A sin is only a sin when it is committed. There is also a distinction in these sins: bad sins and true sins.

Bad sins have a direct impact on others, others are involved. You take something from others or do something to them. That is why they are bad. They might be bad, but they are also fun to commit. You gain from them, but they often harm others. They add something to your existence. They take something away from the existence of others. They are very tempting to commit and can make you feel guilty. At the same time you are able to satisfy your guilt, redeem your guilt, accept your punishment, in this way satisfying the other. You can arm yourself against these vices, control yourself. First there is *Lust*: an offensive and manipulative attitude towards people of the opposite sex, in which they are considered as objects for one's own satisfaction (also known as *indecency*). Lust is sexually aimed in particular. *Greed* is being addicted to eating and drinking too much and indiscriminately, causing one to bring harm to oneself. Finally, the third bad sin is *Greed*. This is the overwhelming desire for money and wealth, preventing one from thinking about anything else (also known as *miserliness*).

The true sins have everything to do with my personality; they stick to my position in the world and especially have an impact on my existence, on my self-image. That is why they are true sins. I cannot realise my existence with them. They especially take away something of my individuality and existence. We consider them as characteristic of ourselves (Nauta 2002). You are ashamed of these vices, of being like this. You would rather not be like this. This shame cannot be redeemed, at most denied, but you cannot resist these vices, this is just the way you are. The first and also foremost true sin from which all other sins originate is *Arrogance, Pride, and Vanity*: the selfish attitude in which one continually wants to be approved of and admired by others. It is the sin that Adam and Eve fell victim to when they wanted to have knowledge equal to that of God. And it is the sin of Icarus who wanted to fly as high as the sun (Van Der Tuin 2002). *Rage* is the attitude of rancour that is reflected in feelings of anger, feeling insulted, revengeful and raging inside (another name for this is *wrath*). *Jealousy* is the third true sin that originates directly from arrogance. It is the constant jealousy of others, who just happen to have something that one would like to have oneself or that attracts the attention that one would like to receive (in other words, *envy*). Jealousy disturbs the relationship with everyone else because they always have something that you yourself do not have. *Apathy* and *Melancholy* are connected to one another and are mentioned as one in the list of seven cardinal sins. The apathetic or insensitive attitude towards life is aimed more at the outer self and is reflected in indifference with regard to the needs and desires of others. *Melancholy* is aimed at the inner self. This is the personal feeling of bitterness with regard to life, of an aversion with regard to the world and those with whom one is connected. This can lead to suicide[5]..

Formation of the conscience
The fact that it was clear what sin was and when one sinned, also made the formation of the conscience very easy. All one had to do was to imprint the sins, the lists, in order not to commit them. This was what confirmation lessons were for. And if one committed them anyway then one

---

[5] The film Se7en is based on this list of cardinal sins. It tells about the revenge of a psychopath who wants to punish man for the evil done to him/people in the cardinal sins. You can see it as a modern way of forming the conscience.

had to go to confession and genuinely confess guilt. Committing a cardinal sin means going to hell, forever, committing a daily sin means doing penance here or purgatory, after death and before still going to heaven.

It was made clear to the child in every most graphic way possible what sin looked like, what the consequences were (an angry looking Blessed Lord), and how one was able to do good, and again what the consequences were of this (a happy looking Blessed Lord). Many picture books are evidence of this.

Modernisation of the concept of sin
The concept of sin is a religious concept and has as such a connection with God, as I have already indicated. In our modern world there is not much room for God anymore, as a result of which the concept of sin has been strongly secularised.

The concept sin has changed in meaning in various ways. Yet we still speak easily of sin, without attaching this to God: what a pity (sin) that vase is broken, we sin against traffic regulations, or against the rules of etiquette. The concept sin comes from the Western Christian view of the world and although that view of the world has changed, it has not ceased to be of influence (Ter Borg 2002).

The awareness of sin and the awareness of the guilt attached to it and the religious version of this especially, are, since Freud, not good for the spiritual welfare. The awareness of sin is sooner the result of the wrong upbringing, it makes every form of enjoyment impossible. This means that one should deal with one's awareness of sin as quickly as possible in a discussion group or self-help group or with the therapist.

Instead of sin and guilt, we prefer to speak of underachievement, reaching one's limits, not getting to it, or of falling short or failing, being unsuccessful and in the worst case, of wrong and a breach. These are masked terms in which we prefer not to mention our own guilt directly. The existence of many seems to have become too superficial for the allowance of the awareness of sin and guilt.

What used to have a negative moral connotation, we now prefer to call something else, more objective: suicide becomes killing oneself, abortion becomes termination of pregnancy, criminal behaviour becomes immature or socially maladjusted or psychotic behaviour. In words like euthanasia, of unsound mind, right to self-determination, genetic modification, digression, failure, mistake, weakness, shortcoming…. the moral connotation has been replaced by a sociological or psychological description.

We can conclude that the sin concept has been "modernised", that is to say: It has been *individualised*: not God or transcendent rules but man, I myself have become the measure of things: it's your own fault; I am the criteria for what is good and evil, my welfare defines this, or at most the welfare of the closest involved still.

It has been *rationalised*, made *scientific*: science softens the consequences of alleged evil actions. Masturbation does not cause diseases of the spinal cord and children and illnesses are not always the result of sex; but science also makes new guilt and sin possible; abortion and euthanasia and eugenics.

It has been *democratised*: we decide what is evil in the social debate, with human self-determination as social phenomenon. Sin is the result of mutual understanding and compromise.

It has been *pluralized*: for a long time now we have not agreed on what guilt and sin are. Different cultures and subcultures interpret what evil and guilt are in different ways, which even leads to opposing ideas on the right to self-determination, self-development, self-defence and suchlike.

It has been *consumerized*: guilt and sin can quickly be bought off or 'therapied away'. Guilt is always connected to punishment and penance: you must and can do something to buy off your guilt. I buy off my guilt by giving to charity, by doing something for the environment (Ter Borg 2002).

In the original concept of sin this was by no means possible: redemption from sin is a deed of God's mercy, only He can forgive, which can be experienced as punishment but also as sympathy. God is the only one who has knowledge of good and evil. The person who believes he knows this, commits the worst crime: arrogance, and slips back to the eternal punishment of the original sin of Adam and Eve.

We can conclude: the modernisation of the concept of sin has not really left room for true guilt…

Modernised conscience

The awareness of sin and guilt may not be quite so present in our modern society any more, but at the same time we have the feeling that things are not as they should be. There is a certain feeling of discomfort, that we are not doing things the right way. We prefer to express this with the word shame. I am ashamed of what I am, for what I do. But I am especially ashamed of the fact that, in this society in which everything and anything goes, I am unsuccessful in being who I want to be. I fail to achieve my ideal self-image. I put on a mask of success and security, but behind this I am ashamed of my pride, my jealousy, my arrogance (the true sins). This shamefulness of myself results in a lack of self-respect, in indifference for the fate of others. I only need others for confirmation that I myself am not doing too badly. But every empathetic capacity is lacking here, 'whilst respect is demanded from others for who one is, or at least, for who one pretends to be… every criticism is avoided…others are judged as friend or enemy, manipulated for one's own gain, their love exploited for one's own satisfaction' (Nauta 2002).

For that matter, the truest sins in the eyes of many people are pride and jealousy. A study among others, among students of my faculty showed that they believed these sins to be the truest (not the worst). People struggle with these sins most. I am envious of the other because I believe he gets the recognition I would so much liked to have had myself. I wish I did not need that recognition, but unfortunately, I do. After all, I am a loser. And I am ashamed of this, because this is the last thing I want to be.

What are conscience and the formation of conscience if sin and the awareness of sin, the experience of guilt no longer exist, but that of shame? Shame has everything to do with narcissism. Shame is injured pride that is aimed most deeply inwards. Guilt and the awareness of sin are aimed at the outer self, I am guilty with regard to another, I am guilty in the eyes of God. Guilt and sin are offered and taught to me from the outside. I learn because the other points out the evil I do to him, the law I breach, whether this is the law of God or of man. That I am sinful and guilty is made clear to me by others and is made clear to me because the knowledge of this has established itself within my conscience.

Shame I do to myself. I am ashamed of myself or I am not. Shame is purely personal and individual, it is not imposed on me and is different for each person. Others do not necessarily have to be ashamed of the things I am ashamed of. This has nothing to do with learning and knowing and therefore, also not with a conscience that has been learnt from the outside.

This poses a question for me as to the form of evil in our (modern) society, because this is no longer the same for each person.

Modern forms of evil

Not so long ago I was in the Tropenmuseum (Tropics museum) in Amsterdam at an exhibition, with Evil as its theme (Faber 2004). An exhibition about Evil, evil as art, evil elevated to aesthetics! Something to enjoy, to look at!? And that is exactly what I did. Evil was presented there in all sorts of ways and forms. Sometimes beautiful, sometimes terrible. I saw devils and demons, a child-devouring witch from Bali, the devil in the form of Judas from Mexico, jinns from Senegal, voodoo devils from Haiti, all over the world religions have their own idea of evil, personalised in a human-animal like being, to make evil look like us and at the same time keep it far enough from us. The woman as temptress of evil appeared many, many times, for instance, the sexy Brazilian goddess Pomba Gira, but also witches, the evil ones from past times but also the good ones who manifest themselves nowadays. But religion is not alone in its knowledge of evil. Evil is so fascinating that it is used as a subject for film, literature and music. After all, evil is also fun, much more exciting than good. I cannot imagine an exhibition about good, it would be incredibly boring and I do not believe it would be a box-office hit. Think about films with Dracula, whose real name is Nosferatu, in which evil still has a human form. But in most films evil is not presented as being of flesh and blood. It is the zombies, the living dead that die as soon as it gets light and the film ends. Aliens overrun earth and destroy everything they come across. Once I saw the Lord of the Rings and the Matrix, images of the endless struggle of evil against good, Sauron against Frodo in the Lord of the Rings, and in Star Wars, the umpteenth sequel of which has just appeared, it is Darth Father against Luke Skywalker. What they have in common is that evil remains invisible and abstract. Sauron is the eye in the fire. Where have I seen that before, that image of the eye: the all-seeing eye that rules and arouses awe. At the top of St. John's

Cathedral in Den Bosch The Netherlands and on the old editions of the School Catechism, but there used to be one at my home, too, it hung in the bathroom, it was obvious why, but it gave no confidence, only fear and awe.

However, the exhibition had more to offer, not only were there images of evil, but a whole section was devoted to dealing with evil. How do we place it in our lives. After all, you do evil, you cannot ignore evil, you have to do something with it or otherwise it will overwhelm you. In the films mentioned above there is continuous, physical violence blown up to improbable proportions, of whole armies that attack and slaughter one another. But closer to home, the fight against evil is present; from the blessing of the house or car, to the offering of a lamb or Abraham's son Isaac, to please the gods. There are specialists in combating evil, the shamans, the priests, the exorcists who offer their services, with their amulets or medallions with which they exorcise or redeem evil. The hand of Fatima, the daughter of Mohammed, protects against evil, but also a male earring or a belt made of tiger claws from Indonesia, offer protection and of course the many masks. There is also an alternative way of dealing with evil, now priests are not so popular. This involves flirting with evil and showing off. In music, heavy metal offers an orgy of noise, the Rolling Stones sang their sympathy for the devil, Alice Cooper and Metallica made their concerts into satanic rituals and in Gothicism, black and dark make-up and tattoos have become a thing of beauty.

The way to deal with evil as taught by the church is to stay as far away from it as possible and if this does not work, as it never does, to undergo your punishment and do penance. The old children's picture books are full of every possible threat, just in case you are bad or have committed a sin; from the punishing, admonishing finger of God to the eternal hellfire. And what it is like there can be read in Dante: certainly not much fun. And yet I know of no other more beautiful poetry than that of Dante's Hell, much more beautiful than his Heaven. Though it should really be the other way round. But good is so boring, so predictable, so eternal. And yet, I would prefer to go to heaven rather than hell, I just do not like to read about it.

However, I did not get an answer to my question of what evil is there. Once again, we know and at the same time, do not know what evil is.

Evil in youth culture

I search further in the world of the modern youth culture, where flirting and showing off with evil is so strongly present. And where better to look than the world of MTV and TMF. Popular music channels, in which in music, text and especially video clips, the world of adolescents is portrayed and shaped and which seem to have great influence on adolescents. After all, this involves music of which the composer Robert Schuman once said: "Music is an expression of the soul". Plato held the standpoint that there was good music and bad, which could influence people as such. For this reason only good music was allowed, thus encouraging virtuousness, according to Boëthuis in his '*Institutione musica*', which is the first standard work on the theory of music in the Christian West. The influence of music, modern rock music in particular, is huge. For adolescents, music is a coping mechanism. "Adolescents are of the opinion that music helps them to deal with problems, to suppress aggression, to hate and to love, to give meaning to life and perspective in times of insecurity" (Janssen 1994). Pop idols that are almost canonised following their death, whose burial site is, in any case, visited by many, for instance Jim Morrison, Elvis Presley and Kurt Cobain, are evidence of this. But living stars too, are able to stir up the crowds during concerts in any case, but also outside these they have great influence through the merchandising. One of the methods used is the video clip. These often function as a support to the music and tell the story of the text in images. Actually, they are only a way of advertising and include attractive images, of course of beautiful women and men and of the temptations in life. However, modern hip hop and rap music provide completely different images. Rapper's texts are often about sex and drugs and violence. The clips portray the way men and women treat each other, especially the way men see women and the role of sex and drugs in this. Examples include the clips from, among others, N.E.R.D., 50 CENT, Marilyn Manson, Nirvana and Snoop Doggy Dog. The texts are equally clear: "Shake, shake…shake that ass girl". "He ate my pussy from dark till the morning". The images show the way men and women treat each other, whereby the women are indeed present for the benefit of the mens' pleasure, they are their sex kitten. And even in this role, they do not appear to be taken seriously, because the faces and posture of the

male rappers show complete indifference. The woman is a thing, is shown in parts and never once is the woman shown as a whole. The violence of Manson is connected with Nazi symbols. No wonder the following article appeared in the newspaper: 'MTV shows nakedness 3056 times a week'. An American parent's club had counted this in a random week in March 2004. Apparently they are particularly worried about it, especially of course about the impact of the images on their children. A different newspaper article: 'Big indecency lawsuit in Rotterdam misjudges youth culture. Where does the boundary lie between sex à la MTV and rape? Ten boys between the ages of 13-17 are on trial on the suspicion of the rape of 4 girls of 11-14 years. I quote the newspaper: 'These children get their ideas of what is normal from the rap clips on MTV. Both the boys and the girls. But those judges never watch MTV. What do they know…? There is a difference between the experiences of those adolescents, for whom sex apparently differs completely to the way the judges see it. What the judges consider to be forced sex, is for the boys and girls normal, it is a part of the way they treat each other, after all, this is what they see on MTV and TMF everyday'.

Two things come up for discussion here; firstly, the question as to whether these are forms of evil. And secondly, that in both newspaper articles a relationship is made between the influence of the media and behaviour. The media contributes to the development of the knowledge of good and evil, and therefore to the formation of the conscience. Much research has been done on the relation between what happens on TV, but also in films and video games and the behaviour of adolescents, in particular (Ravitch 2003, Anderson 2003, Cuklanz 2000). Most of the research concentrates on the relation between violence on TV and behaviour. Adolescents are indeed influenced by what they see. This concerns their great willingness to show imitative behaviour, however, they do not actually exhibit this behaviour. It concerns their intention to behave, which is not the same as actual behaviour (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980). That is to say that they only imitate the exemplary behaviour when circumstances induce this. In the case of the group rape in Rotterdam, it is the group adolescents that stimulated each other to behave the way they did. This is confirmed in a TV documentary later, in which, among others, the adolescents involved talk about what happened. If a girl, through the way she looks or also the things she says, is for one second compliant in a 'chat conversation' on the Internet, then this is understood by the boy to mean that she would like to have sex. Subsequently, she is pressurised. This is also the case with violence. Boys like to pretend to be ninjas, but this only gets out of hand in the situation of a real fight. Thus there is a relationship, but it is an indirect one. The effect of advertising is based on the same principle. The images stimulate the desire to go out and buy a particular product, but an actual purchase will only be made in certain circumstances. Yet this is reason enough to pay attention to what adolescents see and play in computer games. Newspaper articles do contain some truth. The music video clips work in the same way as advertisements for a particular product, in this case they stimulate the purchase of the CD of the particular performers.
The first question was whether the images of the music video clips are indeed forms of evil. The images are used as advertising. If the performer is in the clip, which is almost always the case, then they function as an invitation to identify with the performer and his/her behaviour. The performer is supposed to become a star, an idol, behaves as such in any case. And which adolescent is not receptive to reflecting and copying the exemplary behaviour of their idol, and certainly if this exemplary behaviour is attractive and beneficial to oneself. The examples of music video clips mentioned above are related to the way men and women treat one another and the role of sex in this. Women are portrayed as being at the service of mens' pleasure and then only for their external physical qualities and really only for particular parts of their bodies. The fragmented images that come in quick succession strongly accentuate this. There is absolutely no equality and respect for one another. The aesthetic pleasure that the body can arouse also does not play a part. The knowledge that fills the conscience is that women merely have a restricted value and that men have a right to sex.
In the tolerant Netherlands certainly, opinions on this differ. For example, it is notable that clips are shown in two different versions, a more or less censored version for daytime and an uncensored version for the nightly broadcasting hours of MTV and TMF. In America, where the clips are often made, they are only shown in the censored version. They are not prohibited in the Netherlands. They do not fall under the same censorship as films, which are also given advice as to age group for TV.

Opinions differ therefore, because the clips are often viewed as innocent provocation and can sooner be considered as a caricature. This applies, among others, to gothic videos, in which the occult and satanic, sometimes connected to sex, are portrayed. They are so extravagant that they no longer have to be taken seriously. Research indicates that with regard to aggression, rock music curbs it rather than encourages it (Lyle & Hoffman 1972; Arnett 1991).

I come to the conclusion that evil certainly is present in the world of modern youth, that it has, however, taken on many different forms and that it is not experienced and recognised as such by every person.

Upbringing

The question that arises and that is also the main question in this contribution is: how does one deal with this as educator, especially with this provocation of and with evil. How does the educator cope? Is it still possible to teach children what evil is, can one still protect them from evil if it is not obvious what evil itself is? What is conscience formation with regard to this?

The reaction of those involved in the rape of young girls taken from the newspaper articles mentioned above is striking. One of the boys says that he does feel a little regretful: "Life in prison really isn't nice". He is concerned about himself most. The question of whether he thinks the girl did not mind is answered with "don't know". He thought it quite normal for a 19-year-old boy to have sex with an 11-year-old girl. It appears that the conscience has not been formed by his upbringing and education but by what is considered as normal behaviour within the group of adolescents. "Acting like a slut or pimp is cool, and then you really belong to the group". What have these adolescents been given in their upbringing?

The upbringing is strongly defined by the fear of educators, the fear that things might go wrong with the educandus and the fear that conflicts will arise causing things to go wrong. Fear in the upbringing is almost always related to good and evil, often implicitly or explicitly based on the Ten Commandments, concentrated on sexuality, honesty and obedience, hardly ever on the works of mercy (care for the poor, the imprisoned, the stranger) and never on care for the environment.

But are we not doing much more evil by avoiding conflicts in the upbringing, rather than confronting them? One can learn from evil, evil does not have to be avoided, one can also learn from MTV and TMF, one does not have to close one's eyes to it.

Does this mean only being tolerant, indifferent with regard to alleged evil? In the upbringing we often avoid the opportunity to learn from evil, we have not got enough time to do so, especially do not want to have arguments with our children, which seem to be a waste of time. In our busy lives we only have quality time with our children. Therefore, they do not get the opportunity to learn from evil.

As an educator the upbringing means allowing evil to enter oneself and showing it. After all, evil is fun too, doing something secretly, together or alone. Evil is in good, good is in evil, too. Evil truly becomes evil when one does not allow it to enter oneself, when one leaves it outside oneself, when one protects oneself from it. Thus, fear of evil leads to evil. Fear of an argument about evil, also leads to evil and not to defence against evil. How can this be achieved, allowing evil into the moral upbringing without fear?

In order to explain this, I will go into more detail on the various concepts of moral pedagogics. I systematise them based on the concepts fear and conflict. Based on the above, I reach the following classification in forms of upbringing:

Fear and conflict avoidance:
1 authoritative upbringing: does not give the conflict a chance, demands absolute obedience, fear is cancelled out by keeping the educandus under control; the formation of the conscience is directed from above;
2 laissez faire: the conflict is avoided, fear is cancelled out by placing the responsibility with the educandus; the conscience is not really formed;
3 negotiation: the conflict is encapsulated by consultation and negotiation, fear becomes mutual fear, a bit for each person; the formation of the conscience is the result of weighing the pros and cons for oneself;

Fear and dealing with conflict:

4 communication and presence: the conflict is faced, fear is made mutually debatable, differences expressed, boundaries set, the conscience is formed through the communicative pre-lived example.

Aim of upbringing

The leitmotiv that continues on through the various concepts of the (moral) upbringing is the question as to the aim of the upbringing. Bring up for what? If fear should be avoided or maintained, what is the reason? What is it that educators wish to achieve with their educandi in a positive sense; a better future for themselves and for society, happiness, freedom, independence, defence, development of one's own talents?
The question is even more important in these modern times, because the aim of the upbringing is no longer interpreted spontaneously. It has lost its naturalness. It is no longer presented based on church, state or philosophy. Society, school and church are in a great deal of uncertainty with regard to their norms and values. Nowadays, therefore, parents and educators have themselves to search again for the aim of the upbringing (Roebben 1995). This is not an easy task amongst the many cultures and religions present in our modern society.
In the authoritative upbringing the solution is sought in imposing higher norms and values. These values are taken from the church and philosophy, politics or humanitarian ideologies, but also from the individual ideals of the educators and from their own upbringing. Both Catholic moral pedagogics from the beginning of the past century and humanitarian moral pedagogics since Dilthey, are based on these concrete aims. In the first case these are taken from the articles of faith that are values in themselves, even independent of their moral and pedagogic implications. In the reality of pedagogic actions, these values are often negatively formulated based on the desire to avoid conflict. Thus the aim can simultaneously have a teleological effect and also a restrictive one. The child is sent on its way and at the same time it is held onto. When applied to our example from youth culture, this means that the parents forbid the child from watching the video clips. They are not open to the child's opinion on them. According to Roebben (1995) adolescents, however, are in the best position to be able to register the shift in values in our society. In the authoritative upbringing this goes unnoticed, or is rejected through fear. With this attitude there is a danger that the educandus will not familiarise him/herself with values, that they remain superficial or either be adhered to out of fear or, as soon as the child has the opportunity, be thrown far away. According to Van Der Ven, this attitude is a form of 'educational deprivation of freedom' (Van Der Ven 1985).
The laissez faire attitude of the educator forms the opposite of the authoritative upbringing. The ideas of Raths' values clarification are the foundation of this. The task of upbringing and education, as opposed to social insecurity, is the 'negative upbringing' (Rousseau), that is to say, challenge every factor that obstructs the development of the individual talents of the child. Young people have to become aware of the values that give their lives direction (Roebben 1995).
Once again applied to our example, this means that parents do not interfere with what their children watch. They remain aloof, do not talk about it either, in this way a conflict does not arise. At any rate, by doing this they take the child seriously and give it the responsibility to find out what good and evil are. This way, adolescents can indeed show what the development of values yields for the present and the future. In its attempt to put the child on its own road to what it believes to be of value, however, this attitude leaves the child to its own devices. "For the sake of the fact that all values are 'valuable', on the condition that they are personally expressed in the class group, is equally valuable" (Roebben 1995). That is why this attitude is in danger of leading to extreme opinions on values among adolescents, as I have indicated in the example of youth culture. Van der Ven thus calls this attitude a form of 'educational neglect', which leads to value indifference, because the forum of reason remains closed for the educandus (Roebben 1995).
The third opinion of moral pedagogics is the attitude that is characterised by negotiation. Society, in every aspect pluralistic, confronts educators and educandi with a multitude of norms and values. The values handed down from Catholicism and Christianity function beside the Islamic shariah, hedonistic values are the opposite of socialist ones. Individualism and social responsibility each have their own values complex. In the process of education these values play a role, are maintained by partners and lead to opposing moves and conflicts. Society and advertising in particular make grateful use of this. In order to avoid conflicts, parents should talk

about and negotiate the road to be taken. The family of today has become a negotiating family. But the school is also involved. Children take part in the conversation on what the housekeeping is spent on, on how the house is decorated, on where to go on holiday, but also on watching films and therefore, also video clips, on contact with boyfriends and girlfriends, on the time of the first sexual experience. On a macro-social level, the Netherlands is known for its polder model, social issues are solved through negotiations between the various partners, in such a way that this results in a workable compromise. This polder model is also reflected in family negotiation (Van Der Tuin 2005).

This opinion includes the characteristics of both other models. The educators stick to their own standpoints, and essentially the children also persevere in their own standpoints, only the actual behaviour is a compromise and involves a little of each. The main objection to this attitude is that discourse on values does not take place. It is not the negotiation that is of importance, but the pursuit of a solution. Essentially, the partners are not interested in each other's values but merely in quickly achieving a way of behaving that is acceptable to everybody. This has nothing to do with upbringing. Applied to the example, this means that the child may watch, but is restricted in what it watches and that agreements are made as to what is really not allowed.

In all three of the attitudes discussed, conflict avoidance through fear is involved, this fear is not made a subject of discussion and discourse on the values for which the parents, educators and children stand, does not take place.

Therefore, I suggest a fourth approach to the upbringing: presence communicative upbringing.

Presence upbringing
Upbringing is caring for the soul of the educandus, guiding it in the search for an individual identity and ultimately, in the search for meaning in the life of the educandus. I have shown that upbringing is often characterised by the image of imposing orders and bans, of demands for obedience, of authority and subjection, by parents and educators as well as by the church. Upbringing resulting in independence and self-development are words of our own time. Bas Levering says that it is not possible to educate in an authoritative way, all sorts of things can be demonstrated, illustrated and explained, but if they are not willing then this leaves one empty-handed. At least, if one does not wish to use violence, to make threats. And just how often does this occur, threaten with punishment, hell and damnation. The history of the Catholic upbringing is evidence of this. On the other hand, the educator is also not empty-handed and does not want to leave the child to its own devices. He really does want the 'best' for the child.

The pedagogic relationship is an erotic one, an art of temptation. Van der Ven speaks of the eros of the upbringing (Van Der Ven, Vorming 1985). What he means by this is that upbringing is, especially showing what the child itself may, so that it does not fulfil itself at the cost of others. I do not have an ideal picture in mind, as early pedagogues could so beautifully put into words, I merely have a vague suspicion of what future is, or rather, of what future cuts off (Steiner 2003). That is why I speak of upbringing as presence, not an imposed presence but a supportive and listening presence. The task of educators is to support young people on the road to their own life. Presence does not mean looking on from a distance, agreeing to everything and only intervening when things go wrong. I take the term presence from the work of Andries Baart (2001). Upbringing involves actual nearness to the educandus, a nearness that adapts itself to the educandus, without being wrapped up in him, because at the same time it maintains enough distance in order to preserve and encourage one's own freedom and that of the educandus. Presence is letting oneself be heard when it is important, is illustrating, is setting boundaries, is facing conflicts, but at the same time having confidence, supporting, having confidence even when things are in danger of going wrong. Having faith in the flexibility of the child, having faith in the basis one has given the child in one's upbringing. Thus, presence is not passiveness but activeness. "Upbringing should take place from a distance, on approach and always with the benefit of the doubt. Nothing is more beneficial in the upbringing than 'das Ungefähr'." (Janssen 1998). This means having confidence in the educandus that he is able to cope on his own and stimulating and arousing interest and being open to the questions that will be asked.

Let us, if we are educators, consult ourselves. We bring our children up as independent, free people who have to follow their own path, on which they make their own choices. Often these are not our choices, sometimes we are surprised that they make choices along the lines of what we wanted to give them. Again and again they make us think about the choices we make and have

made. They keep us up-to-date, with modern society, with our fast-moving time. They get us on the Internet and mobile phone, they chat with us on the computer. They teach us to listen to different music and especially to appreciate it. They prevent us from sticking to acquired certainties and opinions. We repeatedly have to review our opinions on politics, on what good and evil are, on freedom and responsibility. And they criticise what is natural to us in faith and philosophy. They force us to search for new words and new meanings in ancient words and stories. We have to relearn how to interpret and tell the ancient stories. Of course we do not allow ourselves only to be taught by them. We have taught and given them so much on the path to adulthood, perhaps too much. Let them give something back for a change: we taught them how to take the road to the future, they show us the way in the present. Sometimes this is beautiful, challenging, difficult, too. But certainly worth it.

Finally

So are they given enough? Whatever that is, what we actually give our children. I answer this question by referring to a booklet by Oser (, titled 'Wieviel Religion braucht der Mensch'?. This is the answer in my own words: Perhaps we do not give our children that much, but what we give them has to be extremely deeply rooted. This is upbringing, not negotiation, but being actively present.
Earlier on in the article I mentioned the all-seeing eye of God that formed our conscience. It showed us what good and evil were and at the same time it made sure that we acted accordingly. In the meantime it will have become obvious that I no longer wish to consider the eye as such. That eye of God made it well understood just how sinful man is. I wish to conjure up that image again in order to show and let it be felt what this used to mean: An upbringing of fear and prohibition.
Now what I mean by this is that upbringing in presence is: having an eye for what the child needs, an ear for its concerns, voicing one's own opinion, holding up a hand to catch it if it is in danger of falling and then throwing it up again until it can fly by itself.

References

Ajzen, I., Fishbein, M. (1980), *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior,* Inglewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall.
Alma, H., Janssen, J. (2000), 'Jeugd en zingeving', in: Alma, H. e.a. *Zin op school. Zingeving in het voortgezet onderwijs,* Nijmegen, KSGV.
Anderson, C.A., Stephen J.C (eds)(2003), *The influence of media violence on youth,* Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishing.
Arnett, J. (1991), 'Adolescents and heavy metal music: from the mouths of metalheads'. in: *Youth and society* 23,1,76-98.
Baart, A. (2001), *Een theorie van de presentie*, Utrecht, Lemma.
Becker, J.W. e.a. (1997), *Secularisatie en alternatieve zingeving in Nederland*. Den Haag, Sociaal en cultureel planbureau.
Blom, J.C.H., Lamberts, E. (1999), *History of the Low Countries,* New York, Berghahn Books
Cuklanz, Lisa M. (2000), *Rape on prime time: television, masculinity, and sexual violence*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
Davie, G. (2000), *Religion in modern Europe: a memory mutates*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Davie, G. (2002), *Europe: The Exceptional Case. Parameters of Faith in the Modern World,* London, Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd.
De Hart, J. (1999), Godsdienst, maatschappelijke participatie en sociaal kapitaal. In: P.Dekker (red.), *Vrijwilligerswerk vergeleken. Nederland in internationaal en historisch perspectief. Civil society en vrijwilligerswerk III*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau/Elsevier
Depoortere, K. (1984), *Wij zijn van U met al ons kwaad. Over Zonde, verzoening en biecht,* Tielt/Weesp, Lanno.
Dijkstra, A.B, Dronkers, J. (1997), *Verzuiling in het onderwijs : actuele verklaringen en analyse*, Groningen, Wolters-Noordhoff.

Dobbelaere, K., e.a. (2000), *Verloren zekerheid: De Belgen en hun waarden, overtuigingen en houdingen (Lost certainties: Belgians and their values, convictions and attitudes),* Tielt:, Lannoo.

Eysenck, H.J., Nias, D.K.B. (1978), *Sex, violence and the media,* London, Maurice Temple Smith.

Faber, P. e.a. (2004), *Het kwaad. All about Evil.* Amsterdam, KIT Tropenmuseum.

Geerts, C. (1973), *The interpretation of cultures: selected essays*, New York, Basic Books.

Grenzen aan gedogen (1996) Ministerie van Justitie, 's-Gravenhage : Sdu Uitgevers.

Greeley, A. (1995), *Religion as Poetry*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers

Groebel, J, Smit, L. (1996) *Media en geweld: inventariserend onderzoek Utrecht*, Den Haag, Sdu Servicecentrum.

Halman, L. e.a. (2005), *Atlas of European Values,* Leiden, Brill and Tilburg University.

Hervieu-Léger, D. (2000), *Religion as a Chain of Memory*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Hoogenboom, B., Vlek, F. (eds)(2002), *Gedoogbeleid, tolerantie en poldermodel: tellen (we) onze zegeningen nog? : beschouwingen over en verhalen uit de praktijk van regelgeving en handhaving,* Zeist, Kerckebosch.

Huisman, W. (1996), *Gedogen: een verschijnsel van alle tijden en alle plaatsen?,* 's-Gravenhage, Ministerie van Justitie.

Huisman, W., Joubert, C.M. (1998), 'Gedogen: een typisch Nederlands verschijnsel?', in:*Regelmaat*, 1998, 3, 145-152.

Janssen, J. (1994), *Jeugdcultuur: Een actuele geschiedenis.*,Utrecht, De Tijdstroom.

Janssen, J. (1998), *Nederland als religieuze proeftuin*. Nijmegen, Katholiek Studiecentrum voor Geestelijke Volksgezondheid.

Janssen, J. (1999), Individualiteit en engagement: religies en relaties in de hedendaagse cultuur, in: Evers, H en Stappers J. (edts.), *Het informatieparadijs*. Nijmegen: Valkhof Pers, 65-102).

Kamalipour, Y. R., Rampal, K.R. (eds) (2001) *Media, sex, violence, and drugs in the global village,* Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield

Kennedy, J.C. (1995), *Nieuw Babylon in aanbouw : Nederland in de jaren zestig (transl.: Building new Babylon: cultural change in the Netherlands during the 1960s)*, Amsterdam, Boom.

Kennedy, J.C. (2002), *Een weloverwogen dood: euthanasie in Nederland*, Amsterdam, Bakker.

Kennedy, J.C. (2005), *De deugden van een gidsland: burgerschap en democratie in Nederland, Amsterdam*, Bakker.

Kerkhofs, J. (2002), *Het geweten. Een sociologisch-theologische studie over de ruggengraat van goed en kwaad.* Tielt, Lannoo.

Lyle, J., Hoffmann, H. (1972), 'Childen's use of television and the media', in: Rubinstein, E et al. (eds), *Television and social behavior. Vol. 4. Televison in day-to-day-life,.* Washington, US Governement Printing Office.

Nauta, R. e.a.(2002*),* 'Echte en erge zonden: een inleiding', in*:* Nauta, R. e.a.(2002*), Over zonde en zonden. Opstellen over de tragiek van het bestaan*, Nijmegen, Valkhof Pers.

Oser, F. (1988) *Wieviel Religion braucht der Mensch? Erziehung und Entwicklung zur religiösen Autonomie.* Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus./Gerd Mohn.

Post, H. (1989), *Pillarization : an analysis of Dutch and Belgian society*. Avebury, Aldershot.

Ravitch, D., Viteritti,J.P.(eds)(2003), *Kid stuff : marketing sex and violence to America's children,* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Roebben, B. (1995), *Een tijd van opvoeden. Moraalpedagiek in christelijk perspectief*, Leuven, Acco.

Steiner, G. (2003), *Lessons of the masters*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Swatos jr., W. H., Olson, D.V.A. (eds.)(2000), *The secularization debate,* Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Ter Borg, M, (2002), 'Waar is het zondebesef gebleven?', in: Nauta, R. e.a. (2002*), Over zonde en zonden. Opstellen over de tragiek van het bestaan*, Nijmegen, Valkhof Pers.

Thurlings, J.M.G. (1978), *De wankele zuil: Nederlandse katholieken tussen assimilatie en pluralisme,* Deventer, Van Loghum Slaterus.

Van De Plas, M., Fens, K. (1963*), Uit het Rijke Roomsche Leven: een documentaire over de jaren 1925-1935,* Utrecht, De Fontein.

Van Der Tuin, L. (1999), *Catechese en diaconie,* Tilburg, Tilburg University Press.

Van Der Tuin, L. (2002), 'Hoogmoed', in: Nauta, R. e.a.(2002*), Over zonde en zonden. Opstellen over de tragiek van het bestaan*, Nijmegen, Valkhof Pers.

Van Der Tuin, L. (2003), Kommunikation in Anwesenheit, in: *Religionspädagogische Beiträge*, 50, 2003, 73-89.

Van Der Tuin, L. (2005), 'The Netherlands: The Dutch disease Ziebertz', in: H.-G., Kay, W. (2005), *Youth in Europe I. An international empirical study about life perspectives,* Münster, Lit.

Van Der Ven, J.A. (1985), *Vorming in waarden en normen*, Kampen, Kok.

Van Der Ven, J.A. (1998), *Formation of the moral self.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Van Harskamp, A, (2000), *Het nieuw–religieuze verlangen*, Kampen, Kok.

Van Heyst, A. (1995), 'Zonde als verstoring van verhoudingen', in: K.W.Merks, F.J.H.Vosman (eds.), *Uit op geluk: De Katechismus van de Katholieke Kerk over goed en kwaad: uitleg en commentaar.* Baarn, Gooi & Sticht.

(Tilburg, September 2005, translation Nikki Idema)