

CHAPTER 2•

THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANDMAN’S THOUGHT REGARDING A THEORY (PHILOSOPHY) OF EDUCATION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Many publications on pedagogics by Landman have appeared over the past twenty-seven years. In terms of a few titles, in this chapter there is an attempt to track the development of his pedagogical thinking, and to show how his views of pedagogics gradually unfolded, developed, and deepened. Because he has continually remained a seeker of truth, there necessarily have been certain turns in his views. Even so, he has maintained some standpoints over the years, and even vigorously.

An attempt is also made to determine the influence which his teachers (such as C. K. Oberholzer and J. Chris Coetzee) and other fellow pedagogues have had on his thinking and, in chapter eight there is a further tracking of the development of his thinking on his graduate students. In addition, the influence of philosophers is considered. Applying the chronological approach can enable one to determine the degree to which these influences have been assimilated into his own characteristic ways. In a personal letter to Landman, C. K. Oberholzer himself recognizes that Landman follows in his own footsteps, when he writes “my greatest academic pride and gratitude is that you continue my preliminary work” (19.4.77). As one of Landman’s graduate students, Dr. C. G. Coetzee, asserts correctly that Landman introduced him to the German school of [philosophical] thought (Colloquim 1.4.87). That is, German’s, such as Heidegger and Husserl had an influence on Landman’s thinking, as is shown later. However, when there is mention of this influence, this must in no way leave the impression that he slavishly followed these pedagogues [and philosophers]. The development of

• Translation (2012) from: Lemmer, Catharina J.: *W. A. Landman as pedagogiker: ‘n Studie in die fundamentele pedagogiek*. Unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, University of South Africa, Pretoria, 1987, pp. 45-81. EDITED September 2023.

Landman's own independent thinking is evidence of this, and is explicated in the following. However, before proceeding to this, the author thinks it advisable to present a supplement in the form of a chronological list of the ten publications selected for discussion in chapters two through seven, plus a code ascribed to each. This will facilitate their referencing by indicating only their code in the mentioned chapters.*

- 1969 Inleiding tot die fundamentele pedagogiek (IFP)
[Introduction to fundamental pedagogics]
- 1971 Denkwyses in die opvoedkunde (DO)
[Modes of thinking in pedagogics]
- 1971 Opvoedkunde en opvoedingsleer vir beginners (OOB)
[Pedagogics as a science *of* education and doctrines *for* educating: A text for beginners]
- 1973 Fundamentele pedagogiek en die opvoedingswerklikheid (FPOW) [Fundamental pedagogics and the reality of educating]
- 1974 Die praktykwording van die fundamentele pedagogiek (FPF)
[Fundamental pedagogics applied to practice]
- 1975 Fundamenteel-pedagogiese essensies: hulle verskyning, verwerkliking en inhoudgewing (FPE)
[Fundamental pedagogical essences: Their appearance, actualization and giving them content]
- 1977 Fundamentele pedagogiek en onderwyspraktyk (FPOP)
Fundamental pedagogics and the practice of teaching]
- 1979 Fundamentele pedagogiek, leerwyses en vakonderrig (FLV)
[Fundamental pedagogics, modes of learning and teaching subject matter]
- 1980 Inleiding tot die opvoedkundige navorsingspraktyk (IONP)
[Introduction to the practice of educational research]
- 1985 Fundamentele pedagogiek en kurrikulumstudie (FPK)
[Fundamental pedagogics and curriculum studies]

2.2 INTRODUCTION TO FUNDAMENTAL PEDAGOGICS (IFP)

2.2.1 An overview of the terrain of fundamental pedagogics

* See footnotes in chapter one on pages 18 and 42.

Practice is the study terrain of a theory, and a theory has practical consequences. Thus, theory and practice are not isolated from each other. Pedagogical theory is verified in the everyday practice of educating and is a result of describing and reflecting on this practice. This does not mean that a theory is a recipe for planning practice, but rather a theory ought to describe pedagogically permissible guidelines for practice and clarify what that practice essentially is.

The study terrain of pedagogics is the real event of educating itself as it arises in **educative situations**. The phenomenon of educating is a facet of life reality itself. The nature and structure of the phenomenon of educating, as a **particular reality** from the lifeworld, is systematically analyzed and described in a thinking-reflecting way in fundamental pedagogics. To penetrate to and understand the phenomenon of educating which leads to theory forming, the phenomenon of educating itself, as it takes form in an educative event in real educative situations is taken as the **point of departure**.

Fundamental pedagogics, the core area of pedagogics, as a scientific structure, also is a totality of knowledge emanating from essence-descriptions of the educative relationships which manifest themselves in real educative situations.

Fundamental pedagogics, as the science of educative activities, has, as its primary task, learning to know the phenomenon of educating, an event which is only found between and among persons, as one of the most original expressions of being human. The educative event, as an anthropological event, must be brought to light in all its fundamental components and moments, as well as in its deeper connections and facets, so that the pedagogue can describe what is and is not pedagogically permissible. This means that fundamental pedagogics, which is the result of reflecting on the educative situation, has possibilities of application for practice.

This statement also points to the unity of determining facts by analyzing and reflecting on the educative situation and giving direction to the educative work, which ought to be done in future educative situations. Here one has to do with a science which has its

origin in a situation of action, and which studies an event, just as it studies other experiential phenomena which are found in practice. Educating is an expression of the practical attunement of a human being, and this means that a human being is the only being which can, will, must, and ought to purposefully bring about particular changes. “Bringing about change” means that there must be action, and such activities are realized in real educative situations so that the child can progressively live life reality properly.

Each such educative activity promotes becoming adult or it doesn't. The former activities are valued, and the latter are not. Thus, here there is talk of valuation, i.e., of a value preference, because the one condition is preferred over the other. Therefore, fundamental pedagogics concerns itself with a phenomenon descriptively, by which preferred values are always involved and, with respect to which there must be action. These activities occur in educative situations.

Fundamental pedagogics primarily concerns itself with theory forming regarding the structure of educative situations themselves, and with differentiating and further clarifying pedagogical sub-fields (e.g., psycho-, didactic-, socio-, historical-, ortho-pedagogics) as particular aspects of this structure.

The course of the educative event, i.e., the situation of association (where especially three fundamental relationships hold as preconditions for education—relationships of trust, understanding, and authority), and pedagogical encounter are ascertained by fundamental pedagogics, via observing and reflecting on this educative event as it takes form in real educative situations.

The point of departure, or delimited study terrain of fundamental pedagogics is the phenomenon of educating itself, as the primordial fact that educating exists. This primordial fact is irrefutably found in the lifeworld where it has progressed for all times and has been found wherever there are human beings. This primordial fact must be thought through to its roots to disclose and make manifest what is essential, always valid, and real about it. The always valid, unchanging, invariant features, without which the phenomenon of educating could not be thought, must be verbalized in and

described by fundamental pedagogics, via necessarily valid, true and evident categories or irreducible concepts.

The area of study of fundamental pedagogics, i.e., the event of educating, is embedded in life itself and, hence, the practice of science is itself a matter of living. The scientist begins his practice by delimiting an area from the lifeworld as his area of study. This delimitation occurs in the light of a direction-giving idea and intention to act (e.g., [help] the child becoming adult). Thus, he proceeds to make something from the pre-scientific world thematic which contains the structures he is going to reflect on. He stakes out a method, as a way of accessing his object of study, and designs a suitable conceptual structure, and grammatical forms of expression. In this way facets of daily life are established as an area of study for the scientist. Hence, at the root of fundamental pedagogics, as a science, there is a making life reality from the lifeworld present, i.e., the event of educating, as the reality of educating.

Fundamental pedagogics is focused on learning to know the event called educating (pedagogy). Bringing to light all the components and moments, as well as the deeper connections and references of the event, includes illuminating the formal aim of educating. This aim stems from reflecting on the event of educating itself, i.e., what is unique to it. The formal aim of scientific activity, also regarding the pedagogical, is also found in its own sphere.

Fundamental pedagogics is grounding-pedagogics, because it has, as a task, the grounding of the pedagogical within reality.

Fundamental pedagogics *accompanies* the other pedagogical fields of knowledge [part-perspective] in designing and grounding their own categories in terms of their own questions, as asked in pedagogics, thus, as embedded in the pedagogical situation. This accompanying insures that, by a joint focus on life reality, a radical penetration of it becomes possible. Each part-perspective has the task of clarifying and expanding its own terrain of research but, from the foregoing, it is now concluded that one of the future tasks must be, with the accompaniment of fundamental pedagogics, to design its own [sub-pedagogical] categories which emanate from its own perspective on and grounding in life reality [educating]. In the

following, an explanation is given of the modes of thinking for designing a fundamental pedagogics.

2.3 MODES OF THINKING IN PEDAGOGICS (DO)

2.3.1 Modes of thinking for designing a fundamental pedagogics

The pedagogician wants to penetrate to the real essential features, or fundamental structures of the reality of educating. To be able to do this, he must use certain modes of thinking which enable him to design fundamental pedagogics as a science.

In his search for truth, i.e., to answer the question of what makes the reality of educating what it really essentially is, the fundamental pedagogician must describe, interpret, and evaluate. He can only do this by following the phenomenological way to the reality of educating itself to unveil or particularize pedagogical categories and criteria there. He then uses the categories as illuminative means of thinking to disclose the pedagogical reality. After this, an evaluation of their realization follows by applying pedagogical criteria.

In chapter four, attention is also given to three other possible scientific approaches for designing a fundamental pedagogics. The dialectic, contradictory, and hermeneutic pedagogical thinking, as ways of realizing this design, are considered.

2.3.1.1 Phenomenological thinking is categorical thinking

Only a pedagogician, as a phenomenologist, can take responsibility for the categories which he accountably applies, as interpretive means of thinking, thus, illuminative ways-of-access [to a phenomenon]. Real essences are brought to light, or expressed and, thus, appear with the help of illuminative means of thinking; thus, these means (categories) are ways by which real essences are reached. They are ways by which the scientist penetrates to real essences, and by which these essences become manifested (Viljoen and Pienaar 1971, 93).

Hence, a category opens a way to real essences. It is an illuminative means of thinking because it is a way which opens and brings to light [something] for thought. It is an illuminative means of thinking which is a way of thinking by which real essences (with their meanings and coherences) can appear.

“Way” is derived from the German word “weg”, which means “something moves itself forward” (PFP: 3). When a category is now described as “a way”, this means that it creates a way along which real essences can move from being concealed to being unconcealed. Without such a way, these essences will remain hidden. (A category is a means, medium (Latin) which makes these essences accessible). To make accessible means to create a way by which this access can be attained. A category is an illuminative means of thinking which makes an aspect of reality accessible so that its real essentiality can become visible. A category is a means which creates a way of access for thinking. What is involved here is creating a way of access by illuminative thinking. It is the thinking which builds a way (Heidegger 1959: 110) and means (ways of thinking) are needed to build this way—categories build these ways of access through illuminative thinking. Such a way remains in the thinking (Ibid: 99). This means that thinking remains illuminative, with the help of illuminating means (categories) which bring to light these real essences with their meanings and coherences and makes them visible through adequately expressing them in words.

It is only the light of illuminative means which gives a person a way of accessing real essences. Thanks to this light, real essences become unconcealed to some degree (Heidegger 1963: 41-42), and can be adequately verbalized.

Categories are illuminative means of thinking which let a being be, i.e., let it appear as it really, essentially is. Categories create a way of access to the being of a being and they are that way.

A pedagogician has the responsibility of entering a clarifying conversation with the reality of educating as it is embedded in everyday life reality. He must also take responsibility for the means which create ways of access to the essential features of educating. The pre-scientific lifeworld contains all the structures which are

going to be reflected on and, therefore, a brief clarification is given of pre-scientific concealedness.

2.3.1.1.1 Pre-scientific concealedness

The non-scientific is characterized by the obvious and the ordinary. In accepting the obviousness of a particular being, e.g., pedagogical being, its real essences (the ontic structures, which are preconditions for its being), remain concealed. The real essentials remain hidden in pre-scientific concealment for the non-scientist.

Now, it is precisely from this obviousness and ordinariness that scientific work is initiated. The scientist, as a seeker of truth, becomes surprised about a particular reality within universal life reality, which suddenly has become conspicuous. The practitioner of pedagogics, as a form of science, will search his area of study, i.e., the event of educating, within the universal reality of life itself. This area of study, the phenomenon of educating, which manifests itself as an educative event within educative situations, is now delimited (thematized) by the pedagogician from the pre-scientific lifeworld which contains all the structures which will be reflected on (IFP, 40-41). Thus, the real essences of the event of educating, which remain concealed in the obviousness of daily life, must be brought to light from this science-enabling lifeworld, as world of a person's original directedness (Husserl).

Genuine scientific wonder, as the initiator of a desire to know, leads to a radical penetration. as a return to the grounds, as preconditions, for the being of a particular being. In fundamental pedagogics, this means that the pedagogician searches for the foundations of the being of the pedagogical as an ontic event. This task of illuminating the being-structures of the educative event, as a primordial interpersonal event, is the task of fundamental pedagogics, as essence pedagogics.

In his pedagogical thinking, a fundamental pedagogician searches for an answer to the question of what it is which makes the reality of educating what it essentially, really is. Thus, there is an implicit interrogation of the sense and meaning of the event of educating, including the sense, and meaning of categories for thinking about

and criteria for evaluating the actualization of this event. This also means that fundamental pedagogics is significance pedagogics, by which the pedagogical categories and criteria are used to describe, interpret, and evaluate the fundamentals and why they are involved in the pedagogical as clearly as possible.

In making a particular being unconcealed, e.g., the pedagogical, real pedagogical essences, thus preconditions for the pedagogical, are brought to light. This means that the pedagogical must be brought by fundamental pedagogics out of the obfuscation of pre-scientific concealment (everyday obviousness) into the clearness of a disclosing scientific perspective.

With the above discussion of pre-scientific concealedness, i.e., the obviousness and ordinariness of things, is to already begin describing and interpreting, via a phenomenological way of thinking. This scientific describing and interpreting must now be worked through in closer detail. Thus, in the following, attention is given to subjectivism and subjectivity, as well as to the reduction steps of the phenomenological method, or attitude of thinking which can lead to designing a fundamental pedagogics.

2.3.1.1.2 Scientific describing and interpreting

Later, when attention is given to the steps of the phenomenological reduction, the phenomenologist takes the lifeworld as his point of departure for his scientific practice and, thus, for his scientific disclosure of categories for thinking and criteria for evaluating.

In describing and interpreting scientifically, the scientist who wants to be a phenomenologist must approach persons and things by going out to the phenomenon and giving himself the task of striving for the original, naïve contact with the world which is “already there” in an undeniable presence.

Therefore, the commonality of all scientific practice is the constraint to perceive, investigate, and think about the mystery of surrounding human phenomena in their pre-scientific concealment. Such scientific reflection requires scientific describing and interpreting. In this describing and interpreting, also with categories for thinking

and criteria for evaluating, the scientist must be vigilant against falling into subjectivism.

- **The provisional suspension of tradition, hypotheses, and subjectivism**

Tradition amounts to certain customs, conventions, and cultural values of a people being passed on from generation to generation. However, when it comes to scientific describing, and interpreting, the scientist cannot and might not use this uncontrolled and often error-filled knowledge. If the pedagogician, in his fundamental pedagogical thinking, should particularize pedagogical categories and categories from the tradition, such categories/criteria will not be universally valid and necessary, but will only have validity for a specific people. However, the pedagogician, as a scientist, searches for the essential features or onticities of a delimited, i.e., thematized, area of reality—the reality of educating.

The radical-reflecting scientist will turn down, as an unscientific approach, the use of any **hypothesis**, as a presupposition for his scientific practice. This means that all preconceived theories and/or hypotheses must be provisionally bracketed before a pure thinking view of that which shows itself as it is will become possible. The scientific judgment, which is the logical consequence of a thinking view of what is, will then be able to pass the test of universality. The scientist who wants to practice a logically and ontologically accountable science cannot be satisfied with relative judgments.

In his fundamental pedagogical thinking, the pedagogician searches for critically justifiable, systematic, and universally valid (apodictically evident) knowledge about the appearance of educative relationships during an educative event in pedagogic situations. Thus, this involves the scientific describing and interpreting of the pedagogician's scientific viewing of, reflecting on the pedagogical as a sphere of reality, with the aim of illuminating the ontic structures without which the pedagogical reality cannot be thought.

Pedagogical categories and criteria come into appearance when the subject (pedagogue) and the object (the reality of educating)

contribute to pedagogical knowledge, i.e., this has to do with the unity of mutual implication, as objectivity-in-subjectivity. On the other hand, **subjectivism** of the pedagogician as opinion-intrusion on the reality of educating, detracts from this reality's possibility to appear as it really, essentially is. In other words, then the pedagogician cannot ontologically understand and interpret what is experienced as ontic. The pedagogician, as a scientific practitioner, searches for true objectivity as a disinterested, supposition-less striving for intersubjectively valid truths bounded to the reality of educating, and in agreement with it, i.e., an objectivity as reflective thinking purified of all presuppositions regarding the reality of educating. The only method, as a way of access or way of thinking, to the reality of educating, with the aim of bringing-to-light the essential features of this reality is open-minded phenomenological description and hermeneutics. Therefore, we now proceed to a cursory discussion of the phenomenological attitude of thought, and the steps of reduction paired with it.

- **The steps of the phenomenological reduction**•

Phenomenological thinking entails implementing the phenomenological approach as a method for acquiring a vision of the phenomenon of the reality of educating itself.

The practitioners of phenomenology will return to an original encounter with the world, as a primordial field of presence. In such a pre-reflective experiencing of the pre-scientific lifeworld, the phenomenologist lived experiences the existential relationship of the meaning-giving subject and the meaning-inviting object. To understand this human lifeworld in its immediacy, a phenomenologist must implement several reduction steps. In doing so, he acquires valid knowledge, which is unconditional, definitive, indubitable, and absolute about the particular event in reality (e.g., the event of educating) which is embedded in universal life reality itself.

• These steps are verbal derivations by Landman for the sake of objectivity. Also see footnote on page 17, Chapter 1.

The following reduction steps are considered, i.e., the phenomenological, the eidetic, and the transcendental. These mentioned steps, however, are not to be radically separated from each other.

1. The phenomenological reduction

Methodologically, the phenomenological reduction is an attempt to distance oneself from all “natural” (empirical-factual) knowing. To be able to penetrate to the real essential features or fundamental structures of the reality of educating, pedagogical thinking must first be rid of all presuppositions and opinions which might haphazardly accompany or be added on, as covering to a phenomenon, i.e., the pedagogical. The “getting rid of” involves a methodological act.

These opinions and philosophy of life views are only provisionally placed between brackets, which can be removed later. However, this removal is a post-scientific matter. The phenomenological epoche also implies that the pedagogician-phenomenologist must leave out of consideration all sciences which have a bearing on the human world, and he might not make any scientific statement foundational for him in his pedagogical thinking. He brackets everything, and then proceeds. In this re-beginning, he involves himself with the matter itself. After the phenomenological reduction is carried out in its full consequences, the following reduction step arises in its turn, i.e., the eidetic reduction. However, it is emphasized that the phenomenological epoche is not summarily discontinued but continues to be incorporated into the course of the entire event of the phenomenological reduction.

2. The eidetic reduction

With the help of the phenomenological epoche, the phenomenologist has arrived at the “matter itself” (Heidegger). All the accidentals and opinions which have obscured the reality as a cloak of ideas are now bracketed until their future, post-scientific removal.

The eidetic reduction is the possibility of describing and interpreting the example, and disclosing the universal sense which it particularizes. The pedagogician, in his pedagogical thinking, is able, with the help of the eidetic reduction, to penetrate to the essential features which make the phenomenon of educating invariant with itself, and which make its appearing in its real essentiality possible. The methodological act which is carried out in the eidetic reduction by the phenomenologist is the so-called free variation. By a sustained varying, the phenomenologist succeeds in separating the essentials and the non-essentials of this (pedagogical) reality from each other by a discriminative viewing. To describe these essential features in their clearness, i.e., clearer obviousness in an unadulterated way, pedagogical categories are designed, or particularized as grammatically expressed truisms. Pedagogical criteria, as ways of questioning for evaluating the permissibility (or not) of certain aspects of the educative event are analogously fundamentally designed. The particularization of pedagogical categories and criteria is an activity of the pedagogician, as a scientific practitioner. This brings to the fore the third step of the reduction, which is distinguished.

3. The transcendental reduction

Designing or particularizing categories and criteria occurs as truisms expressive of reality based on the intentionality of the pedagogician. Husserl calls the transcendental acts of transcendental consciousness “noesis”, and their correlative object “noema”. For example, “thinking” is a noetic act and “what is thought” is its noematic correlate. Consequently, transcendental subjectivity involves describing and interpreting the noemata.

The transcendental “I” (transcendental ego, transcendental subject) cannot be the “empirical I”. Thus, the “empirical I” of the pedagogician must also be placed “between brackets” in the act of transcendence, as accomplishing the sustained phenomenological reductions. The phenomenologist does not now fall into a subjectivism, but the pedagogician-subject tries to be objective regarding the reality of educating. Thus, essentially this involves an objectivity-in-subjectivity, because this amounts to a being-involvement between a person and his knowing, an involvement

which points to the unity of reciprocal implication of person and knowing. Only then is the pedagogician able to view, via thinking, how the essential features are designed by the transcendental consciousness into ideas or constituted into what is essential to the phenomenon of educating as an intentional or meaning-carrying phenomenon, to what is a phenomenon-for-the-pedagogician-phenomenologist. The universal validity and necessity of the acquired pedagogical knowledge in pedagogical thinking can be intersubjectively verified with other pedagogician-phenomenologists in an open scientific conversation. Further confirmation can occur in terms of the dialectic, contradictory, and hermeneutic methods.

Fundamental pedagogics, thus, searches, via thinking, for real pedagogical essences, for the pedagogically meaningful, thus, for the preconditions for the pedagogical to appear authentically. By means of phenomenological describing and interpreting (hermeneutics), as a thinking-describing reflection (essence-disclosing reflection), the fundamental pedagogician searches for fundamental pedagogical structures. In the following, it is ascertained which structures are fundamental pedagogical structures.

2.4 PEDAGOGICS AS A SCIENCE *OF* EDUCATION AND DOCTRINES *FOR* EDUCATING: A TEXT FOR BEGINNERS (OOB)

2.4.1 The fundamental pedagogical structures

Structure comes from the Latin word “struere”, and it means to heap up, to order, to call into being: “structure points to the bringing to light of the existing reality—the calling into being of ontic being. Therefore, “struere” means, from above, to give something the structure which it ontically and essentially has. Essences which belong together can be grouped together to form a structure” (van Rensburg et al. 1979: 154).

A structure can be viewed as a *rule* (Kwee 1969: 33) to determine which realities make it possible for a situation to appear as a pedagogical situation.

A structure is also a *constitutive unity* (Ibid: 33) without which another reality cannot be thought, and without which it cannot exist. Thus, a fundamental structure is characterized by its necessity and inevitability.

A fundamental structure is a *precondition*, i.e., something which is required for something. Educating cannot be understood in its real essence if there is not a pointing to the realities which are preconditions for it: The preconditions are foundations which make it possible for something (educating) to come about. Fundamental structures, then, are preconditions, and a science which, via thinking, searches for these preconditions, is a *fundamental* science.

A fundamental structure is also a reality which especially is a *bearer of meaning*. When pedagogical structures are described as bearers of meaning, this means that, without them, the pedagogical will mean nothing and, thus, will be ungraspable and meaningless. To grasp educating requires an understanding of what the bearers of meaning are, and what they really, essentially are.

A fundamental structure is a *real essence*. It really exists, and essentially belongs with that of which it is an essence. It is a reality which is not accidental, and is not modifiable, but is invariant for all educative situations. To be a real essential implies that which is universally valid, and necessary for all genuine educative situations. Further, that real essences are authentic knowledge structures (Farber 1966: 133) means that finding and understanding them are preconditions for understanding the pedagogical. They are also preconditions for reasoning logically about the pedagogical because essences are universal, logical structures (Patka 1962: 31). Hulsman states this even more strongly by saying that pedagogical essences are phenomena of the event of educating (Hulsman 1965: 14).

A fundamental structure is *evident* – a reality which shows itself as obvious, indisputable, and undeniable. Evident is that which is perceived and shown as indubitable. According to Husserl, what are evidences are certainties which can serve as a firm ground for further thinking (Husserl 1950: 49). These evidences of the educative situation must be found and brought to light through reflective intuiting, thus, through radical penetrative thinking. That

which is pedagogical and not something else, that which is experienced in the educative situation as necessary must be disclosed, otherwise the educative event cannot be grasped.

A fundamental structure is *lived experienceable*. In other words, it is a reality which is lived experienced by the pedagogician, as scientist, as undeniably and unquestionably embedded in the totality of living which is present in it. Thus, a fundamental structure is what is illuminated in the thinking through of the pedagogician as a precondition for living it. Hence, pedagogical structures point to what is thoughtfully lived experienced in intuition, as giving life to the educative event, and without which educative action will not be amenable to being lived.

From the above, it is concluded that there cannot be a fundamental pedagogical situation if the fundamental pedagogical structures are not present. These structures are essential features which cannot be thought away and, thus, are universally valid preconditions for, grounds or fundamentals of an educative situation.

In an educative situation, educator and educand enter a special relationship with each other. The following three educative relationships are known as the *relationship structures*:

- The pedagogical relationship of trust.
- The pedagogical relationship of knowing (understanding).
- The pedagogical relationship of authority.

They are fundamental pedagogical structures because, if they are not realized, an educative situation does not exist, and educating is not possible. Realizing these real pedagogical essences is a precondition for an educative situation to progress meaningfully.

Proceeding from the one event to the following is known as the sequence of the educative event. The following fundamental pedagogical structures (real pedagogical essences) are known as the pedagogical *sequence structures*:

- The pedagogical association.
- The pedagogical encounter.

- Responsibility for educative interference [engagement].
- Pedagogical interference.
- Return to pedagogical association.
- [Periodic breaking away].

The realization of the pedagogical relationship and sequence structures is known as educative activities. The educator is someone who can realize the pedagogical relationship structures and sequence structures with the child. This occurs with an eye to realizing the *aim* which the educator has with the child. Thus, the educative activities are directed to realizing the educative aim. This means these activities are aim-directed, and this presumes knowledge of the aim that must be realized. Hence, the educative aim is also a fundamental pedagogical structure, thus, a real pedagogical essence.

An educative situation is characterized by the presence of pedagogical relationship, and sequences structures which are realized with an eye to the educative aim. A pedagogical situation has, as fundamental structures, the pedagogical relationship, sequence, and aim structures. The pedagogical aim structures essentially are the universally valid contents of the form of being human to which the child is on the path, i.e., adulthood. The *aim structures* include the following:

- Meaningful existence.
- Self-judgment and self-understanding.
- Human dignity.
- Morally independent choosing and acting.
- Responsibility.
- Norm identification.
- Philosophy of life.

The educative activities of an educator are realizing the relationship, sequence and aim structures. The aim of the educative activities is educating the child.

An educator who wants to educate in a responsible way will reflect on his educative activities so that he can clearly understand them. This means he must be able to describe and interpret his educative

activities. Thus, he reflects on and verbalizes them. To verbalize means to indicate, to let appear, to allow to hear, to bring to light how a particular reality really-essentially is. To verbalize so that the above can occur, particular words are needed which must allow the real essences of his educative activities to appear. These words the educator uses in verbalizing his thinking are known as categories. Categories, then, are means of thinking by which educative activities are illuminated; thus, they are illuminative means of thinking. Pedagogicians are continually in search of pedagogical categories without which it is impossible to understand the educative activities. After an essence analysis [of activities] by pedagogicians, such as Landman, the following *pedagogical categories* have been disclosed and put into suitable words:

- Venturing-with-another.
- Gratitude-for-security.
- Responsibility-for-relationships.
- Hope-for-the-future.
- Task-of-designing-potentialities.
- Fulfilling-destination (adulthood).
- Respect-for-dignity.
- Task-of-self-understanding
- Freedom-to-responsibility.

The responsible educator will continually try to evaluate his educative activities. He must ask himself if his actions in educative situations are pedagogically accountable. To do this, he needs criteria for judging or evaluating. These criteria are also fundamental pedagogical structures because they are preconditions for a meaningful progression in educative action. These fundamental pedagogical structures are known as *pedagogical criteria*. Pedagogical criteria are nothing other than pedagogical categories which are used as categories for evaluating. This means that the pedagogical criteria have evaluative significance which is seen and understood by the educator, and which he then applies to evaluate his educative activities.

In summary, there are four fundamental pedagogical structures, or real essences:

- The pedagogical relationship structures.
- The pedagogical sequence structures.
- The pedagogical aim structures.
- The pedagogical criteria and categories.

Pedagogics is essence pedagogics (Landman). This means the scientist (pedagogician) who studies the pedagogical situation will search for the real essences of the fundamental pedagogical structures. In this search, the pedagogician must answer the following questions: what are the real essences of each pedagogical relationship structure, and what are the mutual relationships among them; what the real essences are of each pedagogical sequence structure is, as well as the mutual relationships among the pedagogical relationship and sequence structures; what the real essences are of the pedagogical aim structures and pedagogical criteria are, and how these criteria are applied.

The above is concerned with the educative situation. The educative situation implies participants. Thus, the pedagogician, via thinking, must ask questions about the real essences of being an educator (giver of support) and being an educand (seeker of support).

The following concentrates on the pedagogical relationship structures, as explicated by Landman in 1971.

2.4.2 The pedagogical relationship structures

2.4.2.1 The pedagogical relationship of trust

The child has need for an adult in whom he has trust. He wants to be understood and supported in his situation of need by a trustworthy adult. He wants to experience emotional security and yearns for safety. A precondition for this experiencing and responding to his yearning is an adult who awakens trust in him, thus, an adult who can establish a relationship of trust. Educating requires a sphere of trust, i.e., the presence of an adult who can protect him against dangers but, at the same time, can support him in shifting the boundary of this safe space, thus, an adult with whom he can enter the future. There are at least two preconditions for a child to have trust in an adult:

- Acceptance of the child as he is (i.e., unconditionally and without bias), and acceptance of what he can, will, must, and ought to become (i.e., an adult).
- Respect for his dignity as a person (respect for dignity).

Because a pedagogic is a seeker of the essences of essences, he also searches for the essences of acceptance. When educators accept a child, this means they are prepared to enter a special relationship (educative relationship) with him, and that they intend to care for him. Consequently, two real essences of acceptance are:

- Willingness to constitute a relationship.
- Intention to care for (take care of).

Firstly, *willingness to constitute a relationship* is now analyzed more closely so that some of its essences are brought to light. Educators are persons who are able and prepared to *accept* a child in educative situations.* This implies a readiness by the educator to influence the child pedagogically to progressively comply with the demands of propriety as an adult does. Further, they are prepared to influence the child via the way(s) they exemplify the norm-image of adulthood so that he can emulate it. To accept a child also means to make it possible for him to assume all the responsibility(ies) which he is prepared to take. There is an aim of acceptance, i.e., to *bond* with the child so that he can support him to adulthood. Bonding is a precondition for educative relationships to be intimate, and for being able to accept real *responsibility* for a child's becoming adult. The fact that a child is addressed as a "child" indicates that bonding is accomplished, that responsibility for him is accepted, and that *co-existentiality* will be shown to him. In this way, the child will experience that he is welcome, and that he is accepted with his potentialities, without unworthy human motives playing a role. Acceptance also means that a child is addressed and listened to by an adult, and that he, in his turn, addresses and listens to an adult so that there is a joint *future-directedness*. Hence, in an educative situation, an accepted child is regarded as *being-a-partner* and, hence, as *being-accompanied*. *Regarding a*

* Italicized words must be viewed as real essences of the pedagogical essence "willingness to constitute a relationship".

child, as a partner and as accompanied. serve as preconditions for him to want to properly exercise his *being-a-participant*. An educator supports him to participate in the adult world increasingly and progressively, with its demands of propriety.

Secondly, the pedagogical essence, *intention to care for*, can be analyzed so that its real essences can be brought to light. Even before his birth, a *caring space*^{*} is prepared for a child, which remains until one day he stands independently from his educators. Within this caring space, *situations of acceptance* can now be created in which opportunities arise by which the child can experience that he is accepted. Various activities are carried out because an educator has love for the child. The child experiences this love by means of loving care and by knowing that the educator is concerned about him. *Caring-out-of-love*, then leads to *acting-in-love*. These activities are real essences of pedagogical acting-in-love. of which the following are distinguished:

- *Making-[preparing]-a-home*. The space which is lovingly prepared for him is a place in which he feels at home.
- *Establishing-nearness*. Because a child is viewed as a fellow person, and not impersonally distanced, the distance between his educator and himself disappears. Nearness is established in a pedagogical encounter.
- *Admitting-into-our-space*. The child is accepted, along with the other participants in the educative situation, as a participant. We-ness is very important in a genuine educative situation.
- *Turning-to-in-trust*. A child turns himself to an educator in whom he has trust. An educative relationship is a face-to-face relationship because educator and child turn to each other as bearers of faces (only a person can turn his face to another person).
- *Accessibility*. An educator embraces (includes) a child with his loving acceptance. Therefore, he is near a child ,and available when the child has a need for him. He is ready

* The italicized words can be seen as real essences of the pedagogical essence “intention-to-care-for”.

and willing to establish a relationship with a child, and wants to realize his intention to care for him.

- *Belongingness*. An accepted child experiences that he and the educator belong together. A pedagogical situation will then be characterized by “we belong by and with each other for our sake”. Then, the educative aim, with the norms which speak through it, can become clearer.

2.4.2.2 The pedagogical relationship of understanding (knowing)

An educator must have knowledge of the essence of a child so he can know what the real essentials of child-being mean. In a pedagogical relationship of understanding (knowing), this involves pedagogical knowledge, i.e., knowledge of what the real essentials are of a child-in-educating. This includes knowledge of a child-in-educating at various levels of his becoming toward adulthood, e.g., knowledge of a toddler-in-educating, an adolescent-in-educating, etc. It is important that the educator know how a child sees the structure of his child-like lifeworld, what the role of educating is during his becoming, what his essential activities and discoveries involve, and how he attributes and experiences meaning in his being-on-the-way-to-adulthood. In addition, he must have knowledge of the learning child in didactic situations, and how he establishes and experiences social relationships.

The relationship of knowing is more than a mere *knowledge-relation*, thus, a relationship in which an educator is cognizant of certain dispositions of a child. In its real essence, it is a *relationship of understanding*. He must understand the essences of being-a-child. This means that, by knowing the essences of a child, he will also have respect for his dignity. Consequently, he respects and understands the otherness of each child, that each child is someone who himself wants to be someone (Langeveld). The pedagogical relationship of knowing is a relationship of understanding, when an educator understands that each child has the right to be an individual, i.e., to be a being who is different from others, and must be different (Langeveld). Thus, each child is a unique person with a yearning to-be-someone-oneself.

The pedagogical relationship of knowing also means that an educator must understand what a child's destination is (adulthood). He can only understand this if he understands what the educative aim is. He must know and understand the universally valid contents of adulthood and be able to interpret these contents in light of the child's level of becoming.

In his turn, a child must increasingly arrive at an understanding of what being an educator involves. He must gradually understand what it is the educator represents in an educative situation. He must gradually understand that, in the person of the educator there is representation of a selection from the world as it is, and as it ought to be. He must understand that he is guided by the educator to the world with its demands of propriety, to the future with its demand-making design, especially the demand to perform tasks, and a readiness to accept responsibility.

2.4.2.3. The pedagogical relationship of authority

According to Oberholzer, there is a yearning in a child for authority and sympathetic authoritative guidance. A relationship of authority appears when one of two persons who are with each other, needs support, and the other has the means to support him. Because of the not-yet adulthood of a child, the relationship of authority is of fundamental significance in a pedagogical situation. The obligation to be obedient has a central place in the moral life of a child.

Educating without authority is unthinkable (Langeveld). A relationship of authority is a precondition for the existence of a pedagogical situation, as well as a guarantee of its continued existence until a child lives the norm-image of adulthood. In a relationship of authority, the child is addressed by an educator, and called to responsibility. Initially educative authority is paired with the person of the educator until, as an adult, he himself is the representative of the demands of propriety. A child first looks to the educator's example as **the** bearer of authority, but gradually he turns himself to the norms themselves, and to the authority **they** express.

Obedience points to acceptance of authority, and by obeying authority, security becomes possible. In a pedagogical situation, as a situation of security, an educator provides sympathetic, authoritative guidance. Only through sympathetic, authoritative guidance can educative activities be realized, and the child's confidence be awakened.

Educating to moral independence is educating to a genuine acknowledgement of authority (Langeveld). This acknowledgment includes obeying the obligation to assume one's own responsibility to the extent that this is possible, considering a child's potentialities, age, schooling, etc.

Landman quotes Oberholzer where he explains "There are those who want there to be no authority in educating; there are others who award it such a prominent place that educating really is synonymous with the exercise of authority. Whoever says educating, means authority, and whoever will have no authority present, may not speak of educating. There are prominent thinkers in the field of pedagogics who view the element of authority as precisely the characteristic of educative action. This does not mean that only a child is placed under authority; rather, also, and especially an educator must place himself under it. As one who obeys authority, via acknowledging it, he can do nothing other than also lead and support an educand to increasing obedience. The authority is there to protect the freedom which a person is, in such a way that the freedom which he must master will never impair his dignity".

In the following stage of development of Landman's thinking (in terms of the chronological appearance of his publications), the significance of taking the reality of educating as the point of departure for thinking came into the foreground.

2.5 FUNDAMENTAL PEDAGOGICS AND THE REALITY OF EDUCATING (FPOW)

2.5.1 The reality of educating as point of departure

Reality is everything which exists; it is the non-living reality (things), and the living reality (persons, animals, plants). Life reality is a human, meaningful, and experiential world. The reality of educating is that reality where adults and children come together so that the not-yet-adults can be helped to become proper adults. This being together is visible in the form of educative situations, i.e., the reality of educating is the total of all educative situations. The reality of educating is a differentiation of reality, i.e., a part of total reality (van Rensburg et al. 1979: 116).

The reality of educating is observable in educative situations as educative events. It is not a fiction, or abstraction, but rather a reality which is mutually connected with other lifeworld realities, such as the social or the psychological.

The structure known as the reality of educating also possesses its own structures, which the thinking consciousness of the pedagogician can distinguish, but which can never be separated from each other in concrete educative situations. There is mention of the reality of educating as a structure, of pedagogical structures and their additional structures. These “additional” structures are the essences of the essences (fundamental features). A pedagogician is a thinking seeker of real pedagogical essences, whose thinking must take a point of departure from somewhere. The appropriate point of departure, as discussed above and subsequently, is the reality of educating. The significance of taking the reality of educating as the point of departure now enters the foreground.

In the thinking search for knowledge, only two ways are possible: either it has to do with the essentials of an aspect of reality (the reality of educating), or the non-essentials. If the second way is followed, this human action will be characterized by general [idle] talk, superficial curiosity, and ambiguity, thus by essence blindness (Heidegger). The latter is evidence of being unscientific. Thus, for a phenomenologist, there is only one meaningful way to knowledge, i.e., a thinking appeal to the matter itself (Heidegger), i.e., a thinking search for what it is which makes a reality (educative reality) what it is as it is, and not otherwise (Heidegger). Whoever wants to know the essentials of the reality of educating must search, via thinking, for real pedagogical essences.

As a phenomenologist, a pedagogicean also knows that the totality of the educative reality must never be disturbed. Therefore, he never makes separations, but only distinctions, to better understand. Thus, he tries to bring to light the real essences with their coherences [essences], and phenomenological thinking is always realized against the background of the universal lifeworld.

In his thinking search for real essences the pedagogician, as phenomenologist, must carry out certain steps of thinking. They are situation-directed, and the following steps of thinking must be carried out before the [phenomenological] steps of thinking are meaningfully possible:

- first, choose to study your philosophy of life
- resolve to set it aside [bracket it]
- second, choose to [more thoroughly] study your philosophy of life.

Only after these three steps of thinking are carried out can the phenomenologist be free from obfuscations by isms, and being concealed by his own philosophy of life, and direct himself to real educative situations (the reality of educating) to seek real essences of educating. The aim of the steps of thinking he subsequently is going to apply is to verify the essence status of the essences he has observed. These phenomenological steps will be returned to in section 2.5.2.

The pedagogician, who has the reality of educating as a point of departure, thoughtfully looks to the pre-scientific lifeworld where the event known as educating is observable. He will, via thinking, examine more closely the everyday reality of educating to try to understand what is characteristic of it. He is going to thoughtfully investigate situations, where educators and children are with each other, to determine what distinguishes those situations in which educating occurs from all other situations. His efforts are situation-directed.

The significance of taking the reality of educating as a point of departure for a Christian pedagogician, with his own philosophy of

life, is that it must be permissible. Thus, he must ask himself the question of whether his philosophy of life permits him to take the reality of educating as the point of departure for his thinking about educating.

If this question should be answered negatively, all steps of thinking determined by the chosen point of departure will be meaningless. A corroborative answer, on the other hand, will support the pedagogician in his situation-directedness.

The Christian-Protestant pedagogician must bring to light and must do this by thinking. An additional question which now arises is if he might do this with respect to the reality of educating itself. Might this reality itself serve as the point of departure for reflecting on it, and might the reality of educating itself be reflected on? As an answer, it can be said that, for a Christian-Protestant pedagogician, reality in its totality has been created by God and, thus, the reality of educating itself is a creation of God.

A Christian-Protestant pedagogician must see his philosophy of life as a source of knowledge about educating, which is equivalent to the reality of educating itself as such a source. This does not mean that there are two realities, i.e., a philosophy of life grounded reality of educating, and a lifeworld grounded one. Such a view would be an unacceptable dualism by which the reality of educating is split open and torn to pieces. This has to do with two ways of presenting the same reality of educating, which provisionally are studied separately. It can also be said that these two ways of presentation of what educating is, after the provisional separate study of each, must necessarily be synthesized, since the philosophy of life disclosure of the essences which lie in the reality of educating itself, must be further clarified and enlivened, and the lifeworld essences must be ordered [by the reality of educating itself].

For a Christian-Protestant pedagogician, this involves a respect for the mandate expressed by the God created reality of educating. This is a “reigning over” which undoubtedly also implies a “thinking reigning over”, thus, a reflective bringing to light of what the reality of educating is. A Christian-Protestant pedagogician knows that one of the demands which his philosophy of life presents to him, is to

practice his science in philosophy of life permissible ways. He knows that situation-directedness is permissible for him and is a valid task. Thus, he begins by trying to determine why it is necessary to undertake a scientific penetration, thus, an essence analysis of the everyday reality of educating. Real essences of educating are to be found in the reality of educating itself. A pedagogician observes in the everyday reality of educating something which can possibly be an essence of educating. All additional steps of his phenomenological method are steps of thinking to verify the essentiality of such [possible] essences. With each step he progresses through, there is an increase in his certainty that he has observed a real essence of educating. These steps of verification are now discussed.

2.5.2 STEPS OF THINKING FOR VERIFYING THE ESSENCE-STATUS OF ESSENCES

2.5.2.1 Free variation as thinking away

The pedagogician directs himself in thinking to the reality of educating itself, because the real pedagogical essences, with their coherences, which he seeks, are to be found there. Now, he must begin to test or verify the essentiality (essence-status) of the essence(s) which he thinks he has observed. He must show that this essence is so characteristic of educating that, if it is denied or eliminated, educating in its fullness is not possible. The essence which he has observed via his permissible and necessary situation-directedness, must be shown to be incapable of being thought away in a genuine educative situation. He proceeds to work as follows: He tries to think away the essence(s) which he identifies in educative situations. If in his reflecting on educative situations which he knows those situations are varied (changed) so that the essence which he wants to test, is absent and educating in its fullness is still possible, he has not observed a real pedagogical essence.

Then he must investigate, in thought, different variations of an ordinary educative situation. He must investigate if his essence(s) also cannot be thought away in, e.g., didactic-pedagogical situations, and in pedotherapeutic ones. If these essences remain unable to be

thought away through all variations, then its essence-status has been confirmed.

Noticing the scientific necessity of situation-directedness gives meaning to the choice-of-free-variation-as-a-way-of-thinking-away and makes it possible. To think away (as a form of free variation) is a way of thinking. It is a methodological act which will not elicit any philosophy of life objections because it is not a threat to philosophy of life content.

2.5.2.2 Free variation as acting away

The pedagogician will now go further to determine that what he has shown to not be able to be thought away, also can't be acted away. It is possible that he made some mistakes in thinking during his activity of thinking away and, to attain greater certainty, he is now going to try to act away the essences in real educative situations, which he cannot think away.

Acting away seems to be scientifically (methodologically) necessary, since it can be a meaningful mode of verification. If there can be an action as if an essence of educating does not exist, and educating in its fullness is still possible, here one decidedly does not have to do with a real essence of educating. It is clear to everyone that a real acting away has greater power of verification than thinking away, where mistakes in thinking can be made or his memory of educative situations which he has experienced can fail him. A Christian-Protestant pedagogician must study educative situations in which there is already an acting away, to determine where the acting away of essences of educating have led. Such studies can be carried out jointly by fundamental pedagogics and orthopedagogics.

2.5.2.3 Separating the essentials and the non-essentials

After a pedagogician sees the scientific necessity of thinking away and acting away, he proceeds to additional steps of verification to continually increase the certainty of the essence-status of the essence(s) he has disclosed. That is, in his situation-directedness (which he must keep working through), he proceeds to separate the

essences from the non-essences (what could be thought away and acted away), which are also found in the pedagogical situation.

The scientific necessity of separating what cannot be thought or acted away (essences) from the non-essences is because of the necessity for the essences to appear more clearly, so that the additional steps of thinking can be carried out as effectively as possible, and so that what is valid and necessary in all educative situations can be clearly seen. What cannot be thought and acted away necessarily are separated from the non-essentials on scientific grounds.

2.5.2.4 Stating contradictions

The separation of the essentials and the non-essentials has now been realized, and a Christian-Protestant pedagogician knows that it is both scientifically necessary and philosophy of life permissible to carry out such an act.

Another meaningful way of verification is to state for each essence its contradiction, as a possibility. There is the possibility of the presence the contradictory (opposite, converse) of each essence of educating in a pedagogical situation. Thus, such a contradictory has reality status, but the question is if it has the right to exist in a genuine pedagogical situation. If it should have the right to exist, this means that the essence(s) of which the essence-status must be further verified does not have the right to exist and, thus, cannot be an essence of educating. That one that can be shown with clarity and to the exclusion of the other to have the right to exist, is the real essence of educating. The one's not having the right to exist confirms the right of the other to exist. In the contradiction, an essence of educating is placed in contrast to its negation. If such an essence can be arbitrarily substituted by its contradiction, it cannot have ontological status. Thus, a pedagogician searches for essences, for the non-contradictory, the universally valid, and what cannot be thought away.

2.5.2.5 Asking the hermeneutic question

The essences of educating who's right and necessity to exist have been confirmed with increasingly greater confidence by thinking away, acting away, separating, and the contradictory, now appear in the clearest possible way.

The pedagogician is now ready to go further with his verification. No essence of educating is realized only for its own sake, but also with an aim to realizing another essence indissolubly related to it. Thus, the verification of essence-status includes determining coherences. Only an essence of educating which is a precondition for realizing another essence of educating has meaning. For example, the sense of the pedagogical relationship structures is that they make possible the realization of the pedagogical sequence structures. Their coherence can be shown through asking the hermeneutic question. The hermeneutic question sounds like, "What is served by this particular essence?" If it can be shown without question that a particular essence of educating serves to realize another essence then, by this, the essence-status of such an essence is still further confirmed.

2.5.2.6 Investigating naming the essence

In his situation-directedness, the first act of a pedagogician is to name a possible essence of educating which he has observed.

After the hermeneutic question has been positively answered, the name(s) which has (have) been given to the essence(s) must be closely investigated. A philosophy of life comes strongly to the fore in this naming. Naming by a Christian-pedagogician will have a "deeper ring", which means that the essentiality of the named essence will appear even more clearly because naming the essence is colored by his philosophy of life. This fundamental axiom indicates that the pedagogician must determine if his naming is philosophy of life permissible, and if it can possibly be further deepened from a philosophy of life perspective. For example, immediately a pedagogician will feel that he cannot implement names which are only appropriate to the animal kingdom in describing human activities such as educating. Thus, e.g., there cannot be mention of a child's "adaptation" to life, his "growth" to proper adulthood, and his "reaction" if a teacher "stimulates" him. He knows that his

naming must not give evidence of the evolutionist view that a human being is an extension of nature. On the other hand, a pedagogician must also be on guard against falling into an existentialist humanism.

The role of a philosophy of life in bringing about a valued, chosen, genuine, and appropriate naming cannot be denied, and it contributes to its quality.

From the scientific acts of thinking actualized with naming, it seems clear that a scientific investigation of naming is a necessity to determine if it fulfills particular demands: its meaning must appear to be unambiguous; the scientific judgments must be able to be clearly formulated; there must be no doubt about its essence-status; the naming must be of such a quality that the named essence of educating so clearly addresses the pedagogician that he cannot overlook its essence-status.

2.5.2.7 Determining the categorical status of the essence(s)

The name which the pedagogician eventually chooses has now withstood the tests of philosophy of life permissibility and of scientific status, and the essence-status of the essences of educating now appear to be incapable of being thought away, are indisputable, and unquestionable. Only now is the following step in thinking meaningfully possible, and must now be carried out; i.e., the categorical status of the essences must be investigated. Here, it must be ascertained whether the essences have the possibility of being implemented as illuminative means of thinking. If it seems that such an essence cannot be applied by pedagogical thinking so that other of its essences can come to light through such an illumination, the essence-status of such an essence of educating can be doubted. The “categorical test” must be seen as a particularly stringent and deep-reaching mode of verification, and scientifically, it is necessary that it be carried out.

2.5.2.8 Acceptability

The question now asked is if the essences of educating observed by a Christian-Protestant educator may be actualized in real educative situations. Through his entire course of thinking, when he continually verified their philosophy of life permissibility, he already provided an answer to this question. Even so, it is necessary, once again, to only view these essences from the perspective of his philosophy of life to acquire additional certainty about whether he can attribute the status of “essence-for-me” to them.

2.5.2.9 Enlivening educative life

Philosophy of life acceptability prompts, makes possible, and gives meaning to the following step of thinking. Acceptability leaves no doubt about permissibility. Something specific must be recognized, i.e., the enlivenment of the essences of educating, which are characterized by their lifelessness [but also by their viability]. Because of their viability, their lifelessness can be transformed into enlivenment, i.e., educative life. The essences of a philosophy of life serve as enlivening contents for the essences of educating.

For the Christian educator, the permissibility of enlivening-educative-life is a requirement for enlivening a Christian educative life, and he is now prepared to investigate the scientific necessity for the decision to enliven educative life. The pedagogician, as scientist, wants to understand educating in its real essentiality, meaning, and coherence. Each meaningful step of thinking which contributes to this will be implemented. Enlivenment is a meaningful scientific step of thinking because it is necessary and step for understanding essences of educating and, indeed, for two reasons: enlivenment is a hermeneutic step because it gives a further interpretation to the essences of educating; it is a further radicalizing because the pedagogician will think through to the *radix* (root) of the reality of educating.

2.6 SUMMARY AND SECOND STATED PROBLEM

This chapter is introduced by an overview of the terrain of fundamental pedagogics. Each area of science has as a task the illumination and building up of its own terrain of research.

Landman worked in the field of fundamental pedagogics and, thus, it is meaningful to give an oversight, such as is found in his “Inleiding tot die fundamental pedagogiek” [Introduction to fundamental pedagogics]. Since the essence and structure of the phenomenon of educating, as a particular reality of the lifeworld, must be analyzed and described by fundamental pedagogics, it is necessary to follow this with a presentation of the ways of thinking for designing a fundamental pedagogics. Structures which are brought to light as essential qualities unable to be thought away, thus as universally valid preconditions for an educative situation are then discussed. They are known as fundamental pedagogical structures, and here attention is given to the relationship, sequence, and aim structures, as well as to pedagogical categories and criteria. The significance of using the reality of educating as a point of departure for thinking, and as verification, is now raised. Landman, as practitioner of pedagogics on a phenomenological foundation, in his work (FPOW), set himself the aim of eliminating the artificially engendered chasm between a philosophy of life and science. He brings the two matters together without either weakening a philosophy of life, or replacing it with the universal character of the pedagogical. These contributions by Landman can be viewed as yet a step forward in the practice of science.

In chapter three, it is shown how Landman’s idea of science as “knowledge for the sake of knowledge” is abandoned, and the idea of “knowledge for the sake of improving practice” begins to strongly break through. The preconditions for the meaningful improvement of practice are subsequently discussed, i.e., co-existentiality, co-essentiality, overcoming essence blindness, the enlivenment and realization [of pedagogical essences]. That Landman had related the reality of educating to teaching practice, as well as showing the coherence among the fundamental pedagogical essences and the activities of the lesson structure are also explained. In terms of “Fundamental pedagogics, modes of learning and subject matter teaching” (FLV) the coherency among fundamental pedagogical and psychopedagogical essences (essences of the modes of learning and of relationships to reality) are described, and their significance for meaningful subject matter teaching are discussed. The development of thinking which can be perceived in Landman clearly show that, in his research activities, he has kept up with the needs of the time. He

is now involved with groundbreaking work in the practice of educational research. Then, the significance of fundamental pedagogics for designing educational research programs, as shown by Landman, is also described. In conclusion, the significance of fundamental pedagogics for curriculum design, development, and evaluation are also described.

REFERENCES

- Farber, M.: *The aims of phenomenology*. Harper & Row, New York, 1966.
- Heidegger, M.: *Unterwegs zur Sprache*. Neske, Pfullingen, 1959.
- Heidegger, M.: *Sein und Zeit*. Max Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1963.
- Hulsman, H.: "Epoche und Exisenz" in: *Salzburger Jahrbuch für Philosophie*, 1965.
- Husserl, E.: *Cartesianische Meditationen und Pariser Vorträge*. Husserliane, Den Haag, 1950.
- Kwee, S. L. & Van Peursen, C. A.: *De Mens*. Wijsgerige Teksten, Loghum Slaterus, 1969.
- Landman, W. A. & Gouws, S. J.: *Inleiding tot die fundamentele Pedagogiek: 'n Poging tot fundering (IFP)*. Afrikaanse Pers, Johannesburg, 1969.
- Landman, W. A., Kilian, C. J. G, Roos, S. G. & Viljoen, T. A.: *Denkwyses in die opvoedkunde (DO)*. NG Kerkboekhandel, Pretoria, 1971.
- Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. & Liebenberg, C. J.: *Opvoedkunde vir beginners (OOB)*. University Publishers and Booksellers, Stellenbosch, 1971.
- Landman, W. A. & Roos, S. G.: *Fundamentele pedagogiek en die opvoedingswerklikheid (FPOW)*. Butterworth, Durban, 1973.
- Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. & van Rooyen, R. P.: *Die praktykwording van die fundamentele pedagogiek (PFP)*. Perskor, Johannesburg, 1974.
- Landman, W. A., van Zyl, M. E. J. & Roos, S. G.: *Fundamenteel-pedagogiese essensies: Hulle verskyning, verwerkliking en inhoudgewing: met kernvrae (FPE)*. Butterworth, Durban, 1975.
- Landman, W. A.: *Fundamentele pedagogiek en onderwyspraktyk: Metodologie, fundamentele pedagogiek en lesstruktuur (FPOP)*. Butterworth, Durban, 1977.
- Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. & Mentz, N. J.: *Fundamentele*

- pedagogiek, leerwyses en vakonderrig (FLV)*. Butterworth, Durban, 1979.
- Landman, W. A., Kruger, P. J., van Dyk, C. J., Potgeiter, P. A., van Niekerk, P. A., Coetzee, R. A., Hattingh, D. L. & Hill, J. S.: *Inleiding tot die opvoedkundige navorsingspraktyk (IONP)*. Butterworth, Durban, 1980.
- Landman, W. A.: *Fundamentele pedagogiek en kurrikulumstudie (FPK)*. NG Kerkboekhandel Transvaal, Pretoria, 1985.
- Patka, F.: *Existentialist thinkers and thought*. Citadel Press, New York, 1962.
- Van Rensburg, C. J. J. & Landman, W. A.: *Notes of fundamental-pedagogic concepts*. NG Kerkboekhandel, Pretoria, 1979.
- Viljoen, T. A. & Pienaar, J. J.: *Fundamental pedagogics*. Butterworths, Durban, 1971.