

**“A Path to Freedom ...”:  
Humanism, Education and the Unconscious\***

*1. From self-sacrifice to civil courage*

First I would like to briefly explain where the quotation in the title comes from, and what it might mean for us today. In July of 1386 the Austrian duke Leopold III attempted to force the *Eidgenossen* — the Swiss Confederates — into subjugation through military force. His plan went all wrong. At first it seemed as though the Swiss footmen could do nothing in face of the closed and armoured phalanx of Austrians, as though the Austrians would have an easy time of it. Yet it turned out quite differently. With the cry “Der Freiheit eine Gasse!” [A path to freedom!], Arnold Winkelried is said to have drawn as many enemy lances as possible onto himself, thereby breaking through the closed formation of Austrians and enabling the mobile *Eidgenossen* to attack the enemy from within and defeat it.

This is the stuff of legend, passed down over time, a point that is not unimportant for assessing it today. Yet even if there is a core of truth in the story, from a didactic point of view it now only has symbolic, metaphorical value: We must personally do what we can to secure freedom and self-determination, even when risks are connected with this pursuit. One’s own life, however, cannot be up for consideration here, for nothing can justify the surrender of one’s own life. In present-day Europe, this pursuit usually no longer requires sacrificing one’s own life; civil courage is the means of the day. This, at

---

\* Translated from the German by Ginger A. Diekmann. This article was first published in/Dieser Artikel erschien erstmals in: [Tijdschrift voor Humanistiek/Journal for Humanistics](http://Tijdschrift voor Humanistiek/Journal for Humanistics), Nr. 15, Oktober 2003, p. 48-56. A german version of this article is available at my homepage/Eine deutsche Version dieses Artikels steht auf meiner Internetseite [www.schulz-hageleit.de](http://www.schulz-hageleit.de) zur Verfügung.

any rate, is how I understand Arnold Winkelried's role in the battle at Sempach. I would discuss three questions with my students in this regard. First: Is the story of Arnold Winkelried a typical men's story, with no appeal for the majority of women? Are there other stories that better express the desire for freedom? Second: Could the metaphor of "a path to freedom" be ideologically abused, for instance as a demand for a sacrificial death that would nonetheless be futile? And third: Are there seemingly all-powerful persons and institutions in our times as well, against whom strong resistance seems necessary?

Europe has largely freed itself from assumed, undemocratic rule (kings, churches, etc.). Yet the struggle is far from over, and it will never be completely over. What does the path look like for the future? Are there signposts providing clear orientation?

## *2. Human rights as an educational-didactic guide*

If we wish to shape education and instruction in the spirit of Humanism, then human rights must play a considerable role — not just as the content of instruction but also as *experiences* in everyday school life. This is easier said than done, for in didactic terms the topic of human rights is not as simple as it might seem. Discussion with the students about the individual articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights can quickly become boring because nothing exciting is happening. But if one starts with violations against human rights (e.g. torture), one is exposing them, so to speak, to "too much". With this approach the students are confronted with images that are difficult to assimilate, and in the end they are left wondering what action one could take against such abominable injustice. Yet some kind of action of one's own would be crucial, in order to avoid getting stuck in feelings of powerlessness.

At this point I would like to suggest some ways students might internalize human rights, without our wagging our collective raised finger and preaching

morals at them. For one, we should remember that December 10th is *Human Rights Day*. On this day every year articles about the history and current situation of human rights appear in many newspapers; these can be discussed in class in any number of ways. Moreover, with relatively modest preparation one might refer the students to sites on the Internet, where information is provided on Human Rights Day as well as various human rights groups. Working in groups on various key terms is another option. Clearly, the point here is not the sterile imparting of knowledge but an active engagement with a topic that first must win its place in the heart of people.

When students have dealt with the subject several times over the course of their schooling, a long-term learning effect is very likely. In other words, then human rights have become an important and integral part of the public conscience, which is addressed in the very first article of the Declaration of Human Rights of 1948: “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with *reason and conscience* ...”

One danger should be avoided at all costs: the students must not weary of the topic. We should not “overstuff” them with it. In Germany many students grew weary of the topic of National Socialism because they were made to work through it again and again. (I shall return to this problem later.) Though a joy and zest for life are not expressly human rights, they do surface in the text “between the lines” (through key concepts such as peace, the right to rest and leisure and the right to enjoy and participate in cultural life). What is more, they are an integral part of a Humanist way of life, which is what we are concerned with here. Human rights, reason and *joie de vivre* must be interlocked and complement each other; otherwise, the defined aims of Humanism lose some of their power to enlighten.



*The Avenue of Human Rights, Nürnberg*

Of course, in addition to Internet investigations, direct explorations of the topic are possible. All school classes in the Southern German city of Nuremberg should walk along the *Avenue of Human Rights* at least once and — following suitable preparation at school, once again in small groups — closely consider one of the columns.

Each column presents a human right in different languages. The structurally and artistically complete form on view in Nuremberg can, of course, be created on the school playground as well, through much simpler means. Wherever thirty interested participants (or small groups) come together, each could take up one of the thirty articles of the Declaration of Human Rights and give it a material, visible form. After all, the material for the individual columns or stations need not be marble.

I hope these examples help clarify what is meant by “active engagement” with the subject of human rights. The individual teacher can have considerable influence on whether human rights are internalized or whether they are only superficially “checked off” as an obligatory topic.

### 3. “*Bildung*”, *authenticity and trust*

To my mind, a key element of Humanistic education is political awareness among educators and teachers, who do not simply accept the inadequate conditions of their work, but rather fight hard to enhance the status of *Bildung* within our society. *Bildung* is a typically German word, which is difficult to

translate into English. It incorporates several dimensions (general and specialist knowledge, spiritual development, linguistic and social competence, etc.) and should be understood more as a process than as an outcome. *Bildung* is an important Humanist value, and one which is laid down as a human right (Article 26). Things do not look very well for *Bildung* in Germany at the moment. We spend a lot of money on technological prestige objects (e.g. on the Transrapid levitation train), but save in kindergartens, schools and colleges. When classes consist of around 35 students (which is not uncommon in Germany), *Bildung* and education degenerate into a kind of conditioning or proto-military disciplinary training. Should we simply let things continue on this course, or, rather, should we give young persons to understand that Humanism as a theory only makes sense when it is experienced and lived in practice, and when we also show commitment to it?

Whether and how a Humanist educator or scientist shows commitment in public is not at all inconsequential for the educational process. School children and students take keen notice of what is important to him or her. In reaching their own decisions about what direction to take, they need the teacher not only in his or her professional *role* but also as an *individual* and personality with distinctive characteristics. Thus, in my view what matters is not just what we teach (the question of content) and how we teach (the question of methods), but also what we are, what we *embody*. The concept of *habitus*, developed by French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, captures this matter quite well.

Another central concept of Humanist *Bildung* is authenticity; it, too, should be thought of not as an end result but rather as a process of development. A person attempting to establish authenticity in the educational process neither demands intimate confessions nor transgresses his own personal boundaries, but instead simply attempts to connect present-day theory with practical experiences, engage in dialogue as an equal and not suppress his or her own feelings. In

Humanism we have no one above us, but also no one below us. Authenticity can only emerge in an atmosphere of trust and mutual acceptance, which likewise require time and space to develop.

#### *4. A plea for critical examination of one's own past*

The observations made up to now have addressed the present and the future. But what do things look like for the past? Is the past irrelevant for education and instruction that are to be grounded in and inspired by Humanism? On the contrary! One's attitude towards the past and the ability to consider it critically and self-critically are fundamental dimensions of Humanism as the theory for a good, rational life. In the lifetime of every person, every group and every nation there are events which one would rather forget. Germans, in particular, have a great deal to repress, for we are mainly to blame for the two World Wars and the Holocaust. My own parents were dedicated National Socialists, a fact that I find hard to bear. But if I do not manage to face this truth, then the dawning of a better future will also remain closed to me. Whatever we, the generation of teachers, fail to work through and "come to terms with" for ourselves, will be passed on as a heavy burden to the following generation.

It is easy enough to point out the mistakes of other people or to enumerate all the things they did wrong in the past. Our politicians are masters at assigning blame: it is always the others who are at fault. It is much more difficult to critically reflect on one's own past. Every person looks back on traditions that have their dark sides, whether it be industrial enterprises and nations, churches and political parties, or one's own family and home town. Not even Humanism, as a movement of liberation from assumed authority, can claim to have a completely unstained past. For example, the labour movement and socialism were important currents within Humanism, and to some extent still are. Yet no one could rightly argue that their history is without blemish.

The self-critical examination of the past should be not so much an admonition to a younger generation as an achievement of older persons who are horrified by earlier mistakes and thereby make a break with this past. In actual fact, however, this break has not yet occurred in Germany. Today, more than fifty years after the end of the war, the examination of the National Socialist past in Germany is in full swing. In the meantime historiography now has so-called perpetrator research, which has become so extensive that it is difficult for a single person to manage an overall view of it. But the lifting of repression follows later, much later. The historians, too, remained silent a long time, far too long. It was first in 1998, at the 42nd German Historians' Day, that the *examination of one's own guilt* actively and intensively began. The necessary break with the past was substituted with a gradually intensified process of alienation. Which is something, at any rate.

A Humanist Europe would do well not only to celebrate itself, but also to critically engage with its own pasts. The terrible aspects of the past must not be suppressed; they must be worked through and integrated. Auschwitz was a European event initiated by Germans that belongs to our history just as much as Beethoven and human rights. The United States of America, once the most important power for freedom and democracy, at present propagates little more than self-righteousness and its own claims to power. This is something "we" should distance ourselves from.

##### *5. The relationship to the churches: Cooperation and dissociation*

Caution is necessary with respect to the churches as well, which like to recommend themselves in the public realm as the protector of human rights and Humanistic values. With the observations of the previous section in mind, I do think that the churches have enough to do with their own past, and would just like to recall here that *conscience*, which we already encountered in Article 1 of the Declaration of Human Rights ("All human beings ... are endowed with

reason and conscience ...”), is not an invention of Christian churches but rather has its roots in pre-Christian antiquity. Moreover, Christian congregations applied the concept much less to fellow human beings than to God and the “right” faith. From a Humanist point of view this is a dubious stance. Nobody can claim to have the “right” faith.

Certainly there is a specifically Christian *caritas*, to which no Humanist will object, for sensible reasons. Jesus of course preached (and I quote here in full agreement) that one should be concerned less with “the splinter in your brother’s eye” and more with “the wooden beam in your own eye” (Mt 7.1–5). In another context, Jesus warned that he who believes he is without “sin” should throw the first stone at the adulteress (Jn 8.1–11). Yet turning conscience into matters of the right faith, prayer and worship started even with the Apostles (cf. text locations in the Bible with the word *conscience*), a development which had and continues to have disastrous consequences in power politics: If someone thinks he represents God and the “right” faith, then he no longer needs to give much thought to his conscience with respect to other people. This position is exactly where U.S. President Bush and the Christian fundamentalists go astray, and it should serve as a warning to us, the Humanists in Europe.

Cooperation with churches and above all with individual believers is of course possible in certain relevant areas. I would like to see a cooperative, tolerant coexistence of different *Weltanschauungen* in the schools as well, without having what is one’s own and demarcations lost in the process. Yet we are still a long way off from true pluralism. The churches, particularly those in Germany, enjoy tremendous privileges, ones which a Humanist can only dream of. This will have to change in future.

## 6. *Taking the unconscious into account*

“To be able to dream ...”: with this catchphrase we have entered a terrain that seems a bit fishy to many Humanists. This terrain is the unconscious, which influences our conscious thoughts and actions without our even noticing it. It expresses itself in various ways: in pathological contexts as neurosis or psychosis, and among “healthy” and “entirely normal” people as dreams, fantasy and desire, as unclear feelings and confused thoughts, as obsessions and Freudian slips, and many other symptoms. When something is painfully and unbearably embarrassing for us, we must “repress” it so that we can continue to live at least somewhat balanced lives. Traumatic events, particularly those experienced during childhood (war, flight, loss of family members, mortal fear, etc.), cannot be recounted. Their effects are exerted subliminally and are often transferred from one generation to the next, as we know from Holocaust victims.

The unconscious is made conscious through psychoanalytic therapy. The notion that there is an unconscious at all has in the meantime been largely confirmed through neurophysiologic brain research. Sigmund Freud (1856–1939) did not discover the unconscious, but he did systematically examine and describe it. He summed up his scientific and therapeutic agenda in the sentence “Where id was, there ego shall be.”\* The “id”, or “it”, is the largely unconscious drives and passions. “Ego” is conscious perceiving, thinking and decision-making. I believe that we should broaden Freud’s agenda and extend it to the superego: that is, “Where superego was, there ego shall be.” The superego is conscience, morality, a sense of guilt, self-supervision. Though there are people who suffer through their passions (“id”), there are also people whose superego is pathologically severe, denying them every enjoyment in life. Religious people often suffer from such exaggerated feelings of guilt; they need God to prevent them from

---

\* Sigmund Freud, *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, ed. and trans. James Strachey, New York: Norton, 1965, end of the thirty-first lecture. From the German: “Wo Es war, soll Ich werden.” Sigmund Freud, *Neue Folge der Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse* (1932/33), Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1991.

becoming overcome by these feelings. But this is no path or solution for Humanism.

The unconscious plays a role not only in individuals but also in groups, particularly when they stick tightly together and form a “collective subject”. In earlier historiography, for instance, women were hardly ever mentioned. They either were not perceived by men or were pushed aside as completely unimportant. “Men make history” was one slogan of European historiography in the nineteenth century. Or, put more simply: Women were the unconscious of male historiography. In the meantime there is now a bewildering array of research on women and gender, which also compels men to reflect on the one-sidedness of their thoughts and actions, that is, to make it conscious. This is a good example of the dynamics of the unconscious becoming conscious. Often it is “only” certain aspects of a situation that are unconscious, for instance its emotional significance. We sometimes say in our day-to-day lives, “I never thought of that.” That is an indication of the existence of the unconscious.

The unconscious constitutes a special problem for Humanism because it calls the monopoly of reason into question. I have absolutely nothing against reason, and as a Humanist I will continue to do what I can to see that the voice of reason increasingly wins the day, which, incidentally, would be completely in line with Freud, who said, “There is no appeal to a court above that of reason.”\* But that does nothing to change the fact that all people, including Humanists, have their irrational sides and that the history of humankind on the whole has not been an event of reason. If all Humanists were indeed reasonable, then there would be no smokers among us, for example, because smoking damages health and is,

---

\* Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, trans. W. D. Robson-Scott, rev. and ed. James Strachey, New York: Doubleday (Anchor), 1964, chap. 5, p. 43. From the German: “Es gibt keine Instanz über der Vernunft.” Sigmund Freud, *Die Zukunft einer Illusion* (1927), Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag.

therefore, “irrational”.\* We would also have to erase all visions and utopias from our thoughts, for according to the experiences of history we now look back on these are quite unrealistic and thus also irrational. Like religious believers, I too have an emotional yearning for peace, justice and deliverance, which is “irrational” in so far as by and large it can never be fulfilled. Unlike religious believers, I do not then turn to God, but instead attempt first to interest society in achieving more justice and peace, second to make progress through my own efforts, and third to simply rid myself of the hope for final deliverance. The notion of a paradise in the next world, where all my wishes will supposedly be fulfilled, has become a meaningless construct for me.

The term “civil religion” (e.g. capitalism as the only possible way of life, with its department stores as temples) hints at how much religion still unconsciously remains in our new ways of life.

In my view, Humanism is travelling down the wrong path when, in its struggle against religious obscurantism and fanaticism, it simultaneously denies its own unconscious. The rationality of Humanism calls for an acceptance of the unconscious, and we must learn to establish a relationship with it. Helpful approaches in forming this relationship are art, literature and music, among other things, because they rely less on understanding and conscious cognition and more on emotion, sympathy, mood and the unconscious or preconscious. Is it possible to explain why one loves particular melodies or artworks more than anything else? Well, yes, some elements of such love perhaps could be explained rationally, but on the whole it remains somewhat of a mystery, and this is surely for the best. The sixth proposition of the Amsterdam Declaration 2002 begins with these words: “Humanism values artistic creativity and imagination and recognises the transforming power of art.” In line with my

---

\* The Editor asked me to look for another example, so I inserted in the final version: If all humanists were fully „rational“ there would be nobody among us with an unrequited affection.

remarks here, the next sentence might read: “The transforming power of art consists not least in getting closer to our unconscious and thereby overcoming the sterility of a rationalized society.”

Counterpoints to the sixth proposition of the Amsterdam Declaration are the statements about science and research, which I also agree with wholeheartedly. I must, however, place a question mark after the introductory sentence of the second proposition, “Humanism is rational.” If the sentence means that the solution of world problems is dependent on human thought and action and not on divine intervention, then I agree. If, however, the sentence means that Humanists are “rational” whereas other people, particularly those who are religious, are “irrational”, then to my mind the proposition is a dubious division of humanity that is founded on an exclusion or underestimation of our own unconscious. It is my impression that many Humanists think of suspect, irrational *Schwärmerei* when they hear the word “unconscious”. But just the opposite is true. I would not be able to express myself intelligibly in Noordwijkerhout. A person who addresses the unconscious aims not to cultivate suspect, irrational *Schwärmerei* but rather to shed light on it and thereby integrate it into the ego. A problem therefore arises when someone believes he no longer needs such enlightenment at all.

*7. On the path to a European culture of dialogue: The significance of the unconscious in instruction and education*

In order to be able to evaluate the significance of the unconscious in instruction and education, it is useful to differentiate between two dimensions or levels: on the one hand, the level of content and themes (the *what*), and on the other, the level of relationships and communication structures (the *how*).

On the level of content and themes, the task is relatively easy to determine. It is possible and time and again necessary to address *repressions* in history and

politics. For instance, all of Europe is talking about how the planned war against Iraq has a good deal to do with oil and supremacy. In the United States itself only a noble goal is cited: that is, freeing the world of an evil dictator. As is well known, in Germany there was intense resistance to research showing that the *Wehrmacht*, and not just the SS, committed major crimes. Not just the crimes themselves but also the resistance to the truth could and should be topics of instruction. Sadly, there are so many examples of the suppression of truth that further explanation on this point is unnecessary.

It becomes much more difficult, however, when we turn from content to the communication structures in which we ourselves are embedded. Instruction and education are neither psychoanalysis nor group dynamics. They are directed less at the unconscious of the participants than at *the conscious powers of the learners* which are to be strengthened (ability, knowledge, will, thought, action). Nonetheless, the unconscious exerts a strong influence, either as a source of stimulus for free thought and expression or as a limitation and obstruction.

This becomes quite evident when we consider the teacher as an individual. When a teacher is troubled about unresolved problems in his life, this effects his instruction in one way or another. When he finds certain topics unpleasant or embarrassing — for whatever reason — then he cannot handle them in class in an open and stimulating way. Let us consider, for example, that someone is having difficulties with his sexual identity. This no doubt interferes with the freedom of his discussions with young students, who need support in the search for their own sexual identity. The same can be said for historico-political topics. German teachers who as children loved and admired their grandfather as an officer in the *Wehrmacht* will in history lessons either skip over the crimes of the *Wehrmacht* or treat them such that the pleasant memory of the grandfather is not damaged too much in the process.

On the other hand, teachers who have resolved their conflicts and are content with themselves are a blessing for their students. Their courage to face life, their laughter, optimism and ability to build relationships are communicated to the students. The whole debate about worth is superfluous with people who have a feeling of self-worth and thus can convey to others a feeling of being worthy and important.

In making these observations on the teacher as an individual, I do not intend to imply that teachers and educators have to be exemplary people who have no problems of their own. Such people do not exist. I only wish to point to the necessity for self-enlightenment among Humanist teachers, a process that should be as far-reaching as possible, and one which would also substantially differentiate them from their colleagues in the religions. In religious faith the unconscious is *acted out*. In Humanism the unconscious is *reflected on*. This difference plays a very important role in my own personal identity as a Humanist.

The trusting and open atmosphere of dialogue which the teacher creates in the classroom ought to come into its own in society generally as a *culture of dialogue*; unfortunately, we have not come very far in this respect. In the economy and in television, two realms that continually influence our behaviour, the main concerns are almost always with representing oneself to advantage and successfully selling the product at hand. Scientists sell themselves as well. Politics is show business. Advertising is the art of suggestion, which uses extremely sophisticated means to appeal to more or less unconscious pulsional desires. University learning threatens to dilapidate into the collection of credit points, somewhat like the collection of trading stamps at the baker's. There is neither time nor space for lengthier discussions, ones that even make room for contemplative silence and waiting. Yet, in my opinion, important tasks for European Humanism and its teaching methods lie precisely in these areas. One

characteristic of a culture of dialogue is the courage to address things that are mostly skirted around in embarrassment; another characteristic is the strength to listen to these things as well, and not immediately and aggressively shove them aside. Art and literature are integral parts of such a culture of dialogue. Science could become better integrated in this way when it learns to exceed its own specialist boundaries, reflect on its special responsibilities and communicate with non-scientists. A culture of dialogue is active tolerance that interferes when human rights are violated or personal boundaries are crossed.

After 1945 German society was dominated by the silence and concealments of the perpetrators. This did a great deal of damage to the subsequent generation, the one to which I belong. We missed out on the constructive experience of trusting and stimulating discussion. It is precisely for this reason that I demand it now, for the future. We no longer need pronouncements “from above”; we need dialogue, discussion and tolerance “at eye level”. Religions are attractive because they appeal to fantasies of omnipotence as well as of complete security and because they satisfy the need for magic. As Humanists we counter this attractiveness with enlightenment and a strengthening of the human capacity for building relationships. (I am not calling the personal integrity of religious teachers and other religious people into question here. The point here is not about individual, personal qualities, but rather about societal structures.) As German educationist Hartmut von Hentig once wrote, summing up the responsibilities of Humanist education: “Facts need explaining, people need strengthening.”\*

Part of my approach to promoting dialogue in my teaching at the university is that I now and then consciously “switch” from the level of content to the level of communication. For example, I might notice that a discussion, such as one about

---

Which is a translation of the title of one of his books: Hartmut von Hentig, *Die Menschen stärken, die Sachen klären. Ein Plädoyer für die Wiederherstellung der Aufklärung*, Stuttgart: Reclam, 1985.

guilt and repression in history, is not materialising and that I am “balancing out” the students’ silence by talking more. This development is unproductive for teaching and learning. If there is no change in the situation, I have to “switch” and ask what is wrong: Do you find the topic boring? Are you afraid of my criticism? Are you tired? Interestingly enough, quite often such queries have revealed that the cause of silence does not lie with me, but rather in the fear of competition with fellow students who boast and intimidate others with their knowledge. Fear is a huge obstruction to the development of a Humanist culture of dialogue. This is another aspect which we should consider: How must learning be organised so that it is associated with as little fear as possible? (It probably is impossible to completely avoid performance anxiety.)

Another example from my own experience: part of the semester work for my course *Einführung in das geschichtliche und geschichtsdidaktische Denken*\* is to write a report on the class meetings themselves. In this report a student is to recapitulate the content matter covered over the course (topics, theses, literature, etc.), but also to give an opinion on the “atmosphere” in the class, a section that may be entirely subjective. In explanation of this peculiarity I tell the students that teachers also have to pay attention to what mood their class is in, because successful learning is not very likely when there are too many internal tensions. Increased attention to moods, the atmosphere of discussion and the learning climate does not decipher the unconscious, but it also does not shut it out hermeneutically. When further enlightenment is needed, professional help can be obtained (e.g. supervision). This, too, is Humanism as it is lived. With Humanism we are always at the beginning.

#### 8. *Breaking through barriers, both within and without*

Let us briefly return to Arnold Winkelried, whose story we took up in the first section as a symbol or metaphor for our argumentation. Who or what actually

---

\* Which translates roughly as “Introduction to historiographic approaches and teaching methods”. — Trans.

constitutes the “enemy frontline” that we now should break through, if it no longer is — as in Winkelried’s time — the Austrians? Every reader will immediately think of several persons or groups of people who deem their own lifestyle more important than the rights of other people, and who even advocate war on the basis of threadbare pretexts. These persons, groups of people and institutions do indeed constitute an *external front*, or barrier, against which we must defend ourselves as energetically as possible. But that is not all, for in addition to this external front there is an *internal front* that exists in everyday life and within ourselves, without our always noticing it. An example: when I sit evenings before the television, relaxing after a day of work, I tend to get caught up in films showing violent scenes. I know and I frequently notice that war and violence inwardly fascinate me. But I also know that this fascination (most likely formed in childhood) is highly dangerous and that other people have no conscious control over it. Sympathy for military power and violent intervention is unconscious and widely shared. Many people think that if “evil” is to be destroyed one must really give it a good beating. But what is and who is “the evil”? Have not we in the West manufactured and delivered the very weapons which we now fear? Don’t we now have to fight the insane militarization of the world before our very own door? Humanism is not blind pacifism, for sometimes violence does become necessary. To the extent at all possible, however, Humanism abstains from externalising projections of violence, instead starting out with criticism within its own camp.

In the current situation (I am writing in February 2003) we need not only a “path” to freedom, but also truth and peace. Of course, we must continue our efforts to break up the frontline of war advocates; but we must also struggle against the inner temptation to sympathise with violence. If we stop thinking in alternative ways, Humanism will be lost. The Humanist alternative in our own minds is, after all, the “path” to freedom.

## References

Freud, Sigmund. *The Future of an Illusion* (1927). Trans. W. D. Robson-Scott. Rev. and ed. James Strachey. New York: Doubleday (Anchor), 1964.

Freud, Sigmund. *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (1932/33). Ed. and trans. James Strachey. New York: Norton, 1965.

Hentig, Hartmut von. *Die Menschen stärken, die Sachen klären. Ein Plädoyer für die Wiederherstellung der Aufklärung*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1985.

### *Some publications by Peter Schulz-Hageleit on this topic:*

*Leben in Deutschland. Geschichtsanalytische Reflexionen*. 3 vols. (vol. 1: 1900–1950; vol. 2: 1945–1995; vol. 3: Gegenwart und Zukunft). Paffenweiler, Germany: Centaurus-Verlag, 1994–1998.

*Lebensstrom und Rationalität. Humanismus in Zeiten des Krieges* (Sonderheft 1 of the journal *humanismus aktuell*). Berlin: Humanistischer Verband, 1999.

*Am "Jungbrunnen" des Lebens. Eckwerte humanistischen Denkens*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag, 2002.

### **Note:**

This article was first published in/Dieser Artikel erschien erstmals in: [Tijdschrift voor Humanistiek/Journal for Humanistics](#), Nr. 15, Oktober 2003, p. 48-56.

A german version of this article is available at my homepage/Eine deutsche Version dieses Artikels steht auf meiner Internetseite zur Verfügung:

[www.schulz-hageleit.de/psh\\_materialien/Schulz\\_Hageleit\\_Der\\_Freiheit\\_eine\\_Gasse.pdf](http://www.schulz-hageleit.de/psh_materialien/Schulz_Hageleit_Der_Freiheit_eine_Gasse.pdf)