

Prelude

Discipline is the core of moral education. As E. Durkheim revealed it in the opening pages of *Moral Education*, the spirit of discipline is the first element of morality. Issues of discipline are also central concerns to schoolteachers. Courses like “Behavior modification” or “Classroom management” in teacher preparation curriculum reflect the anxiety and perplexity of teachers who have to deal with it in everyday classroom practice. Discipline usually implies to the exercise of authority to maintain order. Seldom have teachers asked where the authority derives or should be derived, and if is order necessary for discipline because it is always and almost taken for granted. Discipline inevitably relates to individual freedom. But is discipline contradictory to freedom, or complementary to it? Each concept naturally leads to a necessity for definition. Discipline, for instance, in *Longman* (1991) *Dictionary*, is a) training and instruction that corrects, moulds or perfects the mental faculties or moral character; b) punishment. Thus discipline is usually related to punishment. For Durkheim, “crime is normal so that punishment is essential to separate normative behavior from what is considered deviant” (Alexander, 2003: 216). A classic statement on discipline can be extracted from Foucault’s (1977: 128-129) *Discipline and Punish* in which “the obedient subject, the individual subjected to habits, rules, orders, an authority that is exercised continually around him and upon him, and which he must allow to function automatically in him.” Therefore, discipline is reinforced by the application of surveillance so that the subject feels monitored. It might be more comprehensible to use “case book” of

morality to exemplify what does it mean by discipline. For instance, W. Bennett, in *The Book of Virtues: A Treasury of Great Moral Stories*, which much reflects American attitude toward morality, enlists self-discipline as the first virtue, followed by compassion, responsibility, friendship, work, courage, perseverance, honesty, loyalty, and faith. Bennett (1993: 21) indicates that “in self-discipline one makes a ‘disciple’ of oneself. One is one’s own teacher, trainer, coach, and ‘disciplinarian.’ It is an odd sort of relationship, paradoxical in its own way, and many of us don’t handle it very well.” On the other hand, freedom is: a) the absence of necessity or constraint in choice or action; b) liberation from slavery or restraint or from the power of another; c) the quality or state of being exempt or released, usually from something onerous. Thus we find freedom is usually conceived in negative terms which enable individuals unaffected from external, authoritarian power. For Durkheim, punishment usually consists of the deprivation of freedom. The article seeks to distinguish what discipline, as it is related to freedom, means to Durkheim and Tolstoy with a view to bridging two educational greats for the pedagogy of morality.

It can hardly imagine that the sociologist Durkheim ever met the novelist Tolstoy. It was not because Tolstoy (1828-1910) is much older than Durkheim (1858-1917). Nor geographical barrier has precluded their encounter because Tolstoy traveled widely in his life time. Thomas Mann (1984), in his *Goethe and Tolstoy* which detailed the lineage between these two great writers, vividly portrayed the then enthusiastic young novelist who visited a German school and collected materials from students for reference of his future educational endeavor. At first impression, they have nothing in common. Durkheim is one of the eminent founders in sociology