

DIDACTOGENICITY

Dr. Jose Cukier (Psicoanalista, miembro de la Asociacion Psicoanalitica Argentina)

CukierJ@FIBERTEL.COM.AR

RESUMEN

Hablo sobre la didactogenicity en 6 apartados:

1. Introducción.
2. Muestro que, aunque muchos educadores poseen estos rasgos de personalidad, no todos los aprendices padecen las mismas consecuencias.
3. Describo las características de los educadores narcisistas, las defensas principales y los riesgos para los aprendices cuando algunas instituciones aprueban a estos educadores.
4. Describo diferentes tipos de pensamiento. Aunque el conocimiento es activo, existe casi un olvido universal de esta verdad.
5. Describo las interacciones producidas por la ignorancia de los educadores de aprendices: transformación de activo en pasivo, tabú del pensamiento, conocimiento enciclopédico, memorias póstumas, trastornos del comportamiento, carecer de atención, hiperagresividades, etc.
6. Desarrollo el concepto del doble educador y algunas ideas sobre las respectivas posiciones de educador y aprendiz.

Mis comentarios concluyen con que el aprendiz necesita al educador, porque el segundo ayuda a satisfacer una parte del viaje no alcanzada en la percepción o la experiencia.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Patología, didáctica.

SUMMARY

1. Introduction
2. Theoretical bases
3. The narcissistic educator
4. The learner. Unconscious thought and knowledge
5. Didactogenic interaction
6. Concluding remarks

KEY WORDS

Pathology, didactogenicity

1. Introduction:

This paper is not a finished study. On the contrary, it suggests apertures to a broader problem.

I refer to didactogenicity. I have coined this term to denote the pathology induced by teaching, an extension of the meaning usually attributed to the word 'iatrogenicity'. (Iatrogenicity derives from the Greek, iatros (physician), meaning whatever originates in the physician.) Common usage has extended the meaning to all disorders caused by physicians.

The Argentine Academy of Letters, when consulted on the validity of the new term, considered that "...it could express whatever is caused by teaching..." But we may wonder whether it is possible to avoid it. As Freud has stated, education, like government and psychoanalysis, are three impossible tasks.

2. Theoretical bases.

I consider didactogenicity is any disorder induced in the learner by the narcissistic personality of the educator. Society accepts the disorders thus induced in the learner as being normal and disavows the pathology. The result of this is the normalization of a pathology. It comes into play when the learner's drive for knowledge encounters a certain manner in the educator. I am not referring to teachers in particular, but to a great majority of persons who, when functioning as educators, possess one of these traits. Neither do all learners suffer the same consequences. Two passages from the works of Freud support this view:

a) In New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis (1933) SE 22:149, he writes: "It will therefore be a matter of deciding how much to forbid, at what times and by what means. And in addition we have to take into account the fact that the objects of our educational influence have very different innate constitutional dispositions, so that it is quite impossible that the same educational procedure can be equally good [or bad] for all children." (My addition in brackets.)

b) In "Leonardo da Vinci and a memory of his childhood" (1910) SE 11:79, he states: "In the first of these, research shares the fate of sexuality; thenceforward curiosity remains inhibited and the free activity of intelligence may be limited for the whole of the subject's lifetime, especially as shortly after this the powerful religious inhibition of thought is brought into play by education." (My italics.)

3. The narcissistic educator has a basic conflict:

The reality imposed upon him/her* by the learner indicates castration, loss of omnipotence and the basic differences. The educator attempts to undo the feeling of annihilation produced by the death of the father through disavowal; he tries to maintain the illusion that a genius once existed for whom he is now the spokesman. Perhaps not only the spokesman but also a producer of new ideas who incarnates that genius, in whose discourse the genius is thus kept alive. The educator may on

*N.T.:To ease reading, only the maculine is used.

the other hand be the unique spokesman for the genius, the preferred concessionaire and creator of ideas.

The educator forces his self-created illusion on the learner, but when the latter disbelieves his relationship with the genius by asking questions, the educator becomes authoritarian in order to reaffirm that someone is omniscient.

The educator tends to transform what he at first suffered passively into something active. We can infer a first time when reality lost its coherence for the child, later to be a narcissistic educator, to the point that he no longer understood it: possibly because his parents shut up his questions, thus interfering with his development and investigation. He was left without understanding and this failure is kept alive as repetition compulsion.

The basic defenses of the narcissistic educator are disavowal and repudiation. He disavows because he needs to create a certain exterior world, something to compensate for his deficiency. Later on, I shall discuss the doubles which the educator tries to implant in the learner, as well as the problem of the respective positions of educator and learner.

In repudiation, the educator is attempting to refute the learner's reality and tries to induce the latter to refute it. In order to achieve his goal, he may resort to the use of logical, semantic, pragmatic and interrogative contradictions which create mental detours; he may try to break down his listener's relationship with sensorial stimuli. That he should not believe what he sees or his feelings or the conventional way of thinking. The educator puts these mechanisms into play and tries to force the learner to suffer from them. If the learner does not rebel against the educator, the learner repudiates. If the learner does rebel, he forces the educator to rectify or to repudiate.

When the educator repudiates, he believes that the learner is a transgressor who is disavowing at his expense. In this interaction, the learner is the object of a kind of violence that is worse than authoritarian violence. The latter silences the person, but does not remove his capacity for thought. However, disavowal may remove the other's capacity for thought, depriving this other of his conviction and making him believe the unbelievable.

The learner is endangered when the educator repeatedly supports disavowal. But one condition alone is not sufficient. Other requirements are a previous disposition in the learner, an atmosphere of desertion in his family, particular educational policies and rigid institutions whose leaders are themselves fascinating educators. This system places the learner in danger of becoming oligophrenic because he cannot become an active thinker, but can only passively accept the educator's thinking; there is danger of driving him mad when the context insists that sensorial reality is different to the learner's perceptual registration of it.

A logical contradiction between two affirmations: one coming from words heard (the context) and the other affirmation coming from his own perception, is provoked in the learner. The didactogenic effect is established, not by the contradiction itself, but because it is impossible to question it or to escape from it. Simultaneously, the educator himself must usually submit to educational policies which are logical contradictions of his own perceptions and therefore inflicts on his pupil the same situation in which he himself is suffering.

Why is it taken for granted that the educator must be believed? What is transferred in him and what does he pretend to be? In "Moses and monotheism: three essays" (1939), SE 23:113, Freud discusses the progress of intellectuality. One of mankind's psychic achievements has been to give perception second place to thought. "This was unquestionably one of the most important stages on the path to hominization." The conquest of thought enables mankind to reason that he is born not only of a mother but also of a father.

This conquest carries a mark, which is the father's family name. This mark has a double meaning: the paternal heritage and the priority of thought over perception, whose psychic price is a loss of pleasure. Everyone who attains this conquest is filled with pride because it signifies a victory over oneself.

This priority of thought over representation creates an agency, the paternal agency, which is later introjected into the superego. This paternal agency is projected first to the father and then to the educators. The relationship between the ego and this paternal agency is complex, the function attributed to the latter being the origin of many phrases without which the ego would not be able to reason. Some of the phrases originating in the paternal agency pertain to self-observation.

The ego can believe in the paternal agency or not, and use it to remove its own authority. The narcissistic educator tends to disbelieve paternal ideas. But why does the ego disbelieve the paternal agency? We shall see.

When the educator needs to see himself as a genius, he disavows the phrases of the paternal agency which speak of a reality (castration) and of the difference between the ego and the ideal. The capacity for self-observation is disavowed and is replaced by a fascinated learner. He supports the disavowal and the ego and the ideal remain soldered together. Consequently, the paternal agency is disbelieved. But which agency? The one which keeps the questions open and stresses that the ideal is

inaccessible. The ego unites with the ideal which has not fallen, with a father who makes revelations and tells secrets which support his omniscience. This ideal makes discompletion impossible and obstructs the path toward new knowledge.

How does this disbelief work in the discourse of the narcissistic educator? Instead of recognizing himself as a transmitter of his own teachers' words, he omits the origin of this knowledge as if he had created it, or even pretends to have invented the entire subject. By omitting the origin of this transmitted knowledge, he is by inference inflicting an offensive mark on the father through this disavowal of the origin.

If a learner happens to question the origin of this discourse, he endangers the educator's narcissistic structure, whereupon the educator repudiates the student. The latter must go on being the fascinated adorer of the genius of an educator who denies being an heir and substitute. This educator shows that he is an ex-learner who acquired encyclopedic knowledge without having learned; when the student questions him, he is shown the difference between the ideal and the ego, between the Teacher and the teacher. Doing creates knowledge. The Teacher has knowledge without doing; he is a follower and a repeater.

Another passage from Freud to conclude these reflections on the educator: in 1913, in "The multiple claims of psychoanalysis to scientific interest", SE 13:189, he writes: "Only someone who can feel his way into the minds of children can be capable of educating them; and we grown-up people cannot understand children because we no longer understand our own childhood. Our infantile amnesia proves that we have grown estranged from our childhood."

4. The learner: unconscious thought and knowledge.

What is an unconscious thought? In "The ego and the id"(1923) SE 19:3, Freud speaks of a displacement of psychic energy on the path toward action. This displacement is purely internal, a purely psychic act, as opposed to sensory impressions and experiences.

The displacement of libido from which unconscious thought derives binds representations according to different logical systems which can only be expressed in words. These logical systems governing displacements correspond to simultaneity and passivity, simultaneity and activity (contiguity), analogy and causality (Freud,

SE 1:234 & SE 5:539). Freud distinguishes two types of psychic acts: the development of affect and thought.

The development of affect implies a liberation of libido which reaches consciousness without need of mediation. Unconscious thought implies a displacement of drive from one psychic space to another, something which requires more complex processes in order to enter consciousness.

Unconscious thought can be differentiated from other unconscious content: thing-presentations, derived from perceptions and experiences, as opposed to unconscious thought which is a purely internal act.

Placing the emphasis on purely internal acts implies considering the psyche not simply a derivative of perception and their representations. Considering it only as inscriptions means thinking of the psyche as a tabula rasa. The psyche is actually the result of a series of operations which form it according to structural criteria. Unconscious thought, unlike thing-presentations, runs from unconscious to conscious and is the most genuine representative of the drive. It demonstrates the drive's insistence on being expressed in more than just experience and representation.

This displacement of drive from one space to another seems to be provoked by dissatisfaction; in the face of frustration, one part becomes displeasurable emotion and the other is displaced. This displacement which supports unconscious thought generates unconscious knowledge. Displacement is thrust forward by drive demands, resulting in the psyche's need for growingly complex logical reasoning. Each reasoning surpasses those that preceded it and reorders the antinomies.

On its path to action, libidinal displacement encounters the interposition of the judgement of the pleasure-ego which confers the judgement of attribution, the reality-ego which gives it judgement of existence and the super-ego which attributes the ethical, juridical and esthetic principles. The effectiveness of our unconscious thought leads us to presuppose the truth of the heard or written words of others, whenever their reasoning is more complex than the mind's own reasoning at the time. This complexity perceived in the other precedes the perception of the complexity of our own thought. There is no doubt that there is unconscious knowledge, different from that deriving from perception, and that the psyche does not passively await inscriptions: knowledge implies activity. Notwithstanding, we tend to call the student an "alumnus". What is the meaning of the word alumnus? The Blanquez-Fraile

Latin-Spanish dictionary (1946), p.72, says: Alumno, as, are, avi, atum (from alo). To bring up, to educate - Alumnus-i (from alo), a child who is brought up or educated. On p.69 it says: Alo, is, ere, alui, alitum or altum (of uncertain origin). To support, to sustain, to feed, to bring up, to educate.

Can it be held, then, that the condition of alumnus (student) implies only a passive condition, as the object of support, upbringing, education, or can it be that the word alumnus also involves a disavowal? The disavowal of the learner's active and autonomous knowledge, quite independent of the educator. I leave the question open for my readers' consideration.

The different logical systems governing unconscious thought are diverse psychic conquests, according to their developmental moment.

If we classify them according to form, we can distinguish the following types of thought:

In totemic thought, the ideal is practically accessible; it is an attempt to process the mourning for losses of omnipotence. This omnipotence is projected to the ideal. This type of thought also needs a logical system in order to create substitutes. It is based on the supposition that there is no difference between animals and human beings.

In mythical thought, the difference between animals and human beings is secured, its logical system surpassing the former one; its logic is that of the concrete operations which make the difference between work and play intelligible.

In religious thought, a person can be taken as an idol, but only by asserting that the only reason for doing so is that the person represents god. This requires that intelligence pass from the concrete operations to the more abstract operations. It is acquired during puberty. The ego ideal becomes more abstract, less perceptible, more inclusive and more omnipotent.

Thought in terms of cosmovision retains the notion of abstraction and eternity but omits the mark of faith or divinity. It includes the possibility of conflict that is resolved in a future re-uniting of forms.

The types of thought described up to this point create totalities, the ego ideal appears to create totality and is a projection of the ego's illusory totality.

Scientific-ethical thought: The illusion of identification with a whole is lost, the ideal is unrealizable and thought is fragmentary. This thought is scientific because it is fragmentary and ethical because the ideal is unrealizable.

There are mixed productions or transactional formations between less complex ideals and others more abstract. Whenever the transaction is surpassed, the more complex ideal then subsumes the preceding complex ideal.

5. Didactogenic interaction.

Introduction.

Freud, in "The 'uncanny'" (1919) SE 14:234, tells us: "The theme of the 'double' has been very thoroughly treated by Otto Rank ["Der Doppelgänger", Imago T.III, 1914]. He had gone into the connections which the 'double' has with reflections in mirrors, with shadows, with guardian spirits, with the belief in the soul and with the fear of death;"

When the educator disavows the learner's reality, he recreates in the external world a double that duplicates the teacher, his mirror double. In this way, he averts castration. This double is projected to the pupil and the educator likens himself to the learner. The educator sees his own and the student's ego ideals as mirror images. In their supposed equality, the professor ignores the different types of preconscious thought that pertain to each of the student's developmental periods. The educator also disavows the differences between each of his learners and each one's particular situation. Some students have reached the level of thought which the learning institution and the educator expect of them. Others have not. When institution and educator ignore the differences between the students, they provide teaching that is apparently equalitarian. The same teaching for all learners. However, the effect this produces is paradoxical, since it emphasizes the disequalities between learners and between the educator and the learners.

Disequalities between learners are emphasized because students at different levels of development of their preconscious thought receive the same information. Therefore, the student whose level is more advanced can receive insufficient information and insufficient stimulus (the available libido can be detoured to discharge through action, generating "behavior disorders"). The student whose developmental level is inferior can receive information that he is not yet able to understand (this can generate "mental retardation").

The disequalities between learner and educator are accentuated when the educator pronounces his educational discourse, for example, from the level of scientific-ethical thought, when his listener is on a less-developed level of thought (mythical,

for example). The listener is unable to grasp the professor's thought unless intermediate thoughts are used as mediators. The student cannot reach the educator, and the distance separating them grows. The educator can attempt to approach the learner with pedagogical refinements, audiovisual material, resources and methods; but these attempts will be sterile as long as the disavowal of the student's reality continues. He can, on the other hand, reach the pupil by going back to former stages of his own thought (in the example above, by going from the scientific-ethical back to the mythical), but in order to do so, he must accept the differences (emerge from narcissism) and lift his infantile amnesia.

In order to improve our understanding of some types of didactogenic interaction, I consider we must first discuss two concepts: a) the educator and his doubles and b) the respective positions of educator and learner: defenses.

a) The educator and his doubles:

a.1. The double image: priority is given to the traits of the object. The educator, in order to disavow a primitive feeling of calamity (as I said before, because of castration and the death of the father), resorted to an omnipotent double to reassure him and to guarantee his survival. This double, projected to the learner, shores up his image. He needs for the learner to say yes to everything. Every one of the learner's acts that ruins his image also ruins his omnipotence, provoking feelings of shame and humiliation. The educator feels that he loses motor coordination of his movements. He cannot listen to himself. He loses visual and acoustic images and because he doesn't listen to himself, he cannot coordinate what he says. The students "put him to shame".

But the image that ruins him is his own self-image, which only apparently comes from the external world and from the learner's internal world. An example: the educator knows his subject superficially and needs to give an illusion of depth. To achieve this, he tries to make a big impression, as a way of ordering the students not to ask questions. If they ask questions, he can disqualify the question or attack the students because they ask. He transmits a double message: "believe me because I know in depth" and, at the same time, "be suspicious because I don't know the answer and am only attacking the question". He can induce the other to become oligophrenic. He seeks learners "in his own image"

a.2. The shadow double: The shadow concept as regarding emotional states has been described in literature. Webring to mind the example from "Santos Vega" by Rafael Obligado:

"When evening leaps
sobbing into the west,
a sad shadow sweeps
o'er the Argentine plain,
and when on the morrow
sun bright and serene
lights the broad country scene,
the melancholy shadow
flees kissing the plain,
spurred on by its sorrow..."

In the shadow double, priority is assigned to facial expressions and the unification of a body by means of emotional states. The educator projects his emotional shadow on the learner and reads it on the other's face. When the educator loses his function, he deposits his experiences in the student so that the latter vibrates with the former's problems. An example. The teacher who deliberately denies the student the mark he really deserves, giving him a lower one in order to "stimulate" him. He forces his double to suffer the sadistic effects of the superego and makes his face sad. A double who will never be recognized as such, he suffers exactly what his teacher suffers. He is a shadow or "a grieving soul"

who follows his educator. Just as Atahualpa Yupanqui says:

"Sometimes I follow my shadow
sometimes it follows behind
poor thing if I were to die
who would walk with it through time"

The idea in this type of double is that the shadow or the soul lives on even after the body dies and that it misses the body.

a.3. The spiritual double or "guardian soul".

This assumes that reality is only the replica of an idea. The world is perishable; only abstract, enigmatic ideas that can be deciphered with a unifying code really exist. His discourse can be cryptic and only becomes clear when he reveals the code

that lends coherence and form to what he says. This code is only accessible to those who are in spiritual communion with him.

This educator supposes that he must "squeeze" the student. He believes that he must extract the best from the learner, his essence, by appealing to the union of kindred spirits. For this educator, "the essential is invisible to the eyes".

a.4. The organic double.

This educator is usually an over-adapted personality who demands results at the price of organic processes in himself and in the learner as well. By this type of discharge, he is able to preserve his own homeorrthesis (a concept in biology which refers to homeostasis, not as something static but directed toward something, for example toward growth). He offers content not in keeping with learning time, generating states of intoxication in the students (similar to those the educator suffers).

The students usually produce intellectually correct responses, at the cost of organic illness (ulcers, diarrhea, juvenile diabetes). The learner, being a double, is transformed into "my flesh and blood".

If the learner rebels, he causes the double to return to the educator, upon which the teacher suffers the psychosomatic illness. An example: "These students are going to be the death of me", "They worry me to death", "I feel dizzy by the end of the class".

If the student fails to study, this means a narcissistic wound for the educator which must be mended with greater demands and super-ego requirements with which it is difficult to comply and whose effects are paradoxical. This type of interaction exhausts both teacher and student, who show signs of depression, impotence and loss of interest in the task they share.

This educator tends to have a speculative economic type of discourse, in which teaching is used secondarily for other ends (personal prestige or other dividends within legal limits).

b) The respective positions of educator and learner. Defenses.

Before discussing the positions the learner holds in the narcissistic educator's mind, I cite Freud in "Group psychology and the analysis of the ego" (1921), SE 18:69: "It is true that individual psychology is concerned with the individual man and explores the paths by which he seeks to find satisfaction for his instinctual impulses; but only rarely and under certain exceptional conditions is individual psychology in a

position to disregard the relations of this individual to others. In the individual's mental life someone else is invariably involved, as a model, as an object, as a helper, as an opponent;"

As I said before, the basic defenses of this pathology are disavowal and repudiation. I shall now try to correlate the defenses with the positions.

The defenses function as distributors of positions. We see that in disavowal, the educator's ego suffers a split between an ego attuned to reality and another ego attuned to the wish (the pleasure-ego).

The ego attuned to reality (the official ego) corresponds to the part of the educator's psyche whose relationship with knowledge is not narcissistic, that is willing to encourage questions and to avoid being fascinated by answers. It is an interrogative ego that tries to compare what it hears with some type of reality. The educator's pleasure-ego tends to seek an ingenuous learner, a trusting and easily fascinated helper. The relationship between educator and learner is sustained as long as the former's pleasure-ego is able to fascinate the latter. If this is impossible, this ingenuous learner is re-situated as the opponent's helper.

The ego attuned to the wish remains tied to an ideal model; this tie is maintained as an ideal, because the subject guarantees it. The pleasure-ego and the ideal model mutually presuppose each other.

This type of tie can be seen in narcissistic educator-learner relationships. The teacher is the learner's ideal model ("I'd like to be like him"). The learner is the teacher's former double ("I was once like him"). Through disavowal, the pleasure-ego creates something in the external world to remedy its deficit. It is in this exterior setting that he locates the model, the helper and the opponent.

The relationship between educator-model and learner-helper who idolizes the educator continues as long as the pleasure-ego is able to keep up its position by producing an impact or by corrupting the other.

If the learner (helper) asks a question that the educator cannot answer, the latter feels the question is hostile. Why? Because the educator loses his place as model. Then the educator reorders the question and experiences the learner (helper) as being an opponent's delegate. The educator attacks the opponent (who is a peer) through the helper. He does not attack the helper (who has been denigrated and is now

unworthy of confrontation). A symmetrical structure is created in which opponents confront each other without listening to each other.

And the learner no longer exists. We can observe relationships in which teachers and their favorite disciples suddenly become embattled and ignore the relationship they share (knowledge). They become enemies, transforming what seemed to be a scientific dispute into personal affairs whenever the disciple tries to shift position.

I shall now discuss some types of didactogenic interaction.

a) Transformation of passive into active.

Freud, in "Leonardo da Vinci and a memory of his childhood" (1910) SE 9:78, writes: "The curiosity of small children is manifested in their untiring love of asking questions; this is bewildering to the adult so long as he fails to understand that all these questions are merely circumlocutions and that they cannot come to an end because the child is only trying to make them take the place of a question... Researches are directed to the question of where babies come from... children refuse to believe the bits of information that are given them..." Although parents give what they believe to be good answers, the child does not believe them and this disbelief, according to Freud, initiates their intellectual independence. The child does not believe because he is not able to do so. This is a universal failure which incites the child to go on thinking; as Freud notes (*idem*, p.79n), it is "the prototype of all later intellectual work".

Another type of disbelief is connected with maintaining the illusion that serves to defend against displeasure. The child does not want to listen in order to defend his narcissism against reality. He is ready to believe, but dislikes what is being said. This is a universal defense, a hostile attitude towards the father's spoken words. When the tendency to disbelieve the spoken word, as true as it may be, crops up, parents can generally be seen to disbelieve their own words, to disbelieve each other; to disbelieve the father in an under-developed paternal function; disbelief originating in the function of his own word.

For example, "Do as I say, not as I do". In this imperative, his action divests his word of authority.

A didactogenic nucleus is created in the learner which he later repeats actively.

The failure involved in didactogenicity originates in an insufficient relationship with the parents. We must differentiate two types of failure. The first is stimulating;

the second type of frustration is linked to the parents' narcissism, interfering with the child's questions and corresponding development and research.

b)Categorical imperatives. The taboo of thought. Encyclopedic knowledge. Posthumous memories. Other consequences of the relation between disavowal and repudiation.

A person who listens to a teacher for the first time, although he or she cannot understand the teacher, thinks: if he says it, there must be something to it. This refers to moments in which the infantile mind is unable to understand the reasons why, even when they are explained.

The learner understands that they are "just because". He hears imperatives, which does not necessarily imply that the educator is despotic (although this can be used despotically).

An educator knows that the learner at first listens to him as if he were a categorical imperative. This will gradually form the super-ego. Later, the ego will conquer the reasons. When the conquest of these reasons is interfered with, the imperatives remain intact. This perpetuates the learner's dependence and the educator's power.

The drive for knowledge may not find the path to preconscious thought because of this prohibition, thus establishing the taboo of thought.

The question originating in the drive is taken up by the ego as its own and this questioning is answered by pre-formed encyclopedic knowledge which stops up the questions. The questions may be repressed and filled up with encyclopedic knowledge (memorization, repetition).

Answers inappropriate for the developmental stage may be registered as posthumous memories, awaiting comprehension, once the experience is past. A posteriori, they are understood and may or may not have a traumatic effect, depending on their content. Reciprocally, the educator may assume that the learner's lack of comprehension is due to lack of learning or to the learner's error. Whenever the question is stopped up, interaction is avoided as well as decision-making and the consequent autonomy.

Freud discusses this problem of incorrect timing in connection with the relationship between the seductive mother and her child, who is not ready to respond to her.

The educator's disavowal, together with the repudiation of the educational institution, supported by inappropriate curricula, induces the student to repudiate. This repudiation may become manifest in the form of behavior problems, lack of attention, marked aggressiveness, exacerbated sexuality. When these symptoms are detected, they are usually evaluated as disorders of the individual learner (and they may be), while again disavowing the didactogenic effect of the teaching.

c) Splitting of the learner's ego.

Freud, in "Fetishism" (1927), SE 21:156, says that:"things might be permissible to a child which would entail severe injury to an adult."

In the infantile mind, disavowal and the consequent splitting of the ego is not pathogenic until a certain stage of development. This splitting is useful to the learner in helping him to keep auto-erotism as a resistance in order to conform to society. One part of the ego, the reality-ego, relates to the educator; the other, the pleasure-ego, to the wish.

When the educator supports or stimulates splitting with messages that are inappropriate for the logical system being used by the learner, the latter's reality-ego does not learn: because it does not experience, since it is relating with the wish. Without experience there is no memory trace, only pseudo-learning and memorization. The reality-ego tries to defend itself and cannot keep up its attention. False exchanges with an accumulation of unmodified information build up. The learner organizes pseudoknowledge by over-adapting, spending too much time for the achievement of objectives. Results are not consistent with the effort invested.

d) One more reflection:

The educator, backed by educational institutions and policies that are ignorant of the learner, can massively reproduce the induction of didactogenic pathology.

This is "cloning". That is, the undifferentiated reproduction of "subjects", identical to each other, replicas of the ideal model proposed by the educator and by the institution's group representation. This is to be the subject of future disquisitions.

6. Concluding remarks.

Although the principal agent of this pathology is the educator, I do not mean to refer only to the teacher but to all of us who educate everywhere education is taking place: within the educational system, in the mass media, in the family.

When there is didactogenicity, what and how to teach is planned without taking into account who is to be taught, without comparing empirics to theory.

The goal is generally to develop certain intellectual structures, avoiding anything emotional, personal, historical and relational. The objective is to achieve results that are neither enjoyable nor applicable.

And yet, a learner needs an educator. Why does he seek him out? Because there is something of the drive that is not entirely satisfied, that goes on insisting. It insists and keeps the questions alive, searching for a path. A path that differs from perception and experience, which the educator can help to satisfy partially.

Summary

I discuss didactogenic pathology in six separate sections: 1. Introduction. 2. I show that, although many educators possess these traits, not all learners suffer the same consequences. 3. I describe the characteristics of narcissistic educators, the main defenses and the risks for the learner when certain institutions endorse these educators. 4. I describe different types of thought. Although knowledge is active, there is nearly universal disavowal of this truth. 5. I describe didactogenic interactions produced by the educator's ignorance of the learner: transformation of passive into active; the taboo of thought, encyclopedic knowledge, posthumous memories, behavior disorders, lack of attention, hyper-aggressiveness, etc. I develop the concept of the educator's double and some ideas on the respective positions of educator and learner.

My concluding remarks emphasize that the learner needs the educator, because the latter helps to satisfy a portion of drive not discharged in perception or in experience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

ARGENTINE ACADEMY OF LETTERS: Personal letter, 1987.

BLANQUEZ-FRAILE, A. (1946). Diccionario Latín-Español.

Barcelona: Sopena.

DIVRY, G. & DIVRY, C. (1967). Divry's New English-Greek and Greek-English Dictionary. New York:

Divry.

FREUD, S. (1896). Letter 52. S.E.1.

----(1900-1901). The interpretation of dreams. S.E.5.

- (1910).Leonardo da Vinci and a memory of his
childhood.
S.E.9.
- (1913).The multiple claims of psycho-analysis to
scientific interest. S.E.13.
- (1919).The uncanny. S.E.17.
- (1921).Group psychology and the analysis of the
ego.S.E. 18
- (1923).The ego and the id. S.E.19.
- (1927).Fetishism. S.E.21.
- (1933).New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis.
S.E.22.
- (1939).Moses and monotheism: three essays. S.E.23.
- OBLIGADO, R.(1906). Santos Vega: 1. El alma del payador.
Poesias. Buenos Aires: G. Mendesky.
- TONUCCI, F.(1987). Con Ojos de Niño. Barcelona:
Barcanova.