CHAPTER 10

CONCLUDING SUMMARY REMARKS

Although the aim of this chapter is to conclude this dissertation, this does not mean that this topic has been finalized. As already noted, because of its nature a real finality cannot be attained. In a science such as the pedagogical there cannot be a claim of completeness.

Throughout this dissertation there is an attempt to be unbiased, logical and faithful to reality. Nowhere is the claim made that complete finality can be offered to all pedagogical questions because such answers are not possible. A pedagogician remains a seeker of reality. In addition to the foundations Landman has already laid, he remains involved in penetrating more deeply into the phenomenon of educating in order to continue to purify insights and concepts.

The extent to which the development of pedagogics in South Africa is attributable to Landman’s thinking is difficult to determine, and the future itself must still make this judgment. Perhaps this can be done one day when the historical perspective has broadened.

In the present study there is an attempt to objectively disclose the development of Landman’s thought that can be seen in his contributions to fundamental pedagogics. The hermeneutic description of Landman’s thinking necessarily must lead to a more complete perspective on it. All information presented is, in the author’s opinion, viewed as relevant to the aim of the study. The biographical details that arise must continually be seen as a foundation for and against the background of his pedagogical thinking; then the impression will not arise that this is a biographical study.

Landman rightfully can be mentioned in the same breath with, e.g., Oberholzer and Gunter as a pedagogician who has contributed substantially to establishing pedagogics as an autonomous science. One of Landman’s greatest contributions to the area of pedagogics

---

undoubtedly is expanding it into an autonomous science in South Africa.

Although there indeed was much collaboration among Landman and fellow-pedagogicians as well as observable influences by teachers such as C. K. Oberholzer in this country and overseas by such thinkers as Heidegger, a high degree of recognition definitely is given to Landman’s originality.

The reader of Landman’s works, and hopefully of this dissertation, will be struck by the fact that he has already written so many books—and thus he has filled a huge void in South Africa. The broad range and scope of these works are all the more remarkable if this void is kept in mind. The promotion of pedagogics in South Africa is indebted to Landman among others. His keen intellect has ranged over almost all of the subject areas of pedagogics and he can express himself with authority about these areas (In this respect there is reference to the commentary of Professor Louw in chapter 9). No wonder that he is viewed as a pioneer in many areas.

However, he gives preference to fundamental pedagogics. He is at the forefront of the development of this subject area and the fact that he is seen as a pioneer is because he also moves in areas that for many co-workers are still almost unfamiliar. As an example one can think of his contributions to phenomenology and research methodology.

As an outstanding pedagogician and as an academician of unique stature, in Landman one finds an intellectual performance far above the average scientist. Evidence of this, among others, is the following sentence from a personal letter by C. K. Oberholzer sent to Landman on 19 April 1977: “I salute you as an aristocratic intellectual!”

In particular, Landman is known for his keen and direction-giving thinking about the area of fundamental pedagogics. In this thinking he is in agreement with C. K. Oberhozer’s ontological grounding of pedagogics by which this science can lay claim to a relative (i.e., grounded) autonomy.
During the course of time Landman has shown that within the framework of the pedagogical and pedagogic thinking, ontology is only possible as phenomenology and that phenomenology is meaningful only as ontology. Therefore, it is the task of the fundamental pedagogician to radically-empirically search for the real essentialities or the essential reality of the pedagogical that, as fundamental ways of living, form the grounds or preconditions for all educating. This meaningful method earned Landman the name of honor of “essence pedagogician” within fundamental pedagogic circles. He has made a decisively clear choice between essence-awareness and essence-blindness.

On the basis of his strong epistemological attunement Landman is aware that the disclosure of pedagogical essences would be useless to the pedagogician unless they are cast in special pedagogic forms. Also in this respect he agrees with Oberholzer and has expanded on the latter’s thinking in outstanding ways by designing relevant pedagogical categories and connecting them to the unveiling of pedagogical essences.

With this the era of pedagogical categories-and-criteria-design was put on solid footing. The pedagogical categories and criteria finally confirmed the autonomy of pedagogics and Willem Landman figured very prominently in this.

Landman the pedagogician is not only an extraordinary scientist but also a fine pedagogue and, thus, for him science cannot merely be practiced for the sake of science itself. Science for the sake of science must be looked beyond and moved beyond by applying fundamental pedagogics to practice. From the phenomenologically oriented sphere of pedagogics he again showed in a surprising way the importance of a philosophy of life. A pedagogue stands under a dual appeal that stems from his pedagogical as well as his philosophy of life insights. Also, on a scientific level Landman takes into account this double appeal with his double postulate: scientific necessity and philosophy of life permissibility. The fundamental ways of living of the pedagogical are now seen as enlivened *fundamentalia* in the practice of educating (Kilian: acknowledgment during SAVBO honorary medal award 1981).
Landman’s particular contributions to pedagogics examined in this study are briefly summarized as follows. The details are ordered in accordance with their appearance in the study.

* A valuable contribution is made with respect to the development of the phenomenological method:

- At first there was a strong Husserlian explanation with his absolutizing of reasoning in the foreground. Husserl’s steps of reduction were described in an understandable and applicable way.

- The phenomenological method was described in detail with a clear movement away from a methodological monism. This occurred by making room for the contradictory, hermeneutic, triadic and empirical methods.

- The phenomenological acts of disclosing (essences) were reinterpreted in the form of questions posed to the pedagogician. The pedagogical discussion about contemporary phenomenology was more closely elucidated.

- Phenomenology in action. The significance of phenomenology for research was explicated for the first time, especially regarding the following:

  • Attunement to research.
  • Preparation for the research.
  • Verification of the research.

  It was strongly indicated that philosophy of life permissibility was also a meaningful criterion for educative research.

* The following contributions were made regarding the application of categories in pedagogics:

  - Original pedagogical categories and examples of their
practical application were given. It was explicated that pedagogical criteria in reality are categories-in-the-form-of-questions.

- The ontological-anthropological grounding of pedagogical categories (and criteria) was indicated. Thus, pedagogical categories were justified epistemologically.

- For the first time, the concept “category” was analyzed etymologically and phenomenologically and its application for disclosing pedagogical essences was demonstrated.

* The significance of a philosophy of life for the practice of the science of education:

- That life philosophical judging has relevance for the way science is practiced was strongly stated. Philosophy of life permissibility of acts of thinking acquired equal status with scientific necessity. Philosophy of life permissibility is seen as a particular criterion for scientific practice. This view is a breaking away from Husserl’s rationalism in terms of Heidegger’s “Befindlichkeit”[attunement]. In Landman’s 1977 book, “Fundamentele Pedagogiek en Onderwyspraktyk”, this matter was even more sharply stated because it was shown that philosophy of life permissibility is a mode of affective attunement. With this, philosophy of life judging of activities of scientific practice became part of the concept “scientific”.

* As far as philosophy of life content is concerned, the following was noticed and explicated:

- The fact and possibility of philosophy of life enlivenment is a universal matter.

- Life philosophical matters can claim the same degree of structural status as the relationship, sequence, activity and aim structures.

- The way in which essences from philosophy of life sources
and from the reality of educating itself are synthesized must also meet scientific requirements.

- The particular preconditions for meaningful philosophy of life approved improvement of practice are explained: co-existentiality, co-essentiality, overcoming essence blindness, awakening to life and actualizing.

* With respect to essence viewing in pedagogics, the following insights were contributed:

- The concept essence is outlined. To clearly indicate that pedagogical essences are not Platonic ideas, the concept “real essences” is used, especially in the sense of “preconditions”.

- In the thinking search for knowledge only one of two ways is possible: Either it involves the essentials of the reality of educating or it involves the non-essentials. This statement is used as a fundamental axiom.

- It was clearly stressed that to be a real essence it must have categorical status.

- It was decisively advocated that the elimination of essence blindness is a necessary scientific criterion. That pedagogical thinking not only involves revealing essences but also bringing to light coherences (relationships) enjoyed particular attention.

- For the first time it was clearly seen that pedagogical essences in reality are ways of life. They are ways of living that are fundamental for a child to become a proper adult.

- It became clearer that educational research in reality involves applying research procedures with the aim of:
  
  - disclosing essences,
  - realizing essences, and
  - verifying essences.
Landman also made important contributions to the development of research methodology. In this respect he promoted and stimulated important developmental work.

- For the first time in Afrikaans a publication appeared describing research methodology and its significance for the investigation of the practice of educating.
- Research methodology for the basic preparation of teachers was developed by Landman and the proposed program of preparation was accepted by educational institutions in the Transvaal.
- Research methodology for the development of curriculum research had already progressed far.

To allow for a proper understanding of Landman as a pedagogician, his works must not be read piecemeal because this can leave the impression that a holistic view of his particular approach or method of scientific practice is not possible. In this dissertation there is an attempt to present a holistic view of Landman’s methodological, logical and systematic approach. In doing so a high priority is given to the demands of objectivity in order to present an honest, impartial and disinterested (i.e., not for one’s own benefit) piece of work.

The purpose of looking at the development of Landman’s thought with respect to this matter that he views as prominent and has been explicated in his educational writings is primarily to lead to a better understanding of his thought and in doing so to arrive at a more complete and refined holistic view and evaluation of his work. The second aim is to provide an acceptable perspective on his work and thought because of the tendency in South Africa to sometimes unnecessarily label educators.

Pedagogics as a science, as any science, uses technical language with its own terminology and concepts. Sometimes a concept has a variety of meanings, thus the present study provides etymological explications of the concepts presented and used by Landman in order to clarify them. This was also done because criticism sometimes arises about Landman’s handling of certain concepts.
In the present study attention is also given to the views of other pedagogicians about Landman’s works. There is an attempt to render this commentary as objectively as possible. In doing so there is a decided restraint of evaluative commentary about the nature or reasonableness of this commentary as well as its scientific merits. As a true scientist, Landman welcomes constructive criticism directed at the truth about the phenomenon of educating. If the scope of the useful foundations laid by Landman on which others can build is taken into account, the sometimes inevitable criticisms of his thinking are weighed and deemed to be weak objections.

Indeed, one of Landman’s greatest contributions as a pedagogician is found outside of the narrow or purely academic world. As an academic he not only practices science but also is closely involved in the preparation of student teachers. His students through the years are able to confirm that he meaningfully led them to their future calling as teachers. He has a particular talent for making the part disciplines of pedagogics (and particularly fundamental pedagogics) accessible to his students. Landman’s influence in this domain can hardly be overestimated. His involvement in the organized profession of education indicates that he himself actively campaigned for effective teacher preparation.

Landman is not only a champion for the status of pedagogics but also for the teaching profession as is clearly evident from the many papers he has presented at symposia (See Appendix 1).

As a practice-directed pedagogician it is very necessary to him and he devoted himself to the fact that teachers must be thoroughly prepared in pedagogics. He put a high premium on expertise because he believes this would elevate the status of the profession.

Landman shows himself to be a fine pedagogician. This means that he carefully adheres to scientific demands. His work is systematic and logical and rests on methodically acquired knowledge. Therefore, the results of his thinking are accountable, verifiable and demonstrable. His many publications (See Appendix 2) testify to his creative mind in the above demands. If the developmental course of his thinking is followed it is clear that he is a citizen of the
scientific world of his time. These publications indeed testify to a continuing and full-fledged program of research that has appeared to the benefit of fellow pedagogicians as well as students.

Rightly, Landman is viewed as one of the architects of the phenomenological method in South Africa. The way he applied it in the past and still does indicates that there never needs to be reasons for concern that the phenomenological approach betrays Christian and National policies of teaching in South Africa. On the contrary, all who know Landman are aware that he fully endorses these policies. Indeed he devotes himself to extending and implementing them. Landman has excellent success in dealing with phenomenology in a Christian accountable way—in obedience to the demands of propriety of his philosophy of life as well as of his particular science. Landman has shown that to think and work phenomenologically one must not necessarily be a non-Christian.

As a rule a philosophy of life supports faith-based beliefs that make a persons comings and goings meaningful. The most important is that a Higher hand makes it possible that through human effort an aim can be reached. God is directed to and works with people as co-workers. For Landman, the essential core of a philosophy of life is in the activity of educating and the Biblically oriented sight or vision of being human (child-on-the-way-to-adulthood). Landman’s particular perspective is engaged in and imported into every facet of the reality of educating and teaching.

For Landman providing service is not only a priority, it is a way of life. Evidence of this is his involvement in so many different areas of society related to the teaching profession. Landman’s contributions and influence in the organized profession of teaching can hardly be overestimated. He is particularly attuned to the status of the teaching profession as will be shown presently.

Landman is not only a pedagogician but also honored nationally as a teacher. This is expressed in national awards he has received for his extraordinarily successful academic life and career. In this regard he received the Transvaal Teacher’s Association Medal of Honor in 1981, the South African Academy of Science and Arts Medal of Honor in 1984 and also its Stal Prize for Education also in
1984. After being acquainted with this part of the study it will be agreed that Landman is a worthy and deserving recipient of these awards, that his academic excellence and quality are recognized by them as is his fine attunement to and involvement in the practice of educating in the broadest sense.

Landman’s Christianity is a strong foundation for all of his activities. The next particular service that he provides in reality is service to his Creator.

The contributions made to the organized profession of teaching are services that he provides on a post-scientific level. There is a boundary difficult to delimit between scientific and post-scientific work. However, the concept post-scientific can be applied here since it involves the application of scientific knowledge to practice. This post-scientific work flows from the practice of science. However, it is no longer science and is no longer known as pedagogics. The post-scientific application consequently is a matter that falls outside of the area of pedagogics although it stems from scientific practice.

The fact that with respect to the contributions mentioned, Landman moves in a post-scientific terrain does not imply that he thereby separates himself as a pedagogician from his scientific thought. In the post-scientific this involves criteria as guidelines for the Christian educator carrying out the particular education of children of the Covenant.

Landman’s local activities also can be described as post-scientific because they involve prescriptions. As soon as there are prescriptions, one is immediately in a post-scientific terrain. When the area of the post-scientific is entered pedagogical findings and judgments can no long lay claim to having a scientific character. Then the claim of being universal and apodictic (of universal validity and necessity) can no longer be made.

The concept post-scientific is the term for distinguishing what the scientist does [applies] in practice from the knowledge that he has formulated scientifically. As soon as the scientist introduces his findings into practice and makes personal choices based on them
then he is post-scientifically involved with them. Scientific knowledge can be of such a nature that it can be meaningfully applied to the everyday activities of persons. Pedagogics is such a science with application possibilities. This involves using scientific knowledge in planning practice in order to reach the educative aim and to perform the educative task with greater accountability (Landman et al. 1979: 94).

An overview of Landman’s contributions to the organized profession of teaching and to religious life appears at the end of this study as an appendix.

When credit is given to Landman for the contributions he has made and still makes to pedagogics the intention is not to deprive his predecessors or his followers of the credit they deserve. The purpose is only to offer a hermeneutic exposition of his contributions and in doing so to do justice to him as a pedagogician, especially within the field of fundamental pedagogics, by showing that his penetrating thinking and indefatigable energy has helped pave the way for pedagogical thinking in South Africa. In this way he has achieved a rightful place for himself in the series of South African pedagogicians.

Thus, without detracting in any way from the merits of all of the other influential pedagogicians in our country or those yet to come, it is asserted that the pedagogics of today could not be practiced in a scientifically accountable way if the contributions of Landman were not taken into account.

“Knowledge begins with service to the Lord; it is only fools who disparage wisdom and education”.
(Proverbs 1:7 1983 Afrikaans version)
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