DIGNITY

Safeguarding of children and young people

Published by:
Don Bosco Youth-Net ivzw

DIGNITY

Safeguarding of children and young people

Published by:
Don Bosco Youth-Net ivzw

Colophone

This is a publication of Don Bosco Youth-Net ivzw. Don Bosco Youth-Net ivzw is an international network of Salesian youth work offices and youth organisations which work in the style of Don Bosco.

This publication is realised with the support of the European Youth Foundation of the Council of Europe.

Edited by:
Rein Meus

Acknowledgements:
Roger Burggraeve
James Robert Gardner
Stefan Stöhr
Lieve Van Aerschot
Katharina Jochem
The Irish Salesian Province

Proof reading:
James Robert Gardner & Patrick Kerridge

Graphic design & layout:
Don Bosco Kommunikation GmbH, Munich

Table of contents

Introduction

DIGNITY is a publication to support youth workers in ensuring safeguarding of children and young people in intercultural settings of youth work.

Safeguarding is a subject of growing importance in youth work. It deals with the subject of protecting children and young people against various forms of abuse. As such it is closely connected to Human Rights Education: each form of abuse is a violation of the Universal declaration of Human Rights. This subject is in many youth organizations still taboo. However, we need to be aware that in every type of organised youth work we can be confronted with cases of abuse.

Unfortunately there are not many resource materials available for youth workers to deal with this issue. Don Bosco Youth-Net has experience of implementing safeguarding in its activities. Through this publication we want to share this good practice with other youth work organizations, by offering a tool to support the development of safeguarding in their organizations and to create awareness on the topic of safeguarding in working with children and young people.

The book exists of three parts: In the first part we research the ethical foundations of safeguarding in working with youth. The second compares the human rights with the Preventive System of Don Bosco and gives impulses for safeguarding in youth work praxis. The third part offers some practical input on how to deal with safeguarding in youth work organizations.

Part 1 – Ethical foundations

Safeguarding is all about ethical conduct when working with young people. As culture is a strong determining factor of what is perceived as ethical or not, the main challenges in intercultural youth work are the intercultural differences in ethical conduct. Therefore it is important to have a universal understanding of the ethical foundations in working with youth. The article *The Vulnerable Mastership of Children and Adolescents* of Roger Burggraeve offers this universal understanding.

Part II – Human Rights and preventive system

The Preventive System of Don Bosco from the 19th centurary and the human rights declared in 1948 are much closer than we think. Both use different language, but the content and the goals are very much similar and as such they are both supporting each other. In his article *Human Rights and Don Bosco's Preventive System* Stefan Stoehr compares the 30 articles of the Universal declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) with ideas of Don Bosco rooting in his prevention system.

Part III – Youth work praxis

In her article *Safeguarding and its intercultural challenges… dream or nightmare?,* Lieve Van Aerschot starts from her experiences as an international trainer in youth work to raise questions on how safeguarding is challenged in an intercultural setting.

Building awareness on safeguarding in youth organizations gives practical information on how to develop an own safeguarding strategy inside a youth work organization. This can be helpful both for a local organization, as for an international organization. The article is based on the unpublished policy paper *Child Protection Policy of the Irish Salesian Province,* and has been edited by James Robert Gardner.

Over the chapters DIGNITY deals with subjects like 'safeguarding, prevention and the Universal declaration of Human Rights', 'the definition of abuse', 'cultural differences in perception of safeguarding', 'good practices', 'methods for training', 'safe communication', and 'installing organizational procedures on safeguarding'. Because of the nature of our activities, we focus on safeguarding in intercultural settings. However, we are convinced that the book can be used in local settings as well.

Part 1 – Ethical foundations

The Vulnerable Mastership of Children and Adolescents

In search with Emmanuel Levinas of the ethical foundations for a safeguarding and liberating education towards responsibility

Introduction

In this essay both the vulnerability as well as the strength of minors, children and adolescents form the starting point for a reflection on the ethical foundations of education. The expression 'vulnerable children and adolescents' usually makes one think of the concrete situations they find themselves in, and likewise of certain characteristics and behaviours by which they are typified.[1] Without minimising this factual vulnerability, we search indeed for a deeper, more essential vulnerability that is inherent in every child, in every adolescent. Inspired by the thought of the Jewish philosopher, Emmanuel Levinas (1905-1995)[2] we would like to demonstrate how this principal

[1] We mostly make use of the expression 'children and adolescents' but also regularly of the term 'minors', since we intend to discuss children and adolescents who are minors. Insofar as they fall under the pedagogical responsibility of adults, we shall at times make use of the Latin term 'educandus': the one who has to be educated.

[2] The cited studies of Levinas are listed below in alphabetical order. Citations in our text are indicated with an abbreviation of the original French edition, along with the cited page or pages. For the literal quotations the cited page from the available English translation is indicated after the forward slash (/). Abbreviations used: **AE**: *Autrement qu'être ou au-delà de l'essence*, La Haye, Nijhoff, 1974. [English translation (ET): *Otherwise than Being or Beyond Essence*, translated by A. Lingis, The Hague/Boston/London, Nijhoff (Kluwer), 1981.]; **AS**: *Autrement que savoir* (Interventions by Levinas in the discussions and *Débat général*), Paris, Osiris, 1988; **AV**: *L'au-delà du verset. Lectures et discours talmudiques*, Paris, Minuit, 1982. [ET: *Beyond the Verse. Talmudic Readings and Lectures*, translated by G.D. Mole, Bloomington & Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1994.]; **CPP**: *Collected Philosophical Papers*, translated by A. Lingis. Dordrecht/Boston/Lancaster, Kluwer/Nijhoff, 1987; **DL**: *Difficile Liberté. Essais sur le Judaïsme*, Paris, Albin Michel, 1976 (2nd ed.). [ET: *Difficult Freedom. Essays on Judaism*, translated by S. Hand. Baltimore, The John Hopkins University Press, 1990.]; **DVI**: *De Dieu qui vient à l'idée*, Paris, Vrin, 1982. [ET: *Of God Who Comes to* Mind, translated by B. Bergo, Stanford, University Press, 1998; **EFP**: "Entretiens", in F. POIRIÉ, *Emmanuel Lévinas. Qui êtes-vous?*, Lyon, La Manufacture, 1987, pp. 62-136. [ET: "Interview with François Poirié," in **IRB**, pp. 23-83 ;]; **EI**: *Éthique et Infini. Dialogues avec Philippe Nemo*, Paris, Fayard & France Culture, 1982. [ET: *Ethics and Infinity. Conversations with Philippe Nemo*, translated by R.A. Cohen, Pittsburgh, Duquesne University Press, 1985.]; **EN**: *Entre nous. Essais sur le penser-à-l'autre*, Paris, Grasset 1991. [ET: *Entre nous. Thinking-of-the-Other*, translated by M.B. Smith and B. Harshav, London/New York, Continuum, 2006]; **HAH**: *Humanisme de l'autre homme*, Montpellier, Fata Morgana, 1972. 1972. [ET: *Humanism of the Other*, translated by N. Poller, Urbana & Chicago, University of Illinois Press, 2006.]; **HN**: *A l'heure des nations. Lectures talmudiques, essays et entretiens*, Parais, Minuit, 1988. [ET: *In the Time of Nations*, translated by M.B. Smith, Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1994.]; **HS**: *Hors sujet*, Montpellier, Fata Morgana, 1987. [ET: *Outside the Subject*, translated by M.B. Smith, London, Athlone, 1993.]; **IRB**: J. Robbins (ed.), *Is It Righteous to Be? Interviews with Emmanuel Levinas*, Stanford (CA), Stanford University Press, 2001; **LC**: "Liberté et commandement", Montpellier, Fata Morgana, 1994. [ET: "Freedom and Command," *in*.**CPP**, pp. 15-45.]; **NLT**: *Nouvelles lectures*

vulnerability sets us on the tracks to the ethical foundation of every form of educative responsibility. Thus it will be made clear how this responsibility stands or falls with the institution of the prohibition against violence and abuse of power. We shall call this the aspect of 'safeguarding'. At the same time, on the basis of the equally essential strength of the face of the other, the ethical mastership of the minor will be made clear. Thanks then to this mastership the positive dynamism of pedagogical responsibility can be developed, up to the radical idea that education likewise implies a responsibility for the responsibility of adolescents and children, both for themselves as well as for others, and indeed based on their stature and in accordance with their growth. In short, the concept of a multi-faceted education will thus unfold wherein not only safeguarding but also liberation for freedom and responsibility will be given their indispensable place.

1. The radical otherness of children and adolescents

In order to focus on the essential ethical vulnerability of children and adolescents, we start from Levinas' general insights regarding the alterity of the other. Indeed, we encounter children and adolescents as 'others' and in and through their alterity they appeal to us towards responsibility.

1. They surpass time and again our impressions

The 'I', that by means of its capabilities and knowledge draws the world to itself (cf. infra), is as it where interrupted by the epiphany of the other, precisely the manifests itself as radically different. Levinas calls it the 'radical fact' or 'pure experience' (TI 39/67): "a traumatism of astonishment' (TI 46/73). The other presents itself to me as a 'withdrawing' and 'transcending movement', and this not only factually and temporarily but essentially and definitively. The other derives its meaning not integrally and wholly from the world surrounding it, nor from evolution, history, a system of totality. The other surpasses all historical, sociological, psychological and cultural origin of meaning. The other presents itself as the unique one, that radically goes beyond all belongingness to kind, race, family, tribe, ethnicity and people – which already implies a condemnation of all racism (VA 98/110). The other is already infinitely more than the

talmudiques, Paris, Minuit, 1996. [ET: *New Talmudic Readings*, translated by R.A. Cohen, Pittsburgh, Duquesne University Press, 2000.]; **NP**: *Noms Propres*, Montpellier, Fata Morgana, 1976. [ET: *Proper Names*, translated by M.B. Smith. Stanford, University Press, 1996.]; **NTR**: *Nine Talmudic Readings*, translated by A. Aronowicz, Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1990; **PM**: "The Paradox of Morality" (interview with T. Wright, P. Hugues, A. Analy), in R. Bernasconi & D. Wood (eds.), *The Provocation of Levinas. Rethinking the Other*, London, Routledge, 1988, pp. 168-180; **QLT**: *Quatre Lectures talmudiques*, Paris, Minuit, 1968. [ET: "Four Talmudic Readings", in **NTR**, pp. 1-88.] ;**TA**: *Le temps et l'autre*, Montpellier, Fata Morgana, 1979 (2nd ed.). [ET: *Time and the Other*, translated by R.A. Cohen, Pittsburgh, Duquesne University Press, 1987.]; **TI**: *Totalité et Infini. Essai sur l'extériorité*, La Haye, Nijhoff, 1961. [ET: *Totality and Infinity An Essay on Exteriority*, translated by A. Lingis, The Hague/Boston/London, Nijhoff, 1979.]; **VA**: "La vocation de l'autre" (interview with E. Hirsch), in: E. HIRSCH, *Racismes. L'autre et son visage*, Paris, Cerf, 1988, p. 89-102. [ET: in **IRB**, pp. 105-113.].

images, photographs, representations, evocations and interpretations that I design or am able to design. Of course the other is visible; of course the other appears and evokes all sorts of impressions, images and representations, whereby the other is describable. Of course we can come to know much about the other on the basis of what the other allows to be seen somatically, psychologically and sociologically. But the other is always more, or rather different than and irreducible to its photograph, and this not only coincidentally or factually, but in principle: the other can never be adequately represented and contained in one or the other image. I can never encase the other in or equate the other with its graphic form (EI 89-90/85-86). Even though the other has its own physiognomy and character, and thus a recognisable estimable feature, still its face precisely consists in breaking through and surpassing its own image and appearance time and again. In so doing the other essentially escapes all typology, characterology, diagnosis and classification, in short all attempts at knowing and understanding the other totally. The other makes all curiosity ridiculous (AE 113-114/ 90-91). This implies that the other is not constituted by me as a supplement to my deficiency, and likewise not as my mirror image, alter-ego or 're-issue of myself' (TA 75/83/). In short, 'the other is invisible', as Levinas expresses it provocatively (TI 4/34). The face continually belies its own countenance, meaning to say its own visibility and describableness. It is literally '*retraite*' or '*anachoresis*', withdrawal. Its epiphany is always a breaking through and a confounding of this epiphany, whereby the other always remains enigmatic and thereby precisely intrudes as the irreducible one, the separate and different, the foreigner, in short, as the pre-eminently different or as radical alterity.

If we relate this to children and adolescents, than this means that they definitely have a biologically determined origin, but also that they transcend this origin infinitely. The minor always transcends its own past and context. They never coincide with them. Children or adolescents never coincide with their appearance, their family, psychology, sociology. They are always different from what their background appears to be or would lead us to suspect. They do not only remain a mystery factually but also principally. In this aspect the minor as other is – no matter how visible or tangible – invisible. That means that minors are irreducible to their tangible or descriptive characteristics. Sociology, psychology and other human sciences can most certainly deliver a contribution to 'define' the minor, but the minor will never coincide with these descriptions. (Later on we will see how on the ethical level the minor never *may* be reduced to these descriptions). A child or adolescent will always escape and show him or herself different than 'foreseen'. They will continue to surprise their educators as the ones who are ultimately new.

1.2. Our masters who teach us

This rather negative description of the alterity of the other, however, has a clearly positive meaning. The basis for its in-visibility, un-knowability and un-predictability is indeed its 'manifestation of the *kath'auto*' (TI 37/65). The face breaks through its form in order to show itself out of itself. It is pure and simple 'expression' (LC 41/20). This self-expression occurs in a concrete manner in the word and glance of the face. The

other is the one who looks at me straight in the eye and also directly addresses me: we stand '*face-à-face*' before each other. Its glance and word make it present without any detours or intermediary stages. I need not reason out, starting from the fact that a glance or word comes toward me, in order to decide that someone lies behind this expression. The word and the glance of the other make it immediately, ineluctably and almost obtrusively present (TI 35-36/64-65). Moreover, the primary, most fundamental content or message of its self-expression is nothing else than the essential quality of the other, namely its absolute alterity and irreducibility. It is not *what* the face expresses that is of importance here, but *that* it expresses itself. The *fact* of its expression is the announcement of its very presence, of its appearance *as* other, whatever the content of its expression may be (TI 170/196).

In terms of children and adolescents this means that they can never be objects for their educators. They will always be a face that speaks directly to them. The minor is not an object, but a subject: someone who gazes at me, affects me and speaks to me with the authority of an other who comes to me. In this respect a child or an adolescent is always the one who literally comes to us: he or she comes from elsewhere, from itself – its alterity – as someone who calls into question our power (what this means ethically, will be explained below). Maybe we can even say that a minor is 'strong as death', in the sense that through its gaze and (often wordless) word, it breaks into our existence and from within its alterity addresses us directly. A child or an adolescent is an ultimate heteronomous experience that we have not foreseen or could not predict. We therefore have no control over it. Education is always again an experience that comes from the other – the child, the adolescent – who addresses us. As radical others, children and adolescents not only have a voice, but – by means of their appearing before us – they are voice: someone who by means of one's very epiphany speaks to us. We can call this the strong dimension of the face of minors as other.

That is also why Levinas labels the expression of the other as *teaching*, that in no way whatsoever can be reduced to one or the other form of (Socratic) maieutics or midwifery, that only brings out that which has already been contained therein. The expression of the face comes to me 'from elsewhere' and introduces more into myself than what I already contain slumbering within me, namely the real 'message' or 'revelation' of the presence of the other (TI 22/51): "the absolutely new is the other" (TI 194/219). In that sense Levinas can say that the other is my *master*, who by means of its very appearance teaches me about its irreducible alterity, without my ever having already contained this teaching within the depths of my being or my being able to let it simmer up from within me. I cannot foresee nor predict the word of revelation of the face; I do not have it at hand in any way whatsoever. I am not the one who designs, but the one who receives, who listens, and by means of listening obeys (TI 41/69, 73/99).

Continuing in this line we can say that children and adolescents are elevated above us, not because they are more powerful, but because as irreducible others they are our masters and teachers. Mostly we assume that they are lesser than us, literally 'minors', precisely because they are small(er) and vulnerable. But thanks to Levinas it becomes clear how we are in an asymmetrical relationship to minors, in the sense that minors

are more than us, and we are less than them. We do not first teach and instruct children and adolescents. First they have to speak to us and teach us. Every educational relationship has therefore to begin – every time again – with a form of humility and obedience to the minor as our teacher. We are talking here about a different learning from what in Greek tradition is called self-knowledge: "know yourself" ("gnothi seauton"). In relationship to minors, as in every relationship to the other, I do not learn by descending into myself and discovering in my inner most being wisdom over all things, but by going out of myself and being open for the other as the other reveals him or herself to me. The relationship to the child or the adolescent as the ultimate other is no autonomous but a heteronomous happening that rests on the awareness of my not-knowing. In the relationship to the minor I am not the one who designs and determines, but the one who has to receive and accept what the other 'teaches' me. In this respect the alterity of the minor as the starting point for my learning is not only exterior, but also anterior and superior. As radical other the minor brings me towards laying down all pretension and to approach her or him with a certain meekness, so that the child or the adolescent can in all liberty reveal its alterity to me, and this on the basis of the authority of this alterity.

In this way, Levinas turns around the usual, traditional vision on education. It is not in the first place the educators who pass on their insights, wisdom and convictions to the learning minor. It is the child or the adolescent itself that comes first in education: the radical priority of the other: "after You" (AE 150/117). The minor who speaks, and who learns to speak, is and becomes the first teacher of the teacher, whether the latter is a parent or a (professional) educator. As radical other the minor establishes its mastership in education and learning. In this way the child or the adolescent also establishes the being-disciple of educators, and this not just for once, but time and again.

2. The dynamics of the educational face-to-face as ethical crisis

With this turning around of mastership in education, we arrive at the ethical relationship to children and adolescents. For they do not only reveal their mastership in terms of their radical alterity, but through their alterity they appeal to us to recognise, respect and enhance this alterity. Here we come to the content of the educational responsibility for minors. For the further explication of the concrete content of the ethical relationship to children and adolescents, we return once again to the general insight of Levinas about the appeal to responsibility that comes to us in through the face of the other.

2.1. The vulnerability of children and adolescents

Upon closer inspection, the mastership that ensues from the alterity of the face appears to be a very exceptional mastership, namely a mastership that rests on the vulnerability of the other whereby the mastership of the face becomes precisely an ethical mastership. The face, according to Levinas, is the remarkable fact that a being touches me, not in the indicative but in the imperative (LC 44/21).

In order to understand how this all works out, we must reflect more in depth on the phenomenology of the appearance, or rather the non-appearance, or epiphany of the other, which we have begun above. The strong alterity of the face, insofar as it presents itself as its irreducibility to one or the other 'countenance', photograph or representation, has a reverse side, namely an extreme vulnerability that Levinas also calls "strangeness-destitution" (*l'étrangeté-misère*) (TI 47/75) or the 'nudity of the face' (EI 90/86). As a *countenance* the other is vulnerable and it can quite easily be reduced to its appearance, its social position and environment, its accomplishments, its health and clinical picture. As 'in-visible', that is as being irreducible to its face, the other appears by not appearing. In other words, it appears in a paradoxical manner as the displaced person, the widow, the orphan, the foreigner, in short as the one who does not belong in my organised world – a world that I precisely begin to organise as 'my world' on the basis of my natural 'care for myself'. The other eludes not only my providence, it also falls outside of it; it literally falls off the boat. It finds itself literally in 'extra-territoriality' and 'u-topia' or 'non-place'. Precisely for that reason is the face so vulnerable.

It is indeed the appearance of the face as *countenance* that invites me, as it were, to reduce the other to its countenance. On the basis of my perception – whether spontaneous or permeated by method – 'vision' in the literal sense of the word – I strive to grasp the other in an image and to keep it in my sights. And this perception takes place not out of 'contemplative' consideration that wishes only to respectfully 'mirror' the other or 'let it be seen,' but according to self-interested concerns. When I thus succeed in discovering or 'dis-closing' the other person, I can also know how I can interact with her, and how I can include her in the realisation of my autonomy and right to freedom. Hence the face appears as pre-eminently vulnerable, in so far as it can be reduced – based on its appearing and on the basis of my perception – precisely to its countenance, its visibility.

In an exceptional way, this idea of the vulnerability of the face is applicable to children and adolescents precisely because they find themselves in the position of 'minors': they are on the path to adulthood whereby they – certainly as children, but also even as adolescents – are very much dependent on adults, parents and educators who take care of them, both materially as well as relationally, socially and pedagogically. They find themselves inadvertently – beyond their own choice – in a lower position and thus in a position of vulnerability. Or, to formulate it differently: the epiphany of the child and the adolescent unites within itself two dimensions. On the one hand, the 'strenght' or the intrusiveness of 'to be already', with its own substance and force. We therefore cannot ignore the 'force' of their presence and 'being-there'. On the other hand, children and adolescents manifest just as immediately and conclusively their 'weakness', namely the incapacity of their 'not-yet-(really-, fully-)being'. On the one hand, children and adolescents truly 'are', and that is their force; but on the other hand, they 'are' still 'not', and that is their vulnerability. Their 'to be' is everything but assured; it is precarious and surrendered to the goodwill of others. In their radical insufficiency, in their 'being-but-at-the-same-time-not-yet-being' minors are surrendered (and entrusted) to the mercy of others, namely their educators. Thanks to their essential and contex-

tual vulnerability they stand in the asymmetry of dependence. And precisely for that reason it is easy to exercise power over them or to confine them in their dependence, so that a master-slave-relationship comes about.

2.2. The temptation to violence and abuse

We hereby end up directly with what Levinas calls the "temptation to murder" (TI 173/199), which is aroused in the 'I' by the vulnerable face of the other. Although with his bold statement Levinas goes directly against the positive self-image that we cherish narcissistically, an honest appraisal of reality – especially the reality of ourselves (as educators) – still requires that we acknowledge our potential violence towards others (especially minors). It is only by means of this humility and wisdom that we shall be able to prevent and heal our violence, in educational and other contexts (TI 214/237).

The question now is, what allows for the fact that the 'I', *in casu* the educator, can be tempted to violence. For the answer to this question we must turn to the way in which Levinas describes the dynamics of existence of the 'I' (and thus of the educator as an 'ordinary' person – a person like other persons). Just like all other earthly beings the 'I' – as a being – is marked by the attempt-to-be. With a term from Spinoza, Levinas speaks of the *conatus essendi* (AE 4-5/4-5): "the natural tension of being on itself that I have alluded to as egoism. Egoism is not an ugly vice of the subject's, but is ontology, as we find in the sixth proposition of Part III of Spinoza's *Ethics*: 'Every being makes every effort insofar as it is in it to preserve in its being'; and in Heidegger's expression about existence existing in such a way that its Being has the very Being as an issue" (NP 104/70-71). The existence of the 'I', and thus of the educator, is no blank page, no trouble-free existence, but a threatened, fearful and worried existence that displays the inclination – especially when threatened – to fold back into itself whereby it precisely becomes a subjective existence, an I-existence: 'as-far-as-I-am-concerned' (*quant-à-moi*). The attempt-at-being is from the very beginning an 'effort-at-being', literally an effort in order to be, a 'struggle for life' to use an expression of Darwin (AS 80-83). In this struggle to exist the 'I' does not remain turning within itself and affirming itself (I am I), but steps outward in order to transform the other, namely the world, into its means, its house and environment (TI 88/116). Even knowledge is introduced in this project of self-unfolding the ensues from the finitude of the 'I', in the sense that the 'I' literally gets a grasp onto the world by means of developing and applying its knowledge as 'understanding'. It is knowledge, therefore, in the service of the economic transformation of nature into a life world for humans as egos. In this manner, the 'I' realises itself as an *animal rationale*: the animality of the struggle for life is raised to the human level of rationality, but this rational humanity remains at the service of animality (PM 169-172).

This dynamism of the attempt-at-being, however, does not only relate to the 'other' in nature but also to other people in the world. In his egocentric interest the 'I' is inclined to introduce even other people into his project of self-unfolding – or, if necessary, if they form too great a threat, to eliminate them. This leads us seamlessly to the 'temptation to kill', which Levinas repeatedly refers to when he explores the relation-

ship between the 'I' and the other. The ethical benevolence toward the other is not self-explanatory; it is no spontaneous natural given for it must elevate itself time and again above the egocentric selfishness of the 'I' that as a 'for itself', in its fear for limitation, suffering and death, fights with suppressed energy and with all its means for its own existence.

2.3. Many forms of violence and abuse

The 'temptation to kill', according to Levinas, is not only based on the vulnerability of the other but also on the self-interestedness of the 'I', which strives 'to reduce the other to itself'. This reduction is the core of all violence, in the sense that one makes use of force, power and coercion in such a way that the being, the integrity and the intimacy of the person becomes threatened or violated. This applies whatever the form may be in which violence incarnates itself: visible and direct or indirect, hidden and subtle; bodily or psychologically and socially; mild or extreme; individual or collective; profane or spiritual and religious. The concrete forms wherein Levinas discovers this violence are especially the following: the use and abuse of the other, tyranny and enslavement, racism and anti-Semitism, hate and murder. This enumeration can give the impression that only specific or gradual differences between these forms of violence exist. Notwithstanding the relatedness, namely that it always concerns a reduction of the other to the same, Levinas also sees a radical difference, namely when that reduction ends up or not in denial and destruction. That is why for him, murder is a 'unique passion' (TI /232) precisely because it strives to assail and destroy the other in its existence: "annihilation" (TI 209/198), "unlimited negation" (TI 200/225). Killing is radical: one does not dominate (appropriate, use and consume) but annihilate the other. Murder, then, renounces absolutely all 'com-prehension' of the other, for one no longer wishes to include the other in the 'same' – that is, in one's own project of existing – but, on the contrary, to exclude him, because he is 'too much' in the way of my struggle for life. Murder manifests itself as the effort and realization of an inexorable struggle for omnipotence: the I plays not 'all *or* nothing' but 'all *and* nothing.' It promotes itself to 'all' so that the other must be reduced to 'nothing' or 'no one,' which is also to say to 'is-no-longer,' in not only the factual but also, and above all, the active sense of 'is' no-longer (TI 172/198). In other forms of violence we distinguish an ambiguity, which is no longer to be found in the passion of murder. It is namely the ambiguity to deny the other in one way or the other or to rid it of its alterity, without likewise destroying the other. In the manner in which we approach the other and reduce it to ourselves, we want at the same time not to rob the other entirely of its alterity, because in one way or the other we need the acknowledgement by the other of our own power over the other. That is precisely the paradox that Levinas discovers strongly in hate (TI 214/239). Through his hate one wants at the same time both to radically negate the other and also not to do so entirely. From its offensive height, hate wishes to humiliate and crush the other, but without destroying him completely. On one hand, hate aims at making the other suffer, such that he would then be reduced to pure passivity. But on the other hand, hate wishes that the other in this passivity will remain at his most active, so that

he can bear witness to this hate. Only the suffering of the other reveals the destructive, reductive power of the 'I' at work in hate. Whoever hates wants to be the cause of a suffering of which the hated person is the living proof. This is what makes hate so absurd and sordid. Hate wants the death of the other, yet without killing him; it holds the other, still living, at the verge of destruction, so that through the terrible pain of rejection and denial the other testifies to the triumph of hate. A similar ambiguity also applies to the use of the other and to tyranny (see further): they cannot use or overpower the other if that other does not remain existing as other. If the other no longer is, there can be no mention of use or dominance. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that in the non-lethal forms of violence lies a tendency that leads to the destruction of the other or to murder. This tendency manifests itself in racism and anti-Semitism. As forms of hate, they endeavour to deny and exclude the other as a 'stranger' in such a way that that other still can bear witness to his exclusion and thus to the power of the racist and Jew-hater. Ultimately, they strive for extermination and genocide, just as the *Endlösung* or the so-called 'final solution' of the Jewish problem and other mass exterminations in history demonstrate.

In the framework of our Levinasian interpretation of the educational face-to-face, we reflect on a few 'milder', non-lethal forms of violence. Although they seem a far cry from murder and destruction, this does not mean that they would be 'not serious', meaning to say they would not imply any real violation of the other. Precisely in order to promote the ethical quality of education, they must be taken very seriously. Because they are not so serious as murder and killing, one could be tempted not to make much of a fuss about them and perhaps even in certain circumstances consider them acceptable, although they can cause much damage to the other – minors: children and adolescents.

2.4. Tempted to diagnostic reduction

Firstly, with Levinas we can point to 'diagnostic reduction', meaning to say to the inclination of the 'I' (educator) to reduce the other (minor) to her or his appearance (cf. supra). Thanks to my spontaneous or methodical and professionally developed observation – 'vision' in the literal sense of the word – I endeavour to focus on or get an image of the other, and to know and to understand him. By means of his face, which expresses itself physically in and through its plastic form, we get a view of the other thanks to his appearance, meaning to say thanks to his physiognomy, glance, facial expression – and, in extension, thanks to his psychological and social body, namely thanks to his character, relational network, social and cultural milieu. On the basis of our attempt-at-being and its egocentric interestedness we are inclined to approach the other in his observable and objectifiable appearance. Thus the other becomes accessible and understandable to us. Thus I come to know how to deal with the other and how to exercise power over him, so that he 'contributes' to my own happiness and self-unfolding. If an educator can make clear to children or adolescents how well he understands them, he can then obfuscate how much his educational action stands in service of the reinforcement of his own positive self-image as a person and as a profes-

sional. In the words of Levinas himself: "You turn yourself toward the other as toward an object when you see a nose, eyes, a forehead, a chin, and you can describe them. [...] When one observes the colour of the eyes one is not in ethical relationship with the other. The relation with the face can surely be dominated by perception, but what is specifically the face is what cannot be reduced to that" (EI 90/85-86). It is of vital importance for every educator to realise how in the endeavour to gain good knowledge of the other, the child or the adolescent, on the basis of one's own perception, one can inadvertently end up in the risk of diagnostic reduction, and thus in the risk of a real, not always acknowledged form of violence. In this regard, coming to awareness that one is liable to be tempted to diagnostic reduction is already an ethical awareness, namely that such a reduction is not allowed, in other words that one should not 'kill' (which will be discussed further).

2.5. Tempted to pedagogical rhetoric

Another temptation is that of rhetoric, "the art that is supposed to enable us to master language" (HS 203/135), and this art can corrupt conversation in its true nature of 'face-to-face'. Here Levinas follows in particular the view of Plato, who among others in the Phaedrus (273d) states (DVI 24/7-8) that in our conversations we often rely on rhetoric in order to approach the other as "an object or an infant, or a man of the multitude" (TI 42/70). For that, rhetoric makes use of figures of language itself, so that the saying can appear in beauty – as a form of 'appearance': eloquence (HS 207/139). This applies especially to our pedagogical and psychological conversations (TI 42-44/70-72). The risk of using metaphorical rhetoric is that one tries to convince the interlocutor by means of flattering and charming him: rhetoric, thus, as a form of linguistic magic. And as in all rhetoric, one ends up in the temptation to approach the other with a ruse – but that ruse is at the same time embellished in beautiful and elevated language ('*belletterie*') (DL 356/277), whereby it is not always simple to unmask it as a form of abuse of power, or even of terror. Rhetoric can degenerate into a form of violence, in the sense that it attempts to penetrate into reason via wordplays rich in imagery and hyperbolic figures of speech conveyed with the necessary pathos (AE 23/19), so that the conversation partner begins to think and act differently, no longer in conformity with reason but according to the power of the speaker – and this, according to Plato, turns the speaker into a 'despot'. In rhetoric – the violent and less violent but subtle forms – language is transformed into a form of art, namely the art to 'persuade' the other by means of presenting the content of the argument as beauty with the intention – or the consequence – that it is clad with the semblance of truth. Rhetoric would never be able to seduce so many people if in its reasons and reasoning no hint of plausibility would be present. The deception of rhetoric consists precisely in that one attempts to get the other to one's side by arousing trust, namely the trustworthiness of the partial truth, so that the other is then prepared to take along the beautifully embellished lie in the guise of truth (QLT 138/64). Making use of diplomacy, flattery, subtlety, demagogy and propaganda, pedagogical and psychological rhetoric endeavour to win the other over and corrupt him, meaning to say to seduce the other to become

docile and agree with what is presented. Levinas can then also state that rhetoric does not approach the other 'face-to-face' but rather indirectly and obliquely. This does not mean that rhetoric reduces the other to an object. Rhetoric remains a conversation where despite – or by means of – the ruse and tricks of all kinds of figures of speech, one still remains addressing the other. But precisely by addressing the other as other, rhetoric competes for his 'yes', which constitutes exactly rhetoric's ambiguity: a face-to-face wherein violence is done to the other at the same time. Rhetoric is therefore a specific form of violence and injustice, in the sense that one acknowledges the other by means of speaking to him, but at the same time one tries to seduce the other to give himself over to the speaker. Rhetoric is thus not about a form of violence whereby one launches frontally onto the other as an object or inert reality. The eloquent 'I', in this case the educator, launches onto the other, in this case the client, as a free being. Via the use of evocative, metaphorical language and reasoning as such, one attempts to penetrate the freedom of the other so that the other will agree freely with what is presented so beautifully and meaningfully in elevated and even spiritual or religious language. At any rate, rhetoric will go at lengths to give the impression of free consent to the other. Against this background it is understandable that Levinas argues for the use of simple and direct everyday language (HS 207/138), even though he is aware that that language cannot do without rhetoric[3], just indeed as no conversation is possible without rhetoric (TI 42/70). And if we were to keep silent in order to avoid rhetoric, that silence also becomes a form of rhetoric (AV 44/28). Anyway, by means of the use of simple, everyday language, the encounter itself between me and the other, between educators and minors, can especially remain primary – without being flooded by all sorts of eloquent forms and manners of speaking. One is then no longer concerned about the art of speaking but about the encounter with the other himself, whereby the

[3] Levinas points out how we are confronted today with an invasion of a remarkable form of rhetoric in everyday language in the form of a pronounced 'anti-rhetoric' (HS 208/139-140). In our society we notice how a "struggle against eloquence" dominates, clad in a particular linguistic style. We find eloquent discourse suspicious and hence we take recourse in everyday parlance, precisely "to bring down and profane the heights of eloquence and the verbal sacredness it engenders". Stronger still, "everyday speech is found to be not everyday enough, not straight enough. The decency of words, the noble cadence of oratorical speech, the respectability of books and libraries must be debunked. Bring in the filthy words, interjections, graffiti – make the walls of the city cry out". Ordinary, everyday language is still too decent and clean, and that is why people – not only young people or even children! – take recourse to "a language purposely crude that hopes to achieve straightforwardness in a certain vulgarity". To regain one's lost sincerity, ordinary language is not enough, and has to be enhanced by words and phrases more negative and more destructive than negations. "Hence the development of the whole frightening and nihilistic arsenal of scatology: shouts, curses, obscene poems". But this simply is a new rhetoric: "language directed against eloquence in turn becomes eloquence". The rhetoric degradation of everyday parlance into brutal, impolite and uncivil speech can go so far that, just like classic rhetoric, it becomes too horrible to reflect reality. Stronger still, such an anti-rhetorical language then even becomes more deceitful than ordinary rhetoric, precisely because it is clad in the guise of what is absolutely not beautiful and attractive. Then indeed there is no more 'semblance', as in traditional rhetoric, that can make us distrustful. It all sounds so direct and upright that we no longer realise that it is simply a rhetorical and thus embellished directness and uprightness.

presence and the word of the other take first place: "In everyday language we approach the other instead of forgetting him in the 'enthusiasm' of eloquence" (HS 211/142).

2.6. Tempted to dominance and tyranny

Another milder form of inter-human violence, which can also creep into the educational relationship, can be called instrumental functionalisation. Concretely, this happens whenever the 'I', as educator, tries to make the other person, the minor, subordinate to the self as 'food,' or to press him into one or another form of service, hence to 'consume' the other, to instrumentalise him and to use him for egocentric purposes. For this, the 'I' can of course apply all the riches and power, which the I has assembled for himself in his struggle for existence. The 'I' can use all possible means – or better, *mis*use them – in order to draw the other to himself as a 'function' or a 'means' of his own self-development.

What is remarkable is how the functional approach to the other is often coupled with forms of the exercise of power and dominance, which in turn come forth out of self-protection and fear for the power of the other who can equally be a selfish 'I'. In the educational relationship, the exercise of power by the educator remains a permanent temptation especially when one feels threatened. Moreover, the possible misuse of power goes hand in hand with the power position of the educator as a 'professional'. This is no such temptation that educators can put behind themselves once and for all by means of a one-time decision at a certain moment. It can crop up time and again, since educators are not immune and perfect but rather fragile beings so that they can be pushed into the defensive on account of the context and the circumstances. Hence, vigilance and conversion remain necessary in order to accord children or adolescents with the deserved ethical priority: 'after You' (EFP 95/)49.

With Levinas we must also be aware that the striving for dominance, which is intertwined with the instrumental functionalisation of the other, can be tempted towards the 'terror of tyranny'. Following Plato, Levinas labels tyranny as a despotic and unlimited expression of the effort of existing (LC 33/15-17). Tyranny consists in an 'I' trying to subjugate others – but without killing them – in such a way that in one way or the other they give up their freedom to him, in exchange for the satisfaction of their needs (TI 205/229). This tyrannical penetration into, and seizure of freedom makes of its victims not only 'slaves,' but in its extreme form also 'enslaved spirits.' One no longer has an individual will; one loses his or her freedom to think and act. In its consistent form, this means that even the 'capacity' to obey an order – which implies freedom – is eradicated. An enslaved spirit acts out of 'blind' obedience. Here, 'blind' means literally that the 'servile soul' not only loses the experience of his or her autonomy but also of his or her obedience. There is no longer any 'conscious' obedience, but only an inner, irresistible 'inclination' and 'drive' to accommodate oneself to the powerful (TI 214/237). The inclination to submit becomes second nature, whereby the tyranny exercised no longer appears as terror (DL 199/149).

For an ethically authentic educational relationship it is therefore extremely important that the educator is aware of his or her possible striving for dominance, and of

the possible inclination towards the subjugation and subordination of the minor, i.e. the vulnerable other. In his situation of minority and necessity, the other can feel so weak and impotent that he or she would be prepared to become attached to the educator who is 'assisting' him. And the educator can be tempted, in one way or the other, to bind and subjugate the minor to himself or herself, meaning to say to intimidate and manipulate the child or the adolescent as such that the minor surrenders himself emotionally to the educator. Even though it appears at first sight rather far fetched and exaggerated, tyranny is in no way whatsoever impossible in an educational relationship, precisely because the terror exercised can hide behind the pretence of the docile obligingness and unconditional trust of the minor, child or adolescent.

2.7. Real and multi-faceted violence towards children and adolescents

Let us now attempt to summarise what we have learned about all these forms of 'temptation to violence' with regard to the relationship with children and adolescents. The position with respect to the fascination for violence leads us to recognise that violence in relationships between educators and children or adolescents is a realistic possibility and may not be seen as an rare exception related to perverse, pathological and sadistic people. Precisely on the basis of the nakedness and vulnerability of the child the possibility for violence is real. Violence displays many faces and includes all forms of both direct and more subtle forms of indifference. There are both physical as well as psychological, sexual and relational forms of violence, both amongst individuals as well as in a group. There is a broad spectrum starting from neglect and exclusion, to seduction, intimidation, blackmail and manipulation, subjection, 'addictive' forms of dependence up to real slavery (cf. child soldiers, child trafficking), all forms of bullying, ending up in forms of terror, hate and murder.

With regard to sexual abuse of minors by educators, it should not be forgotten that it is not only about violence, meaning to say about an infringement of the bodily intimity and personal integrity of a child or adolescent. Likewise, it is always about the abuse of power, resulting from the asymmetrical dependence that the educational relationship unavoidably implies. When sexual abuse is committed by a religious and especially by a priest, it is moreover about the abuse of sacralised power, effected by the elevated, as it were 'divinised' position of the abuser. In sexual abuse of power, rhetoric likewise plays a role. After all, the perpetrator legitimises his abuse towards the victim on the basis of misleading 'argumentations' with which he attempts to 'convince' the victim or to persuade the victim to so-called 'assent', or afterwards to force the victim to silence – whereby the victim in its turn is saddled, worse still is 'infested', with guilt feelings, which ends up in the loss of confidence in oneself and in others.

There is also the violence that flows from approaching children and adolescents on the basis of perception and knowledge. When educators see the minor, they try to know the child or adolescent through accurate perception and analysis. They try to deduct its personality, character and other characteristics on the basis of its appearance and conduct. It is precisely in the daily perception and exploration of the minor that lays the greatest risk for violence, in the sense that it does not take much to reduce

the child to its face and appearance. Or this knowledge is being used to shape the child into their image and likeness. Certainly under the influence of his possible professional formation based on, among others, psychology and sociology, in particular developmental psychology, the inattentive educator easily falls into the trap of labelling children and adolescents. This takes place especially when they behave 'other than normal' or not according to current expected behaviours. Then one is inclined, on the basis of so-called prior scientific diagnostic knowledge, to use certain labels or even syndromes on them. And that leads in its turn to prejudices that almost unnoticeably get fixated into quasi-definitive views and judgements, resulting in the end in certain treatments and remedies, including all sorts of medications, with all the consequences thereof.[4]

Those who underestimate the potential violence of educators not only neglect the vulnerability of the child or the adolescent but also encourage violence. That is why an important dimension in the ethical relationship towards minors exists in the awareness that adults, *in casu* educators, can potentially be violent towards them, whereby simultaneously an ethical alertness and non-indifference can come into being. This we will now explain more.

2.8. Radical prohibition against violence towards children and adolescents

The description of all these facets of the 'temptation to violence' was no neutral description, in the sense that they already proceeded inadvertently from an important ethical presupposition, namely the 'prohibition against violence', which has been interpreted time and again by Levinas in the unrelenting prohibition: 'Thou shall not kill' (EN 48/30). With this prohibition begins all responsibility for the other, and thus also of education as a specific form of responsibility by parents and educators for children and adolescents. This does disturb our romantic and naïve image of education, as if it would be based spontaneously, constantly and entirely on benevolence and care. Our analysis, in line with Levinas, of a few modalities of violence has demonstrated unambiguously how even education can be subjected to violence and inauthenticity. The work of education is not automatically non-violent because it is educational. Just like every human activity it is potentially violent. Educators who are not aware of this run a great risk – greater than the risk of those who are indeed aware – of ending up in one or the other shrouded or direct form of violence against the minors they have to care for. That is why an ethically qualitative education begins with the awareness that violence is possible ànd prohibited.

We would now like to elucidate further what this prohibition signifies, paying special attention to its implications on education. At the moment that I, on the basis of my attempt-at-being, am tempted by the naked and vulnerable face to reduce the other to myself, meaning to say to its appearance or into a means of my self-unfolding, I realise that that which is possible is actually not allowed. This is precisely the core

[4] One thinks in this regard of the discussions concerning the overhasty and excessive labelling of very lively behaviour in children as 'ADHD' (Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder), with in its wake the numerous prescriptions and taking of Rilatine.

of the fundamental ethical experience beginning from the face – namely, the prohibition against committing the other solely to its own plastic form and psycho-affective, social and cultural image (LC 44/21-22). In my self-sufficient effort at existing, which on the ground of perception and representation aims to become the expression and realisation of individual freedom, I am not merely limited from the outside but in my deepest being – in the very principle of my freedom – shocked and called in question (EI 129/120). In the face I discover myself as potentially violent vis-à-vis the other. The face appears as opposition and resistance: it poses itself before me as a radical 'halt' or 'no', as an absolute resistance against all my capabilities. This is not about a physical but rather an ethical resistance: a resistance of that which actually has no resistance. The banal factuality of violence "reveals the quasi-null resistance of the obstacle" (TI 173/198). Even though the face is not capable of resisting the factual violence, it still stubbornly remains speaking – without words or in an almost inaudible whisper – the defenceless word: 'Thou shall not kill' (HS 141/93-94).

From all this appears something very paradoxical, namely that inter-human ethics begins as a shock experience, namely as the possibility *and* the prohibition to do violence to the other in any way whatsoever. This implies that relational ethics does not begin with a positive commandment that determines what I *must* do, but rather with a negative intervention, a prohibition that questions the straightforward-without-beating-about-the-bush movement of the attempt-at-being. It concerns at the same time an external law, which does not simmer up from the dynamism of the 'living being' itself, as we have initially sketched the law of the autonomous 'I' that poses itself as the law. The fundamental ethical sensitivity that is aroused by the external prohibition against violence is a remarkable form of fear, now no longer the fear or concern for oneself, but the fear – by means of being – of being after the blood of the other. Levinas in this regard also speaks of the scruple. Literally, the word 'scruple' means a 'pebble in one's shoe' making it impossible to stand still, and instead moving or inciting one to take another step. A scruple, therefore, is a disquiet that works its way through the soul obstructively. The scruple can likewise be understood as a form of shame and discomfort: I am apprehensive about the other as to its irreducible being-other, whereby it is surrendered to me to seize and to do violence, to violate, to pest, to maltreat, to abuse, to deny or to destroy, in short to 'kill' in one way or the other and to do it injustice (DVI 254/169). We can then label this first ethical movement before the vulnerable other as an "apparently negative movement of restraint" (NLT 96/126). Confronted with the principal assailability *and* vulnerability of the other, I am thereby called to restrain myself and to pull back – in other words, to *not* do something. The ethics towards the other begins as the paradox of 'restraint', curtailment or 'self-contraction' in the unabashedness and energy with which our responsibility in the first person rushes forward, without looking right or left, without seeing the 'corpses' it leaves aside. Or to put it in different terms, the ethical relationship towards the other begins as a hesitation, a shame over oneself, as a movement of withdrawal and self-questioning. I may feel inclined to ask myself questions along the lines of: 'Oh my, what am I doing…? Am I perhaps too obtrusive, too rough, too self-assured and unconcerned? Or am I too

concerned with myself and my own image?' The appearance of the other traumatises me so that I begin to feel uncomfortable (AE 66/51). "[The face of the other] calls into question the naïve right of my powers, my glorious spontaneity as a living being. Morality begins when freedom, instead of being justified by itself [being sure of itself in its naïve spontaneity], feels itself to be arbitrary and violent" (TI 56/84). Conscience begins as a bad conscience, namely as "the consciousness of my own injustice – the shame that freedom feels for itself" (TI 58-59/86).

All of this implies that the ethical responsibility for minors has to begin with the respect for the commandment: 'You shall not kill'. No form of violence towards children or adolescents is acceptable, whether in the context of family, education or social life. The demand for strict non-violence is the primary ethical task of all educators. It is such a fundamental ethical duty, that it precedes all other ethical approaches to children and adolescents. Its fundamental character is simultaneously utterly paradoxical. By not killing or by not using any form of violence one has in effect not yet done anything. Through obedience to the commandment not to kill the preconditions are created in which things still need to be done.

The commandment – the ethical must – that emanates from the face of the minor has to be rightly understood. That is why a distinction must be made between an 'irrefutable' and 'irresistible' 'must' (shalt not). The responsibility for children and adolescents that appeals to the educators directly and irrefutably from the 'face' of minors can be resisted well. We can simply ignore the appeal of the epiphany of minors. Besides, an irresistible must would not be an ethical must, but a necessity or unavoidability, a having no other choice. We can indeed choose to ignore the 'must not do' of violence towards children and adolescents. That is precisely our ethical freedom. Confronted with the irrefutable appeal that goes out from the vulnerable other, or children or adolescents, we can pretend not to hear or notice the appeal – as indeed we can ignore ány ethical appeal. The appeal can pushed away or suffocated amongst other appellations or responsibilities. It can even be flooded by the passion of self-preservation. This does not change anything with respect to the irrefutable character of the appeal that imposes itself unequivocal to educators. We can escape by turning our gaze away from the child or the adolescent or pretending that we did not notice the appeal of its epiphany, but the fact that we do so already indicates that we must have 'heard' the appeal. This shows that an urgent 'must' flows from the defencelessness of the vulnerable other, or, rather, a categorical prohibition: the prohibition to commit violence towards children or adolescents in any way. The fact in itself that we have in our societies the prohibition 'You shall not commit violence towards children and adolescents', as expression of 'Thou shall not kill', indicates not only the unacceptability of this violence, but also the fact that violence towards minors is not that strange or exceptional. There would not be an ethical prohibition as expression of practical ethical wisdom if there had been no violence towards people in general, and against children and adolescents in particular. Human civilisation exists precisely in recognising the potential of factual violence towards minors (and all vulnerable others) so that something can be done

about it, through education, for example, but also sanctioning, where the prohibition of violence is not respected.

By means of the prohibition and the ethical scruple or restraint awakened in me, the radical ethical asymmetry or 'non-reciprocity' between me, namely the educator, and the other, namely the child or the adolescent, becomes visible. In contrast to Buber's idea of the reciprocity between 'I' and 'Thou', Levinas speaks about "the 'curvature' of the intersubjective space" (TI 267/291). Through the prohibition the 'I' and the other – the child or the adolescent – are not only radically separated from each other, they are also different and irreducible. And, note well, this irreducibility does not depend on their respectively distinct characteristics or on their coincidentally unequal psychological dispositions and moods during the encounter (TI 190/215). It lies in the 'I-other-conjunction' itself: through its demanding, prohibiting character the face of the vulnerable minor stands above me as an *authority* that comes upon me from its ethical 'height' making demands and claims. We can label this as the 'sacred' and 'divine' character of the face of the educandus. As such the minor as other then is not my equal, but my *superior*: not only my master who educates me and reveals something new radically, as we have seen above, but also my 'lord' who as a 'You' commands me unconditionally from its eminently ethical height (TI 74-75/100-101). That is precisely the paradox of the epiphany of the face of the child and the adolescent: as the factual inferior, the minor as radical other is ethically my superior. In this way it refers to the sublime awe and majesty of God. Thus the mastership of the child as other sketched above, is reinforced, or, rather, ethically qualified. The expression of ethical courtesy "After You" also recognises and affirms the ethical superiority of the vulnerable other, child or adolescent (EFP 105/47).

3. The ethical dynamics of the educational face-to-face as bidimensional responsibility

Only through obedience to the prohibition against violence is space created for a positive filling in of a respectful responsibility that allows children and adolescents to unfold and raise their voice: the voice of the irreducible, 'holy' other. But with this, not everything has been said about the responsibility of the one, the educator, for the other, the minor. In his second major work, *Otherwise than Being* (1974), Levinas radicalises the idea of responsibility by describing it as "responsibility for the responsibility of the other" (AE 150/117). We can distinguish two aspects therein, on the one hand, the care for the responsibility of others for themselves, and on the other hand, the care for the responsibility of the other for others.

3.1. Responsibility for the being and the unfolding of children and adolescents

The first aspect dovetails with the incarnational dimension of the heteronomous responsibility for the other, *in* casu the minor, the 'educandus'.

A fully qualified educational responsibility is more than not killing or not making use of any violence, it also the attitude of acknowledgement and respect for the being-other of the minor. And it does not stop at this. It unfolds itself even further. It must be *more* than the 'appreciative respect'. It must develop into a responsibility 'in deeds and actions', meaning to say into a responsibility that expresses itself in concrete deeds of care that are directed towards the well-being of the other, namely the child or the adolescent. Responsibility is thus neither the sentimentalism nor the naïve romanticism of being moved by the tender, delicate minor. Its affectiveness must turn into effectiveness, its dedication to the other into 'works' of care for the other (HAH 40-44/25-29). Without incarnation the responsibility for the other is hollow and empty. Stronger still, it is a lie and denial of oneself. How can one be concerned for the other if one poses no concrete deeds as the expression of this concern? Or to put it in terms of a biblical image: it is not enough to love the other with all our heart, our mind and will, we must also roll up our sleeves and get our hands dirty. Or to put it in a rabbinical way: it is not enough to love the other with our heart and soul, when we do not also love the other with our money, and even more so, with our hospitality. It is so that when you let the naked into your house he makes the floor mat dirty. In short, our yes-word must become flesh – in and through our body – and that in economic-earthly, appropriate forms (AS 81).

If we apply this to the responsibility for children and adolescents, we discover how this altro-centric responsibility implies a remarkable paradox. Being responsible for the other implies a transcendence of the attempt-at-being of the 'I', the educator. But this transcendence directs the educator at the same time to the attempt-at-being of the other, the child or the adolescent. The responsibility for the other only becomes real when it directs itself itself not only to the person of the other but also to the 'being' or 'well-being' in the literal sense of the other, namely the minor. As a bodily other, the minor is in the first place a needy and finite, and thus vulnerable, being. For their survival and good life they need parents and educators, and still many others. To have to live in poverty and destitution is also a form of violence, or rather an unacceptable form of bodily, relational and social violence. "The other's hunger – be it of the flesh, or of bread – is sacred. There is no bad materialism other than our own" (DL 12/XIV). It would be a form of false spirituality if in the responsibility for the other, namely for the child and the adolescent, one would not take care of the other's nourishment and clothing, protection against heat and cold, disease and accidents, "as if the entire spirituality on earth did not reside in the act of nourishing" (DL 12/XIV). Caring for the bodily and material needs of children and adolescents is to liberate them from an essential form of violence – a liberation that is likewise the condition for other liberations, such as education and training.

There is, however, more than this materialism of the responsible care for children and adolescents. We have to be answerable not only for their bodily being and well-being, but also for their attempt-at-being into an independent and free existence. Initially, certainly when it concerns children, minors only avail of a potential freedom which they are able to unfold thanks to the responsibility of the others around them,

in particular their educators (and primarily their parents). In that sense, the promotion of the young individual into an independent and active person does not contradict the heteronomous responsibility of educators. Both are mutually related. The responsibility of educators insures that the 'mastership', of which we spoke above in our description of the radical alterity of the minor, receives its true ethical stance. By their responsibility for the minor, they make the ethical mastership of the minor effectively possible. The responsibility for children and adolescents also includes the care for their becoming independent, articulate and mature. Even more so, without the asymmetrical responsible care of the educators minors cannot even begin to grow into active agents. The heteronomous responsibility for the minor as the radical and vulnerable other is the condition for the development of the minor from potential to active agent. According to Levinas this is precisely the paradox of the heteronomous responsibility for children and adolescents: it is a strongly concrete responsibility, in the sense that it is geared towards the being and self-development of the other. To take heteronomous responsibility for children and adolescents concretely means to create space and possibilities for the growth of the minors to independence and responsibility for themselves. This means anything but a negative or suspicious approach to children and adolescents in their attempts to take their own responsibility. If the child or adolescent is not an object, but an other, a subject, than we have to treat them as full human persons. When necessary, we will give some critical remarks, so that they can adjust active responsibility and develop it better.

Furthermore, the heteronomous responsibility for the minor also means that educators should pay attention to the many hurts that alienate children or adolescents from themselves so that, through caring closeness, they can heal sufficiently from these wounds. This likewise has to do with our natural human condition of finitude and neediness, in particular of minors. As a being of deficit, and thus marked by fear and trembling, it is very much possible that a person does not succeed in establishing and unfolding itself, in giving shape to its freedom. Both on the basis of their natural defectiveness as ell as all sorts of (familial, psychological, social, cultural) circumstances, children and adolescents can fall into the hands of certain forms of dependence, both on the somatic as well as on the mental, relational and social levels. It is not seldom that especially affectively and socially vulnerable minors end up in a situation of alienation whereby their dynamics of freedom itself is affected so much so that they can take up the constructive and creative care for their own existence only with difficulty or entirely not at all anymore.

We can also call this the primary fundamental principle of every education: educators should provide children and adolescents not only with their needs but at the same time and especially approach them in such a way that they are enabled to become as much as possible a free, if not a wholly free, person. Education is likewise a form of liberation for freedom: making the not-yet-free minor free, or entrusting back the possibly alienated minor to itself once again as a centre of thought and action. This is the paradox of every education: bearing responsibility for the unfolding of the self of the other; creating the conditions that children and adolescents act freely, finding within

themselves and in their environments the strengths and possibilities to be able to be responsible for themselves. We can call all of this the emancipatory aspect of each and every educational responsibility of adults for children and adolescents, whereby the problem of paternalism and moralising can be avoided at the same time. Education likewise implies a bit of 'healing' and 'redeeming'. And note well: to redeem is not only a typically religious (Christian) concept but just as much a generally human category that concerns the recovery of the dynamics of freedom, which in one way or the other has not yet been tapped or is already affected. Literally, education is 'e-ducare': to lead away from something. Namely it is to carry away from all sorts of enchainment and depersonalisation which are expressed in habits, relationships, structures or other kinds of 'demons' with old and new names that 'take hold' of or 'possess' people and thus stand in the way of every independent self-determination. To be liberated means that freedom is proffered back to oneself as an internal potency and resilience. Redemption is the freedom to heal towards freedom. In this regard, the many forms of therapeutic and pedagogical guidance of individual children and adolescents (and possibly of their families) are an expression of the heteronomous responsibility of educators and of the society for minors, who as concrete others are marked in their being by all sorts of limitations, obstructions and injuries.

In this regard, educators are responsible for the growth in responsibility of children and adolescents for themselves. With Levinas we can, here, even go further and speak of a responsibility of substitution. During the crooked paths and decisive moments of growth, and from within their own task of responsibility, educators take the lack of responsibility of the minors unto themselves. In this way, too, they recognise and promote the uniqueness of the child or the adolescent. Thanks to the substitutional responsibility of their educators children and adolescents are stimulated and assisted to develop a mature – or better a mature enough – freedom, namely into a qualitative responsibility for their own life as project of meaning. This implies as well an education towards maturity so that children and adolescents are enabled to speak and act in and of themselves and their own internal sources of strength. Thanks to the alert responsibility of adults, in particular that of parents and educators, minors are led to make the transition from 'Fremdbestimmung' (determination from the stranger) towards 'Selbstbestimmung' (determination from oneself). In that way, children and adolescents learn along the way to stand up for themselves, even when this goes against the interference of adults who, for instance, stigmatise them by means of all sorts of diagnoses with a label or a pathology (cf. supra on 'diagnostic reduction'). Education towards maturity is also to be stimulated and to be supported to learn and to dare say 'no': no to all kinds of infringements on bodily, emotional and spiritual intimacy and integrity. To say no even when this infringement does not take place directly and brutally, but indirectly and more subtly, through one or the other form of temptation, trickery, 'propaganda' or 'convincing arguments' and so-called 'progressive – educational, sexual, social – ideologies' (cf. supra on rhetoric) among others, whereby one is led 'in spite of oneself' to accept the insults and violations of one's independence and personal intimacy and afterwards even feel guilty about it all. This pedagogical care for the maturity

of the minor, however, should not allow that children or adolescents become saddled primarily and fully with the responsibility for the 'no', which would bring about an impermissible culpabilisation. The first ones responsible for the 'no' against violence are the adults, in this case the educators: their educational care is based essentially on the prohibition against using any form of violence on minors. They are likewise the first to be held accountable in situations of use of violence on children and adolescents.

3.2. Responsible for the responsibility of minors for others

We now like to go a step further, perhaps a step further than Levinas himself takes in his philosophical view on responsibility, even though he remains our inspiration for this new step. We namely would like to broaden the asymmetrical responsibility of the educator for the minor and also regard it from the perspective of the responsibility of the minor for others. We call it a chiastic responsibility, in the sense that it concerns two forms of responsibility that intersect each other, without becoming reversible as will be explained below. The responsibility of educators for children and adolescents is only integral if it grows forth into a responsibility for the responsibility of those minors not only for themselves (cf. supra) but also and in particular for others. Levinas affirms explicitly that education consists in this: "to elevate the *care-for-self* of living beings to the *care-for-other* in man" (HN 9/1). In other words, if we only apply the idea of responsibility for the other to the educators, our analysis falls short and gives rise to a one-sidedness with dangerous consequences.

It is indeed not impossible that the engagement of educators for their minors ends up in an egocentric and utilitarian result in the minors. The caring responsibility for the other, the child or the adolescent, can be very altro-centric and unselfish, but this can unintentionally entail as well that one leads the child or the adolescent – the goal of our responsibility – to a conventionally smug, self-sufficient life wherein what is only or mainly important is the care for oneself. To put this paradoxically, the altruism of the one can lead directly to a promotion of the egotism of the other. Not only the 'I' but also the other, as 'alter ego', can be selfish, indifferent, dominant, manipulative, violent... We know from experience and all kinds of so-called 'reports' how children and adolescents can also display aggressive behaviour, how they can bully both fellow minors as well as educators – even though we must always strive to gauge the 'reasons' or the 'instigations' of this brutal behaviour. Precisely for that reason, the emancipatory promotion of the other to free self-determination and creative self-expression, as sketched above, should never have the final word. An ethically qualified education must go farther. Not only must it be the expression of self-transcendence in the educator, but also in the minor, the 'educandus'. Through the epiphany of the other, who comes in their vulnerable existence, educators are made responsible for the responsibility of others, the minors, not only for themselves but also for others. In other words, the educator is faced with the challenge to take up his or her responsibility for children and adolescents in such a way that they are helped and stimulated to acknowledge and progressively take up in turn their heteronomous responsibility for others. If this does not happen, education ends up contradicting itself, destroying even its own dynamism

and meaning: in an extreme ethical attention for the minor as radical other, that other is then only led to pose itself centrally at the cost of others.

Concretely speaking, this implies for every form of education that, if necessary, one also confronts children and adolescents with a number of rules. Of these, the boundary rule 'Thou shall not kill' is the most fundamental. As mentioned above this ethical norm synthesises the multi-dimensional prohibition against violence, consumption, humiliation, indifference, exclusion, denial, nagging, abuse of confidence or of the weakness of others... 'Thou shall not kill' is the minimal but strictly necessary condition for humane life in family, school and every form of relational and social life, and for the creative development of the responsibility for the other, to which the minor must precisely be educated. All educators have the ethical mission to initiate and to introduce children and adolescents into the major importance of this prohibition, and also into the absolute respect for it. Firstly, towards themselves: namely that their own bodily intimacy and personal integrity is a sacred boundary that should not be violated by anyone (cf. supra). Then, towards others: namely that they should respect the boundary of the bodily intimacy and personal integrity of others, for instance of other children or adolescents. All that was said above about the prohibition to violence can be applied without hesitation to children and adolescents as far as they are developing into active agents. To put in the words of Levinas: "The *vital* life, the natural life, perhaps begins in a naiveté and in repugnancies agreeing with ethics; it ends in compliance with loveless debauchery and looting erected into a social condition, into exploitation. *Human* life begins where this vitality, innocent in appearance, but virtually destructive, is mastered by interdictions. Does not authentic civilization, whatever be the biological echoes or the political defects it brings to pass, consist in holding back the breath of naive life and thus awakening 'for posterity and to the end of all generations'?" (NLT 25-26/61-62). Children and adolescents must be guided progressively in order to transcend their natural, vitalistic existence towards the other and for the sake of the other: "a limitation through which life awakens from its somnambulant spontaneity, sobers up from its nature, and interrupts its centripetal movement, to open itself to the otherness of the other" (NLT 23/60). When this is neither the goal nor the result of education, then educators fail in their task. Education even ends up then in an anti-education, in spite of all the possible means and forms whereby minors are made capable of leading a happy and prosperous life as active agent. Then children or adolescents have not yet grown beyond the level of their natural urge-to-be and urge-to-live into the level of humane civilisation. In short, a humane, ethically qualified education consists in this that educators appeal to the responsibility of the minor, not only for the cooperation in the unfolding and possible healing of its own freedom and attempt-at-being, but also, and especially, in order to take upon itself, and progressively substantiate, the responsibility for others than itself.

At this the question arises whether this growth in responsibility of minors for others likewise involves their educators, and not only their contemporaries. In other words, are children and adolescents also responsible for the adults who surround them, care for them and educate them? It is not that obvious to give this question a direct and full

yes, in the awareness that a strict equalisation of the responsibilities of educators and minors is out of the question. Such an equating would simply imply an unjust overburdening that does not take into consideration the asymmetry between adults and minors. Such proportional responsibility does not allow children and adolescents to be really minors and to live an unburdened childhood or youth, with all its pernicious consequences for their psycho-affective development. Minors cannot and should never be burdened with the same 'full' and 'weighty' responsibilities to which educators and adults are indeed called. However, this should not end up in the other extreme namely in the implicit or explicit presupposition that children bear no responsibility whatsoever for adults, i.e. those who care for them and educate them. Indeed, this is about a responsibility in their own 'stature' as minor, child or adolescent, and thus about a gradual responsibility: a responsibility that remains asymmetric towards the responsibility of educators. That is why the (limited but real) responsibility of minors for adults cannot in any way whatsoever replace the responsibility of educators. The responsibility of minors cannot be assumed as precondition for the educators to take responsibility for these minors. This does not mean that one should be afraid to give, quite early on, some real opportunities to children and adolescents – each according to one's own development and capabilities – to take small, but nevertheless real, responsibility for others and for the pedagogical climate or milieu. Granting children and adolescents gradually this responsibility prevents from having them only count as the object of care and responsibility. By allowing them to share in the pedagogical responsibility they are confirmed and promoted into subjects of responsibility. Positively this responsibility gives children and adolescents the opportunity to give – or to give back – something to their educators, and not only to receive from them, which implies an important form of respect and ethical emancipation.

To conclude our considerations on the altro-centric responsibility of minors, we would once again like to emphasise the importance of this pedagogical 'responsibility for the responsibility of the other for others'. If the idea of children and adolescents as active agents is disconnected from the concept of the heteronomous responsibility for others but itself, it will end up in all sorts of forms of conflict, aggression, threats and violence. If the free exercise of independence is left to its own, and so can not be inspired from within by the responsibility for the other, it easily becomes a insolent demand for freedom that thrashes about wildly and actively terrorises others. Only an inspired freedom, that is, a freedom that allows itself to be inspired by 'being-responsible-for-the-other', is able to transcend self-centredness and to enter into true humane relationships with others. Herein lies precisely the difference between 'nature' and education as 'culture'.

Conclusion

On the basis of Levinas' thought we have tried to make clear how education is essentially an ethical event. And we likewise clarified how this ethical event follows a double track. On the one hand, the prohibition against violence forms the lower boundary. We

called this the aspect of 'safeguarding', in the sense that an ethically viable education consists in protecting children and adolescents from all forms of psychological, relational, sexual, social and ideological violence, intimidation and abuse of power. This safeguarding as a task for all education and every educator is laconically expressed in the prohibition from the Judaeo-Christian Decalogue: 'Thou shall not kill': minors are 'untouchable', not so much in fact – we know all too well how their dignity is trampled in various manners underfoot – but rather in a normative ethical sense: in their vulnerability they are invulnerable, or rather they should not be 'vulnerated'. This safeguarding on the basis of the boundary rule cited, which applies at all times and in all places and tolerates no mitigating circumstances, is, however, not sufficient for an ethically qualitative education even though it indeed counts as the minimal and necessary condition. Hence we have developed at the same time a view on education as ethics of responsibility whereby education is not only protective but also emancipatory and liberating. In that regard, we pointed to the multi-faceted reality of pedagogical responsibility. Educators are not only responsible for the being and well-being of children and adolescents; they also bear responsibility for their responsibility. By means of learning to take up responsibility both for themselves as well as for others, minors can grow up into full-fledged and worthy persons. Education as the responsibility of educators is also education of children and adolescents into responsibility. The radical alterity of minors is not only characterised by vulnerability but just as well by strength. And it is precisely this strength, understood as ethical mastership, that provokes every education – literally 'calls it forward' – to be liberating, namely liberating into freedom and responsibility: "awakening that is the very life of the human, already troubled by the Infinite" (EN 106/77).

Fr. Roger Burggraeve SDB

Part II – Human Rights and preventive system

Human Rights and Don Bosco's Preventive System

Roots of safeguarding

"Goal for our young people is to become responsible citizens and God-orientated persons." Don Bosco

Human rights are the basic rights and freedoms that all people are entitled. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) is a declaration adopted by the United Nations General Assembly 1948 right after the experiences of the Second World War and 60 years after the death of Don Bosco.

The preventive system of Don Bosco – who lived from 1815 to 1888 as a priest and pedagogian – is his basic educative method which he used during his entire life. He left this system to all man and women who after his death took care about young people around the world (nowadays in 130 countries).

When we today think about dignity of young people and try to ensure and to implement safeguarding in different realities, it is well worth reflecting on the human rights and Don Bosco preventive system in order to enable safeguarding process for and with young people.

Before we compare the 30 articles of UDHR with ideas of Don Bosco rooting in his prevention system, it is necessary to draw up a few ideas of Don Bosco and his pedagogical concept:

Basis for Don Bosco was that every young person has dignity as a human being because he is made in the image and likeness of God. Main pillars of his system are reason, religion and loving-kindness. Inside that he gained to build a family-spirit with trust, joy and accompaniment, prevention, respect for the individual, and lack of corporal punishment.[1]

Prevention in Don Boscos concept places young people in the impossibility of committing faults, which means growing up in a healthy environment and protecting from situations of risk. This is not by pulling away young people from learning experiences but by accompanying them in their process of growing up.

Don Bosco himself neither invented the preventive system nor wrote an essay on his pedagogical system. It is rather that he lived a great synthesis from which others could learn a lot and write about this approach and the combining various elements and giving them a heart.

[1] See Kuttianimattathil Jose; Don Bosco's Educative Method and the tenets of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; in: Charles Maria, Pallithanam Thomas, Dörrich Hans-Jürgen, Reifeld Helmut; In Defence of the Young; New Delhi 2010

An important last element of this pedagogical system is not to see it today as static, but more important to renew it and give new live to it, because this educative method can never be written down in its fullness, but must be lived.

The following synthesis of the 30 articles of the UDHR compared with the preventive system was compiled by Jose Kuttianimattathil SDB[2] and we are thankful by permission of the editors to use it.[3]

Art.	UDHR	Preventive System
1	All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.	"When God created the soul, he breathed on the human being and gave it the spirit of life. This breath is simple and spiritual, made in the image and likeness of God, who is eternal and immortal ... God gave our soul freedom."[4] The preventive system "is based entirely on reason, religion, and above all on kindness..."[5]
2	Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.	"The love of the Lord has no boundaries, and does not exclude anyone, whatever his age, condition or religion. Among our young, ... we have had and we still have, those who are Jews."[6] "That you are young is enough to make me love you very much"[7]

[2] SDB means member of the religious congregation: Salesian of Don Bosco
[3] Kuttianimattathil Jose, p. 125 ff
[4] Maggio, p. 24-25
[5] The preventive system in the education of the Young, Constitutions, p. 247
[6] A letter by Don Bosco written to a Jew in 1881, Letter 2247. Epistolario, V, p. 97
[7] Don Bosco, Il Giovanni Provveduto (turin 1847), p. 7 (OE II,187)

3	Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.	"Concentrate your efforts on the spiritual, physical, and intellectual wellbeing of the boys entrusted to you by Devine Providence."[8]
4	No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.	"The repressive system may stop a disorder, but can hardly make the offenders better. Experience teaches that the young do not easily forget the punishments they have received, and for the most part foster biter feelings, along with the desire to throw of the yoke and even to seek revenge … In the preventive system, on the contrary, the pupil becomes a friend, and the assistant (teacher), a benefactor who advises him, has his good at heart, and wishes to spare him vexation, punishment, and perhaps dishonour."[9]
5	No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.	The preventive system "excludes all violent punishment, and tries to do without even the slightest chastisement."[10]
6	Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.	
7	All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.	"… public matters demand public legalities, so that no party is at a disadvantage before the law, …"[11]
8	Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.	

[8] Don Bosco's Confidential Memoranda to Rectors, The Salesian Rector, p. 25
[9] The preventive system in the education of the Young, p. 248
[10] The preventive system in the education of the Young, p. 247
[11] Letter of 15th April 1850, Epistolario di San Giovanni Bosco, 1, 32

9	No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.	
10	Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.	"Hear both sides before making up your mind regarding reports and matters in dispute"[12]
11	1. Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence. 2. No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.	
12	No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.	"hence I recommended all our Rectors that they should be the first to practice fatherly correction in respect to our dear young sons, and his correction be done in private, ... Never directly rebuke anyone in public, except to prevent scandal or to make it good when it has already occurred."[13] If anyone then should remain deaf to all these wise means of amendment, and should prove to be a bad example, or scandalous, then he should be sent away without hope of returning, with the provision however, that as far as it is possible his good name should be protected.[14]

[12] Souvenir of St. John Bosco to the first Missionaries, Constitutions, p. 266
[13] Concerning the Punishmments to be Inflicted in Salesian Houses, no. 1
[14] Concerning the Punishmments to be Inflicted in Salesian Houses, no.5

13	1. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each State. 2. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.	
14	1. Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution. 2. This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.	
15	1. Everyone has the right to a nationality. 2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.	
16	1. Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution. 2. Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses. 3. The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.	
17	1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. 2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.	

18	Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.	
19	Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.	"Students should be allowed to express their thoughts freely, but take care to straighten out and even correct, expressions, words, actions that might not be consonant with Christian education."[15]
20	1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association. 2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.	Don Bosco from his young age gave importance to 'associations'. He started the 'Society of Joy' in 1832, then religious associations or sodalities ..., the Mutual Help Society.[16]
21	1. Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives. 2. Everyone has the right to equal access to public service in his country. 3. The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.	

[15] The Geneal Articles of the Regulations for the Houses 1877, no. 3
[16] Braido Piedro, Don Bosco's Pedagogical Experience, Rome: LAS, 1989, p. 76,146

22	Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.	
23	1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment. 2. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work. 3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection. 4. Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.	"As a rule the Oratory boys (1842) included stonecutters, bricklayers, stuccoers, road pavers, plasterers, and others who came from distant villages ... During the week I would go to visit them at their work in factories or workshops. Not only the youngsters were happy to see a friend taking care of them; their employers were pleased, gladly retaining youngsters who were helped during the week, ..."[17] "I was beginning to learn from experience that if young lads just released from their place of punishment could find someone to befriend them, to look after them, to assist them on fest days, to help them get work with god employers, to visit them occasionally during the week, these young men soon forgot the past and began to mend their ways."[18] • Don Bosco started the 'Mutual Aid Society', in 1850, the first of its kind for young working boys in Turin. • Don Bosco made 'Work Contract' for bys working in shops, factories, et., ensuring just wages, adequate working conditions, rest, etc. • Don Bosco started his own workshops from 1853.

[17] Memoirs of the Oratory, p. 197–198
[18] Memoirs of the Oratory, p. 190. Ephasis added

24	Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.	"Let the boys have full liberty to jump, run and make as much noise as they please. ... Let care be taken however that the games, the persons playing them as well as the conversation are not reprehensible."[19]
25	1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control. 2. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.	"Many boys from Turin and the surrounding country were perfectly prepared to lead un upright, hard working experience, but, when urged to do so, they often replied that they had no food, no clothing and no place where they could stay even temporarily ... Realising that all efforts would be wasted on some children unless one provided shelter for them, I hastily began to rent room after room in boarding houses, often at exorbitant prices."[20]

[19] The Preventive System in the Education of the Young, p. 249
[20] Memorie dell' Oratorio, 199–201 (Braido, Pedagogical Experience, 76)

26	1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit. 2. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace. 3. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.	"At St. Francis of Assisi (1841-44), I was already conscious of the need for some kind of school. Some children who are already advanced in years are still completely ignorant of the truths of faith. ... At the refuge and later at the Moretta house, we started a regular Sunday school (besides catechism, children were taught to read, write and work with numbers), and when we came to Valdocco we also started a regular night school."[21] "These boys must be given free education. Some need to be given free scholastic materials like books, paper and pens, while others also need food and clothing. These private efforts cannot continue without some sort of special subsidy."[22] The goal of Salesian education is to make the pupils "good Christians and honest citizens."[23] - Don Bosco was the first to start an evening school in Turn (1844).
27	1. Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits. 2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.	"Gymnastics, music, theatricals and outings are most efficacious means of obtaining discipline and of benefiting spiritual and bodily health."[24] An Oratory without music is a body without a soul."[25]

[21] Memoirs of the Oratory, p. 281
[22] Letter of 26 August 1872 to the Mayor of Turin, Epistolario di San Giovanni Bosco, 2, 224–225
[23] Memoirs of the Oratory, p. 190
[24] The Preventive System in the Education of the Young, Constitutions, p. 249
[25] Memorie Biographique 5, 347 and 15, 57

28	Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.	
29	1. Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible. 2. In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society. 3. These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.	
30	Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.	

Conclusion

After this compilation a few conclusions can be drawn:
First of all Don Bosco's preventive system and the UDHR have the same basic inspiration. UDHR does not speak about religion, but the understanding of conscience would be in religious terminology the 'voice of God'. Secondly the preventive system contains many of the rights declared in the UDHR and is over all open to all the proclaimed rights. The only thing the preventive system is not talking about is the terminology of rights which was not common in Don Boscos time. And both lines aim together for a transformation of society.

Because of this familiarity of the two concepts each of them strengthens the other one in various areas:

The Preventive system enriches the UDHR by offering a system of teaching people and not only offering a legal system. The UDHR needs to be promoted through prevention, a culture of rights and an atmosphere in which violation becomes difficult. Don Bosco himself discribed four dimensions of a house in his specific pedagogical style: a school which prepares for life, a home where young people can be, a playground on which young people can be happy and a community which offers the Good News. This four dimensions ensure that the right for education, the participation in cultural life, professing of a religion, choosing a career and the right to association can be realized.

The other way round the UDHR supports the Preventive System by offering a language which is understood today and acceptable to all who acknowledge the bill of rights. By using secular language a real dialogue is possible. A last support by the UDHR to the Preventive System is, that over 150 years after Don Bosco the Human Rights point out for new groups of intervention (i.e. Refugees, Roma...).

For all educators who want to work in the line of Don Bosco it is necessary to promote the Human Rights and to become witnesses to justice and rights and this is what safeguarding is about.

Fr. Stefan Stoehr SDB

Part III – Youth work praxis

Safeguarding and its intercultural challenges … dream or nightmare?

"Men do not quit playing cause they grow old; they grow old because they quit playing."
Oliver Wendell Holmes

Introduction

On a warm summer-day at the beginning of the 21st century, a group of youthworkers from all over Europe is playing outside on the lawn of a youth centre. The baroque monastery that dominates the area looks over them and the mountains surrounding the field of grass complete the stunning view. A fellow trainer and I are delivering a session on games to this highly motivated and eagerly learning group of young people in their twenties. All day long, we teach them about playing: adjusting games to specific target groups, inventing new games, combining well-known games into new ones, making use of materials in an unexpected and creative way. And how, but by playing, can you train young people in the art of games? My fellow trainer and I enjoy the enthusiasm and the laughter of the group and that is why we truly believe we are doing a good job. When at the end of the day we sit back self-satisfied, a participant comes up to us and politely tells us he liked our approach." Yet", he adds," many of the ideas you introduced can not be used in considerable parts of Europe, as some of the games that were played conflict with the rules and regulations on safeguarding". Astonished, I ask for some clarification. I'm provided with a long list of examples: "You asked people to stand on a chair – insurance won't cover an accident as you didn't make proper use of the chair; You played games which require physical contact – how do you know that everyone feels comfortable with this?; You played a game in which someone could be virtually declared death – how does this affect people's feelings?; You took a participant to a separate place to give him some secret instructions – how will you prove you are innocent when this participant accuses you of abuse?". I'm puzzled after this conversation. For me it is the first confrontation with intercultural colliding related to protection and safety. This talk has been the start of a long reflecting- and learning-process about the goals of (international) youthwork and the place safeguarding takes in this.

This article is the result of personal experiences, encounters and fascinating discussions with a large number of European youthworkers, volunteers as well as employed staff members. Although major differences in culture and lifestyle exist among these young persons, they all are heirs to the European youthwork heritage. Therefore, the scope of this article is limited to Europe. Besides, the experience-based character of this paper implies the absence of any scientific research or evidence.

Differences in behaviour

If you organize a camp, training course, seminar for children or young people:
Do you make them stand on a chair? Do you ask for permission to tie wrists together in a game? Do you play games in which physical contact is required? Do you have a one-to-one conversation with a homesick boy? Do you give an eight-year old girl a night kiss? Can you sleep in mixed-gender dormitories? Do you simply build a raft and get on the water or do you need an hour of safety-instructions on beforehand? Do you use sexualised names to make games more attractive? Do you make a risk-assessment for every activity that you plan? Do you have rules for the youthworkers about drinking alcohol?

If you asked 1000 youthworkers from all the European countries to answer these questions, you certainly would end up with a large number of different answers. These differences are, among other reasons, caused by the cultural diversity of the youthworkers. Cultural diversity not only refers to the different countries with their unique cultural background the young people are from. It also includes the various working styles of organizations within one country and the unique personal experiences every person has had in life. Whereas the origin of the variation in answers is not highly relevant in this article, so is the way how to deal with these dissimilarities. But before dealing with the varied styles and approaches in European youthwork, a brief overview of the actual differences is useful. Therefore serves the non exhaustive list of behavioural distinctions below. This list includes examples of very clear dissimilarities in the interaction between youthworkers and children and among the youthworkers themselves. All these differences have been observed in European countries.

Types of games being played
A first difference in youthwork can be observed in the types of games that are played in a country. In some places quite rough games with a lot of physical contact and putting up mock fights are not unusual. In other places you can hardly observe any physical contact during games, but there is a lot of singing and dancing involved. Some people can not imagine playing outside without old, worn clothes that get very dirty. Others perceive it as normal to play carefully in their Sunday-suit.

Besides, there exist major differences on how adventurous games can be and the safety-instructions that need to be taken into account. Activities, e.g. hiking and rafting, are more likely to happen in some countries than in others. Moreover, the safety-regulations that need to be taken into account strongly differ as well.

Finally, there is disagreement on whether it is advisable to play in mixed-gender groups. Some youthworkers take mixed gender groups for granted, whereas others are convinced that separate groups for boys and girls are to the benefit of both.

Communication style
The way youthworkers speak to one another and to the children they are working with tends to differ quite strongly over Europe. In some places there is a culture of being

very nice and polite towards the young people you are working with at any time. This attitude is reflected in warmly inviting children, thanking them for listening, asking for permission to play games that require physical contact. This style often includes conscientious warning for any kind of accident that might happen: for example explain how to use a pair of scissors properly, make attendance to a steep step, use chairs in a correct way. Another approach is the more direct one where children are told what is expected from them. Within this direct style large differences exist about the way instructions and tasks are given. In this style a more indirect way of giving safety instructions is common. Children are given a task and they are expected to know how to e.g. use scissors properly. The youthworkers are conscious about possible incidents, but do not directly communicate safety-risks to the children.

One-to-one conversations
Another controversy on European level deals with whether it is appropriate to have a private talk with a minor in a separate place without a second adult attending this conversation. In some countries it is quite common to have one-to-one conversations with children who don't feel well in the group, who are home-sick, who want to share difficult issues from their life or who misbehaved and were punished. In other places there is a clear policy that this kind of conversations can only be held in the presence of two adults, or at least with a second adult in sight of the child and the youthworker.

Alcoholconsume
Alcoholconsume among youthworkers is a hot issue in many countries and organizations. The main question that rises is: is a youthworker allowed to drink alcohol at all during an activity or a camp? Some people claim that a youthworker can't drink when he is in charge of a group as in the end he is responsible for the children. Others make clear agreements about who can drink, how much and when. Finally, there are some places where alcoholconsume is part of the evenings spent together with the youthworkers and where this consume is not openly questioned.

Now the behavioural differences have been mapped, the question on how to deal with the dissimilarities rises again. If you merely look at the behaviour and judge on what you see, you risk to get stuck in conflicts with people who have a different cultural background than yours. Instead of discussing the observed behaviour, the solution often lies in looking for the value hidden beneath it. Once we grasp and understand the value and hence why youthworkers behave the way they do, conflicts about behavioural differences tend to soften and communication improves.

For example: whereas for some youthworkers playing is the final purpose, for others games are rather tools that attract children in order to teach them religion or school materials. So, quiet and calm games are more likely to appear in places where after the game children are expected to sit down and learn. Another illustration: in some countries the idea of health and safety is omnipresent, which reflects in games where

the accident-risk is brought to the lowest level possible and hence rough games are not played.

Values

When I was a child, one of my favourite activities was to play outside with the children from the neighbourhood. As we all had small gardens, our street was the place to go. We played there for hours and hours, especially during summertime. Some of the things we did were ordinary games, other activities we had to hide more carefully from our parents. When I look back at it now, I remember it as a great time with a lot of freedom, although there were some strict rules on where to go and when to be at home. What we did was not always without danger and some of our self-invented activities would now probably be considered as irresponsible. It seems that our ideas about safety used to be different than the current convictions.

Safety

Safety is one of the values that not only in youthwork, but also in society in general has gained considerable significance over the last decade. Many people claim that risk-factors for children are rising gradually and therefore efforts to protect children should increase equally. This group is convinced that the utmost should be done to protect children against any kind of harm. This idea is widely supported and plenty of books with guidelines and instructions about safeguarding can be found. Others however, feel that children nowadays are overprotected, are 'put in cotton wool'. As these people consider it, children lack freedom and their development risks to be limited by overprotection. This discussion basically deals with the balance between two highly important values: on one hand providing the necessary protection for children and on the other hand giving them enough freedom to develop. It's obvious that many (intercultural) factors like the safety of the place where a child lives, mental and physical health of a child, life-events of the family where the child grows up etc. influence to which side of these two values the balance will incline.

Privacy

Besides 'safety', 'privacy' is another hot issue in European youthwork. It became one of the rights written down in the 'Convention of the Rights of the Child'. For young people this right implies that adults can not intrusively enter their life to gather information and that available information can not be spread limitless. Youthworkers who strongly support this value are likely to have private conversations with children. These youthworkers see it as respectful towards children to talk about private issues in one-to-one conversations. Others claim that these talks should be done by two adults or that at least a second adult needs to be in the immediate presence and view of the child. In this way they want to protect children against abuse by youthworkers and at the same time they want to make sure youthworkers can not be falsely accused by children.

Responsibility
Another value that is strongly emphasized in youthwork is 'responsibility'. Youthworkers are given responsibility over the children they are working with: these children must be offered a nice time in a safe and appropriate way. By taking care of children youthworkers themselves get a chance to develop to independent and mature adults.

The discussion on this topic mainly deals with the level of responsibility that should be given to youthworkers. Some people have a rather suspicious approach to the attempts of young people in taking on responsibility. Very often they fear insurance-issues in case an accident happens. People restricting responsibility for youthworkers often do this to prevent youthworkers being declared guilty in case of an incident. Others claim that youthworkers can only grow in responsibility when a considerable level of responsibility is given to them. This last style requires the necessary support and guidance for youthworkers.

Like the behavioural differences, the values mentioned above are not an exhaustive list of intercultural distinctions within European youthwork. The values are rather an indication of the topics that sometimes lead to arguments among youthworkers. Difficult in dealing with these quarrels is that very often youthworkers are not strongly aware of the values they are guided by in their work with young people. Therefore, confrontation with youthworkers who have different perspectives and ideas, is very helpful. In this way, youthworkers can broaden their view as well as become more aware of their own values and convictions.

Minimum requirements

Due to different values that are expressed throughout various styles of behaviour, there is not just one clear or correct answer regarding the ideal way to deal with safeguarding issues. Yet, the fact that large distinctions in behavioural styles and values are accepted and sometimes even warmly welcomed in European youthwork, does not imply that all behaviour can be justified. There are minimum requirements that need to be met when dealing with young people. These standards can be found in both the 'Declaration of the Human Rights' and the 'Convention of the Rights of the Child'. Behaviour that does not meet these standards is unacceptable. No European youthworker can claim that just because his culture and values are different, behaviour that violates these rights should be justified. These declarations make up the minimum framework in which work with young people can be done.

An important aspect of these declarations is that a relationship in which abuse of power takes place, can never be accepted. Abuse of power needs to be understood in the broadest sense of the word. It refers to every kind of behaviour in which the responsible youthworker takes advantage of his position towards young persons. Abuse of power therefore includes as well emotional pressure, as demand for blind obedience, as sexual abuse, as neglecting the fact that children can only partially assess risks in the environment and judge about the intentions of people.

Within the overall positive atmosphere of youthwork, characterized by voluntary engagement of many people, we should not turn a blind eye to the possible violence of youthworkers towards young people. This risk must be acknowledged regardless the country or place where one lives. Violence includes abuse of power, humiliation, not providing young people with the necessary safety, neglecting needs of young people. Every youthworker should be able to identify any type of violence and to take the necessary action to stop violence and inappropriate behaviour. Therefore, youthworkers need proper formation on leadership, cooperation, communication. Furthermore, they need to be guided and supported in self-assessment and self-reflection. And finally, youthworkers should have a responsible adult in their organization, someone who has a good view on the organization and the volunteers, a responsible who they can report unacceptable incidents to.

The declaration and convention provide us with a clear minimum framework: this outline tells us what is nót allowed, what should nót be done. But in our search for safeguarding this is not sufficiently. We look further towards a positive filling in of this framework: what is appropriate, what is good to do, what can be advised? In the next part of the text, we search for a common ground and common goals in European youthwork, respecting the minimum outline we have. Instead of a framework that limits, we try to create a set of aims that guarantees a positive approach towards the concept of safeguarding.

In search for a common ground and common goals in European youthwork

The positive filling in of the minimum outline can be guided by the quest for common aims. Despite the large variety in behaviour and the tension between values in European youthwork, joined objectives can still be found. Youthwork has a responsibility not only towards children, but also towards youthworkers. It should offer both children and youthworkers a nice time and at the same time support the development of young people to independent and mature adults who take their place and responsibility in society.

Having a good time

The main objective of youthwork is giving children a good time within a safe environment where they can play and build positive relationships with friends. If children have the chance to experience the joy of playing and spending time in a group, this experience is likely to enhance their overall well-being and social skills in a playful way. Youthwork is one of the ‘places’ where children learn how to argue and make up for it, how to win and loose, how to fight and protect one another.

Active citizenship

Besides this first goal, European youthwork aims as well at helping youthworkers to develop to active citizens who take responsibility in society. Youthwork should provide young people with the space and possibilities for growth to independence. This can be done by giving them responsibility and support. In order to take on responsibility for the children in their group, youthworkers must be given the necessary support, guidance and training. In spite of this training and support, youthworkers will still make mistakes and hopefully learn from what they did wrong. And this stumbling of young people towards adulthood must be granted them. Young people need adults who do not belittle them, but who guide them.

Adults carry the task to educate a generation that takes responsibility for itself and the following generation. Youthworkers should be made aware of possible dangers and should be taught to act appropriately towards risks. They should however not become paralysed. In order to educate youthworkers, a respectful approach which takes into account the level of maturity, the strengths and weaknesses of every youthworker is necessary.

The task of youthwork to contribute to the education of young people to active and responsible citizens requires training of youthworkers, especially in the way they relate themselves to the young people they are working with. To start with, youthworkers must be made conscious of the importance to protect the personal integrity of the children they are responsible for. Youthworkers should not allow bullying, abuse of power, emotional pressure within or towards their group. Yet, they do not only prevent integrity being violated, youthworkers also help children to detect violation and support children to stand up for themselves. In fact, they help children to build strength and resilience. A next step taken is to encourage the children in their group to respect the integrity of others and to take on responsibility for others.

This teaching and learning is, due to the nature of youthwork, done in a non-formal way. Teaching actually happens in the way youthworkers deal with one another and the children during activities. Modelling is the most important learning-style for the development of resilient and caring young people. If not adults show young people how to build sustainable and warm relationships, to look after one another, to comfort, to find appropriate ways to deal with one another; Who else will? In this an important task is reserved for youthwork as building positive relationships within a safe environment is the main aim of youthwork.

Challenges

Differences in behaviour, tensions in values, a minimum framework and common goals all combined together lead towards challenges for European youthwork in the 21st century.

As mentioned before, we can not turn a blind eye towards safety-risks or possible violence to young people and children. Moreover, children are vulnerable as they can

only partially assess risks in the environment and judge about the intentions of people. Therefore, we can not but provide youthwork with a minimal framework that ensures safety and integrity of young people. Youthwork should offer young people the necessary protection, in order to create a safe environment that enables young people to feel good, to have a good time, to establish sustainable and warm relationships. However, this safety framework should still be challenging. Young people must be given a safe place where they can experiment, where they can make mistakes and get new chances, where they can discover their talents and weaknesses. Youthworkers should be given the freedom they can handle, should be stimulated to take on responsibility for themselves and others. In this way youthwork can contribute towards the education of a generation that is aware of and dares to face challenges in society.

A special thank goes to Katharina Jochem who had a close look at this article and provided me with the necessary feedback and changes.

Lieve Van Aerschot

Building awareness on safeguarding in youth organizations

Everyone who works with children and youth people – as a professional or as a volunteer – is more and more confronted with strict requirements on how to ensure safety of their target group. In some countries 'safeguarding' has, for various reasons, even become one of the major issues in youthwork. Hence, many youthworkers are looking for guidelines and examples of good practice.

This chapter provides a general definition on child abuse and besides helps youthworkers to start a reflection-process on appropriate behaviour related to safeguarding.

Defining abuse

Child abuse occurs when the behaviour of someone in a position of greater power than a child or young person abuses that power and causes harm to that child or young person. Child abuse, for our purposes, is categorised into four groups:

1. Emotional Abuse
2. Physical Abuse
3. Sexual Abuse
4. Neglect

Emotional Abuse

Emotional abuse is the persistent emotional ill-treatment of a child such as to cause severe and persistent adverse effects on the child's emotional development. Emotional abuse is normally found in the relationship between a caregiver and child.

Physical abuse

Physical abuse is any form of non-accidental injury or injury which results from wilful or neglectful failure to protect a child; e.g. shaking a child, excessive force.

Sexual abuse

Sexual abuse occurs where a child is used by another person for his or her gratification, for sexual arousal or for that of others.

Indirect abuse of children occurs where children have been photographed, videotaped or filmed for pornographic purposes or subjected to gross and obscene language or indecent images.

Neglect

Neglect can be defined in terms of an omission, where the child suffers significant harm or impairment of development by being deprived of food, clothing, warmth, hygiene, intellectual stimulation, supervision and safety, attachment to and affection from adults, and medical care.

Neglect generally becomes apparent in different ways over a period of time rather than at one specific point. It Is the persistent failure to meet a child's physical, emotional and/or psychological needs that is likely to result in significant harm.

Examples of neglect include:

- Where a child suffers a series of minor injuries as a result of not being properly supervised or protected
- The consistent failure of a child to gain weight or height may indicate that they are being deprived of adequate nutrition.
- Where a child consistently misses school; this may be due to bullying or deprivation of intellectual stimulation and support.

Code of behaviour when working with children and young people

In some of the European countries, youth work organizations develop very specific codes of behaviour as a guideline for their youthworkers in order to guarantee safety for children and young people. Such a code of behaviour can be a very useful tool for building awareness on safeguarding in an organization. However, it is very hard to build one universal code of behaviour which applies to all youth work organizations in Europe.

For this chapter we are presenting an Irish code of behaviour. As this code is very detailed it gives a good overview on which elements can be included in such a code of behaviour. The ideas one finds here below can easily be used as a starting-point for a discussion on which behaviour is defined as (in)appropriate in the specific situation where one works.

Code of behaviour

The aim of this is to ensure the safety of children and young people, to enhance the work practices of youthworkers and to reassure parents and guardians, as well as children themselves, that there is a commitment to best practice.

The code is child-centred and stresses the importance of:
- Listening to children and young people
- Valuing and respecting them as individuals
- Rewarding their efforts as well as achievements
- Involving them in decision making (where appropriate)
- Encouraging and praising them

General Conduct
- Physical punishment of children is not permissible under any circumstances.
- Verbal abuse of children or telling jokes of sexual nature in the presence of children can never be acceptable. Great care should be taken if it is necessary to have a conversation regarding sexual matters with a child or a young person.
- Being alone with a child or young person may not always be wise or appropriate practice. If a situation arises where it is necessary to be alone with a child, another responsible adult should be informed immediately, by telephone if necessary. A diary note the meeting with the young person took place, including the reasons for it, should be made.
- Best practice in relation to travel with children and young people should be observed. Youthworkers should not undertake any car or minibus journey alone with a child or young person. If, in certain circumstances, only one adult is available, there should be a minimum of two children or young people present for the entire journey. In the event of an emergency, where it is necessary to make a journey alone with a child, a record of this should be made and the child's parent or guardian should be informed as soon as possible.
- All children and young people must be treated with equal respect; favouritism is not acceptable.
- Youthworkers should not engage in or tolerate any behaviour – verbal, psychological or physical – that could be construed as bullying or abusive.
- A disproportionate amount of time should not be spent with any particular child or group children.
- Under no circumstances should youthworkers give alcohol, tobacco, or drugs to children or young people.
- Alcohol, tobacco or drugs must not be used by who are preserving or working with children or young people.
- Only age-appropriate language, material or media products (such as camera, phones, internet, and video) and activities should be used when working with children and young people. Sexually explicit or pornographic material is never acceptable.

Respect for Physical Integrity

- The physical integrity of children and young people must be respected at all times.

Respect for Privacy

- The right to privacy of children and young people must be respected at all times.
- Particular care regarding privacy must be taken when young people are in locations such as changing areas, swimming pools, showers and toilets.
- Photographs of children or young people must never be taken while they are in changing areas (for example, in a locker room or bathing facility);
- Written consent from parents or guardians should always be sought before taking photographs.
- Tasks of a personal nature (for example, helping with toileting, washing or changing clothing) should not be carried out for children or young people if they can undertake these tasks themselves.

Meeting with Children and Young People

- If the care of the child or young person necessitates meeting alone with them, such meetings should not be held in an isolated environment. The times and designated location for meeting should allow for transparency and accountability (for example, be held in rooms with a clear glass panel or window, in a building where other people are present, and with the door of the room left open).
- Both the length and number of meetings should be limited.
- Parents or guardians should be informed that the meeting(s) took place, except in circumstances where to do so might place the child in danger.
- Visits to the home or private rooms should not be encouraged, nor should meetings be conducted in such locations.
- When the need for a visit to the home of a child or young person arises, professional boundaries must be observed at all times.

Children with Special Needs or Disabilities

- Children with special needs or disability may depend on adults more than other children for their care and safety, and so sensitivity and clear communication are particularly important.
- Where it is necessary to carry out tasks of a personal nature for a child with special needs, this should be done with the full understanding and consent of parents and guardians.
- In carrying out such personal care tasks, sensitivity must be shown to the child and the tasks should be undertaken with the utmost discretion.
- Any care task of a personal nature which a child or young person can do for themselves should not be undertaken by a worker
- In an emergency situation where this type of help is required, parents should be fully informed as soon as is reasonably possible.

Vulnerable Children and Adults

- Since especially vulnerable children may depend on adults more than other children for their care and safety, sensitivity and clear communication are of utmost importance.
- Workers should be aware that vulnerable children may be more likely than other children to be bullied or subjected to other forms of abuse, and may also be less clear about physical and emotional boundaries
- It is particularly important that vulnerable children should be carefully listened to, in recognition of the fact that they may have difficulty in expressing their concerns and in order that the importance of what they say is not underestimated.

Trips away from Home

- All trips, including day trips, overnight stays and holiday, need careful advance planning, including adequate provision for safety in regard to transport, facilities, activities and emergencies. Adequate insurance should be in place.
- Written consent by a parent or guardian specifically for each trip and related activities must be obtained well in advances.
- A copy of the itinerary and contact telephone numbers should be made available to parents and guardians.
- There must be adequate, gender-appropriate, supervision for boys and girls.
- Arrangement and procedures must be put in place to ensure that rules and appropriate boundaries are maintained in the relaxed environment of trips away.
- Particular attention should be given to ensuring that the privacy of young people is respected when they are away on trips.
- The provision of appropriate and adequate sleeping arrangements should be ensured in advance of the trip.
- Sleeping areas for boys and girls should be separate and supervised by two adults of the same sex as the group being supervised.
- At least two adults should be present in dormitories in which children or young people are sleeping. Under no circumstances should an adult share a bedroom with a young person.
- If, in any emergency situation, an adult considers it necessary to be in a children's dormitory or bedroom without another adult being present they should (a) immediately inform another adult in a position of responsibility and (b) make a diary note of circumstances.

Responding to a child or a young person making a complaint

Although general rules on appropriate behaviour are important, they are not sufficiently. Every organization ought to think in advance on how to deal with children, young people who reveal abuse to a youthworker. As youthworkers risk to be emotionally

overwhelmed by the story of a child, guidelines on how to respond can be useful. As in the previous part of the text, the ideas listed below, make not an exhaustive and compulsory list about proper behaviour. Yet, it can help to trigger the debate on which reactions are (in)appropriate. Also the question about what tasks are to be performed by youthworkers and what should be dealt with by child protection agencies/social workers/therapists, ought to be discussed thoroughly within every organization.

Do

- Listen calmly and take them seriously. Only ask questions for clarification. Do not ask leading or intrusive questions. Do not suggest words; use theirs. Allow the child to continue at his/her own pace
- Adopt an emphatic listening style which is compassionate, calm and reassuring. Do not register feelings of shock or horror at what they say.
- Reassure the child that, in disclosing the abuse; they have done the right thing.
- Let them know that you will do what you can to help.
- Tell them they are not to blame for the abuse
- Offer to accompany the person to the support person.
- Report abuse to your responsible
- If you have not been able to take notes, write down and sign what was said as soon as possible.

Do not

- Do not dismiss their concerns. Do not panic. Do not probe for more information. Do not make assumptions or speculate.
- Do not make negative comments about the accused person.
- Do not question beyond checking what has been said. There must be no probing for detail beyond that which has been freely given.
- Make no promises that cannot be kept, especially with regards to secrecy, but note carefully what is being sought. So, do not 'promise not to tell anyone' or say 'you'll keep it a secret'
- Do not disclose the details of the allegation to anybody else – even if the allegations involve them in any other way.
- Explain to the child that this information will need to be shared with others and at the end of the discussion tell them what you plan to do next and with whom this information will be shared.
- Remember: the person who first encounters a case of alleged or suspected abuse is not responsible for deciding whether or not abuse has occurred. This is the task of the professional child protection agencies following a referral to them of the concerns about the child.

Fr. James Robert Gardner SDB

Authors

Fr. Roger Burggraeve SDB, master in philosophy and doctor in de moral theology, is professor emeritus of the Catholic University of Leuven. His research focuses amongst others on sexual ethics, the philosophy of Levinas and the Christian concept of peace, tolerance and nationalism. He is cofounder and president of the centre for peace ethics of the Catholic University of Leuven. Throughout his academic career he was involved in the development of the Belgian youth organization "Eigentijdse Jeugd", of which he was cofounder.

Ms. Lieve Van Aerschot, master in psychology, is clinical psychologist in Ave Regina vzw. This is a residential and semi-residential care centre which offers support for children, young people and adults who deal with behavioural and emotional problems and/or a mental disability. Lieve is an experienced trainer in international youth work and is the current president of Don Bosco Youth-Net ivzw.

Fr. James Robert Gardner SDB has 25 years experience as a youth worker in special youth care. He is chair of the commission on safeguarding of the Salesian congregation in UK. He is an experienced trainer in international youth work with an expertise in delivering training on safeguarding.

Fr. Stefan Stoehr SDB is a trained social worker and experience intercultural trainer. For the last ten years he has been managing youth centres, where he is responsible for implementing rules and procedures on safeguarding. Next to this he is an experience project officer, mainly focussed on social inclusion (projects on refugees, special youth care). Currently he is member of the commission on safeguarding of the Salesian congregation in Germany.

Mr. Rein Meus is general secretary of Don Bosco Youth-Net ivzw. He is an experienced trainer in international youth work. He is the project officer of the DIGNITY project and editor in chief.

Bibliography

The Council of Europe's Human rights education programme thus fare resulted into following educational manuals:

- Compass – a manual on Human Rights Education with young people
- Compasito – a manual on Human Rights Education with children
- Gender matters – a manual on addressing gender-based violence affecting young people
- All different, all equal education pack – a manual on intercultural tolerance
- All different, all equal companion – a campaign guide about education nand learning for change in Diversity, Human Rights and Participation
- Domino – A manual to use peer group education as a means to fight racism, xenophobia, anti-semitism and intolerance
- Alien 932 – a manual on combatting racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance

All these publications can be downloaded free of charge from the website **http://eycb.coe.int/compass/**

Don Bosco Youth-Net ivzw has produced four educational publication with the support of the European Youth Foundation:

- I (am) like you – a simulation game on conflict management and resolution
- Jabbertalk – a manual for intercultural youth work
- Hujambo – an informative game on the exchange of values for intercultural youth work
- Dignity – a manual on safeguarding in intercultural youth work

All these publications can be downloaded free of charge from the website:
http://www.donboscoyouth.net/toolbox

The Partnership Council of Europe & European Commission has developed two websites full of useful youth resources:

http://www.salto-youth.net/
http://youth-partnership-eu.coe.int/youth-partnership/

DIGNITY is a publication for youth workers on the subject of safeguarding. The subject deals with the issue of protecting children and young people against various forms of abuse. The aim of the publication is to raise awareness on safeguarding within youth work settings, through providing a theoretical framework and sharing good practices existing within Don Bosco Youth-Net ivzw.

Don Bosco Youth-Net IVZW is an international network of Salesian youth work offices and youth organisations which work in the style of Don Bosco. The network is active in 13 European countries. It assemblies over 1.000 employees and 17.000 volunteers which cater for 150.000 children and youngpeople.