

CHAPTER ONE
ON THE NATURE AND EXISTENCE OF
REAL PEDAGOGICAL ESSENCES*

W. A. Landman

1. THE CO-EXISTENTIALITY AND CO-ESSENTIALITY OF REAL
PEDAGOGICAL ESSENCES

When it is said that real pedagogical essences are **co-existent**⁽¹⁾ this means that they are only real in relation to each other, however, not in the sense that the reality (actuality) of one is derivable from another but rather in the sense that one helps actualize the other. The one's **being-there** makes the being-there of the other possible. They allow each other to be⁽²⁾ --the one is a precondition for the appearance of the other. For example, the pedagogical relationship structures (with their essences) allow the sequence structures to be (to appear in their fullness), etc. As more of the essences (moments) appear in their mutual relations (coherencies) the more clearly the **structure appears**, of which they are the essences. For example, the more essences (aspects) of the pedagogical encounter become visible the clearer it will appear as a structure of the pedagogical situation.

Co-essentiality⁽³⁾ means that one essence has its own **being-such** only in relation to the being-such of the other essences, however, not in the sense that the being-such of one essence can be derived from another but in the sense that one essence contributes to allowing another essence to appear in its unique being-such. Each essence possesses its own being-such in relation to other essences. For example, the relationship of trust is what it is because it is connected essentially to the relationship of authority. Thus, if there were no connection between the relationships of trust and authority the relationship of trust would be different. For example, the essence of trust "taking action" [i.e., "active acceptance"] cannot appear in the absence of the essence of authority "being told" because an educator's refusal to tell a child what he ought to do or

* English translation also available at: http://www.landmanwa.co.za/funpedes_ch1.htm

"being told" will lead immediately to alienation which is an essence of mistrust [distrust].

Co-existentiality requires a mutual being-there

If two essences only can be-there if they are related to each other, they also must possess a mutual being-there in which both have a mutual part otherwise one has to do with separated realities that stand apart from each other as independent things and that then they are not real [functioning] essences⁽⁴⁾. This mutual being-there can be called a **structure**. For example, the essences "application and experience of restraint" and "presentation of a new way of living [lifestyle]" have a mutual being-there in the structure of pedagogical "intervention". In the same way, it can be said that the relationship, sequence, activity and aim structures have their mutual being-there in a pedagogical situation.

Co-essentiality requires a common/mutual being-such

If essences possess their own being-such only in relation to other essences then they must also possess a shared being-such in which they have a part.⁽⁵⁾ If this is not the case, one is not involved with the real essences of a particular being (structure or situation). Thus, in order to be real essentials of the pedagogical relationship, sequence, activity and aim structures, the being-such of each has to be able to be described as **pedagogical**. Only those essences whose actualizations lead to proper adulthood can be essences of the fundamental pedagogical structures. If, for example, a child can attain proper adulthood without actualizing "norm identification", it cannot be a real pedagogical essence. Then, the being-such of "norm identification" is not pedagogical in nature.

Co-existentiality (being-there with) and co-essentiality (being-such with), in addition, require a mutual ontological sense

That is, there is mention of sense that a pedagogue finds when he reflects on the essences in their being-there and being-such. This does not involve sense that a person has created but what he realizes and can bring to fulfillment by meaningful activities⁽⁶⁾. Such an ontological sense can be shown for the essences of each

independent structure.⁽⁷⁾ Thus, for example, it makes sense that in the pedagogical association there will be simultaneity otherwise educator and child will never appear with each other and if that were so, there could not be a pedagogically meaningful event. The educator makes sure that the meaningfulness of simultaneity is realized (fulfilled) by putting himself in the presence of the child. That is, the educator implements the essence "simultaneity" in its **being-such** (as this is in reality, namely, presence at the same time) and its **being-there is brought about: simultaneity as essentiality has then become simultaneity as existentiality**. Further, this means that the educator has to know the being-such of each pedagogic structure to the extent that it is knowable; thus he has to understand their real essentiality (essence status), meanings and coherencies so he can bring about their being-there, thus put them in the present to be actualized. Thus, it is expected that an expert educator have knowledge of pedagogical essences (knowledge of being-such) and a readiness to actualize essences (actualizing their being-there).

The real pedagogical essences are there, i.e., in pedagogical situations because they are what they are, i.e., because they are pedagogical in nature: **the being-there of the essences is possible on the basis of their being-such**. On the other hand, real pedagogical essences are as they are, i.e., pedagogical in nature, because they are there where they are, i.e., in pedagogic situations: **the being-such of the essences is possible on the basis of their being-there**.

2. SOME METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

As far as the being-such of the essences is concerned the following can be noted: a particular aim of phenomenology is to be a **science of essences**. The phenomenologist wants to describe the essential structure of concrete situations and in doing so bring

phenomenological facts (ontic entities, ontic essences) to light.⁽⁸⁾ As a methodology the aim is to acquire a grasp of essences and this grasp is philosophy.⁽⁹⁾ As a particular philosophy of education, and viewed in this light, fundamental pedagogics has the aim of understanding (acquiring a grasp of) the essential-pedagogical. Now, which essences are pedagogical in nature; i.e., from which essences' being-there in pedagogical situations seem in their being-such to be pedagogical in nature?

Husserl's slogan was "to the things themselves" which points to the recognition of essences as constitutive data that can be **encountered**.⁽¹⁰⁾ From this the conviction (supposition) is that matters have an essence(s) of their own of which a phenomenological grasp can be acquired. A purely phenomenological science then is **essence-investigating** and the phenomenologist is in a position to identify⁽¹¹⁾ essences and their essential relationships (coherencies) with objective validity and to avoid prejudice that really is a blindness for essences.⁽¹²⁾ Fundamental pedagogics strives to be a **science of essences** of the pedagogical situation. It will not contrive or speculatively construct essences but it reads them from the given pedagogical situation itself.⁽¹³⁾ By applying the phenomenological method⁽¹⁴⁾ and other methods* that also are meaningful, fundamental pedagogics searches for **fundamentalia** (essences) of the phenomenon of educating that show themselves as educative events in educational situations. Fundamental pedagogics, then, is a science of **fundamentalia** of the educational situation, **as such**, that searches, by thinking, for the structures (and their essences along with their coherencies) that constitute the "educator-ness" of the educator and the educability of the child. It searches phenomenologically for the being-such, the being-there and the relationships of what is characteristic of the pedagogic, i.e., what is evident of **all** situations in which children are lead and guided by adults to proper adulthood. From this sense, it now seems that research has to be focused on the meaning of real pedagogical essences as **existentialia** of the reality of educating.

3. REAL PEDAGOGICAL ESSENCES AS (EXISTENTIALIA) EXISTENTIALS**

(1) If it is said that a real pedagogical essence is an **existential** of the pedagogical situation, in the first place this acknowledges that it really exists and this means it can be recognized as **really**

* Because today nearly every phenomenologist agrees that an essence-analysis alone is not sufficient and needs to be supplemented by, among other methods, a hermeneutic and dialectic one.⁽¹⁵⁾

** According to Heidegger's use in **Being and Time**, existentials (also called existentialia) are different **ways of being** human and thus are philosophical anthropological categories (ontological categories). This is in contrast to particular factual beings (ontic categories). G. D. Y.

functioning by someone who stands in the reality of educating with open eyes.⁽¹⁶⁾ Its being-there is undeniable and unquestionable. The true being of an essence is determined by its true existence, thus from its durability and invariability. The Greek **aletheia** refers to the unhiddenness of a being. Unhiddenness, as being disclosed, guarantees the possibility of the durability and invariability of essences coming to light. Unhiddenness is an illumination of the presence (being-there) of a durability and invariability, thus of essentiality.⁽¹⁷⁾ Hence, in everyday educative situations "taking-action-in-function"⁽¹⁸⁾ is seen as durable and unchangeable. This taking action that is actualized between educator and the children appears clearly, e.g., in the way they address each other: Educator: "Come here so I can help you." Child: "Mom, please come here and help me", etc.

(2) To qualify as an existential, a real pedagogical essence has to possess **ontological status**.⁽¹⁹⁾ This means that knowledge of such an essence is a precondition for authentically understanding the educative event. For example, educating cannot be grasped authentically if a relationship of authority is absent; the relationship of authority is incomprehensible if the essence "obedience" is left out of account and is absent from understanding it. This absence impedes its actualization or even makes it impossible. Thus, "relationship of authority" and "obedience" each have ontological status. Further, this status refers to the fact that real essences are **structures of being** and thus are necessary for the educative event to be, thus to appear in its fullness, meaningfulness and universality. Briefly, these essences are *fundamentalia* of educating.

Ontological = ontos + logos. **Ontos**: these essences comply with demands of reality in the sense that they have a particular reality-status, namely the status of being necessary for something to be and the reality of educating becomes visible through them. **Logos**: these essences comply with logical demands because by thinking them away there can no longer be logical (consistent with the demands of Logic) reasoning about the pedagogical.

(3) In the third place, an essence is an existential if it is a **conveyer of meaning**.⁽²⁰⁾ It gives meaning to the structure (i.e., situation) of which it is an essence and, in addition, it also is a condition for

understanding such a structure. Thus, the essence "disapproval-of-the-objectionable"⁽²¹⁾ gives the particular meaning to the pedagogic intervention that it has, hence to its way of being. In the absence of disapproval of the objectionable, pedagogic intervention cannot be grasped in its fullness and be realized.

(4) In the fourth place, as an existential a real essence is a particular unconcealed presence (although concealed initially) that is maintained and **appears** in this unconcealedness and, therefore, is **illuminated**--an essence, then, is an illuminating presence⁽²²⁾. A real pedagogical essence is a light that appears in pedagogical situations. The pedagogical essences are **appearing points of light** in those situations and the educator acts in their light. They cast a light on the path he has to follow and this path is essence-actualizing. In this sense an essence functions as a demand. Its appearing presence makes an appeal to be complied with⁽²³⁾. This is an appeal to realize it and the educator who experiences "engagement"⁽²⁴⁾ heeds this appeal. This is his calling to obey the appeal and actualize the essences.

(5) In the fifth place, as an existential the real essence is a **possibility**. It has the character of possibility and thus makes something else possible⁽²⁵⁾. This means an essence has existential status because it is a particular precondition (ground⁽²⁶⁾) for educating to be fully actualized. Further, one essence is the ground (ground structure)⁽²⁷⁾ for actualizing another essence or essences. For example, the essence "being a co-traveler" is really actualized on the basis of "being a co-standee". If being a co-standee ("Come stand by me so I can help you") is a precondition for actualizing being a co-traveler ("Come now with me on the way to proper adulthood") the two essences are co-existential.

A possibility creates other possibilities in the sense that one brings to light, **along with** it, other possibilities belonging to the same reality.⁽²⁸⁾ A real pedagogical essence is merely a possibility because it is in such a relationship with other essences (as other possibilities) that its being-there actualizes the being-there of other essences (= co-existentiality). For example, "approving the approvable" allows the possibilities of "the experience of concurrence", "presentation of perseverance" and "enhancing a sense of propriety" to appear.⁽²⁹⁾ To

be actualized these essences first must be-there as possibilities in pedagogical situations.⁽³⁰⁾

(6) Because a human being is an aim setting being, the existentiality of a pedagogical essence indicates that its actualization can be seen as a meaningful and necessary **aim**. To be a genuine aim, real pedagogical essences have to meet the following requirements, among others:

(a) they have to be able to serve as a principle according to which the educating is guided. For example, an educator who **sets the aim** of actualizing "unconditional norm identification", "attunement to a philosophy of life", "judging from a standpoint", "understanding norms", "living the demands of propriety" and "obedience to a philosophy of life" is in a genuine position to actualized "exemplification of norms"⁽³¹⁾ which is a precondition for guiding a child in the direction of proper adulthood.

(b) they have to be concrete-visible examples⁽³²⁾ for acting. Thus, the educator who, by exemplifying, explaining and creating opportunities for emulating, **sets the aim** of actualizing "movement toward exertion", "dynamic participation", "taking responsibility", "attunement to the demands of propriety", "conquering passivity", "choice for exertion", "living the demands of propriety" concretizes the essence "gradual breaking away from lack of exertion"⁽³³⁾ and makes it visible to the child.

(c) for the participants in the event of educating they must be an obligatory matter. For example, the participants who **set the aim** of noticing and accepting "a trusting encounter", "an authority acknowledging encounter", "an understanding encounter", "giving meaning together", "co-living the demands of propriety", "venturing together-with-courage" and "accepting responsibility", as particular **demands of propriety** in combination will be able to actualize the essence "pedagogic venturing together"⁽³⁴⁾ and there can be a meaningful venturing in the direction of proper adulthood. This means that these participants will value this as worthwhile and enable them directly to experience and accept

the demands this requires of them.⁽³⁵⁾ Since the **will** opposes such experience and acceptance, these participants continually have to make personal choices to subject themselves to these demanding and normative requirements. When the pedagogic essences really are worthwhile to these participants, they can function as norms (demands of propriety) for the will and they can promote being-a-person if the will is directed by a **philosophy of life** to these essentials as pedagogically worthwhile.⁽³⁶⁾

(d) through effort they have to be achieved and actualized as adequately as possible.⁽³⁷⁾ For example, an educator shows by his explanation and presentation that he has actualized "appreciation of possibilities", "unfolding of possibilities", and "functionalizing of possibilities" and continually works on their adequate actualization. Only then can "designing possibilities toward adulthood"⁽³⁸⁾ be a meaningful aim for him.

(e) they have to represent a **striving**. A person's being-in-the-world is characterized by a being directed to something. This being directed can be called a striving and essentially is an "I direct myself to something that still has to be realized". Thus, here is mention of being directed to a goal.⁽³⁹⁾ In this light it can be said that pedagogic essences are aims and that the participants in the educative event strive to realize them.

Setting an aim always involves something being other than it is and indeed something that has to be different. For example, an essence as possibility has to be actualized. Essences appear as something to be realized and the aim is to actualize them. This having to be different involves much more--it is an **ought** to be different and so as an aim, actualizing becomes a demand of what ought to be. This means that the participants in the educative event are called to making something different. Essence-as-possibility has to be made (designed) into a realizable essence. Actualizing as an aim (striving) then is a **task** and because actualizing is a task it points to a further move: with each pedagogical essence that is actualized there is additional movement in the direction of realizing the aim of educating, namely, proper adulthood.⁽⁴⁰⁾ Such actualizing is possible because the participants who are called to do so **exist** in the

pedagogic situation and thus are privileged to be able to put themselves into a relationship with the essences.⁽⁴¹⁾ This requires essence-knowledge (thus conquering essence-blindness) by the educator and "engagement" as a personal choice to accept the task of actualizing essences. Essence actualization is possible because essences are an operative, a functioning reality.⁽⁴²⁾ In this sense actualizing is allowing the essence to function. The educator who has knowledge of pedagogical essences knows that his active representation of pedagogical essences makes possible an adequately functioning pedagogical situation. This framework of essences⁽⁴³⁾ makes the pedagogical situation an existential field⁽⁴⁴⁾ for him within which these essences become **existential ways** (particular ways) of being human.⁽⁴⁵⁾

(7) Essences are existentialia because they are **universalia**. What is meant by this?

When there is mention of universal validity (universality) this does not mean a so-called eternal, unchanging and fixed lawfulness. The universal validity of an essence means that it is **in principle** valid, thus common to and indispensable for all educative situations: it is experienced⁽⁴⁷⁾ as characteristic of these essences that they are valid for **all** authentic educating and thus are a precondition (fundamental) for actualizing **all** meaningful child guiding as well as being repeatable⁽⁴⁸⁾ **everywhere** where adults guide children in the direction of proper adulthood. Thus, universal validity implies an avoidance of non-essentials⁽⁴⁹⁾ and a thinking search for essentials. It is this search that can be described as scientific.⁽⁵⁰⁾ That which is universally valid (pedagogical essences) can be made particularly valid by giving them particular content. For example, "pedagogic intervention", which is experienced as common to, indispensable for and repeatable in all authentic educative situations acquires particular validity and enlivenment (life) for a Protestant-Christian educator when through his Bible studies he notices the following: "In general **admonition** (intervention) means to lead a Christian away from that which is wrong and to do what is good." A Christian educator knows: "We proclaim him, admonishing and teaching everyone with all wisdom, so that we may present everyone perfect in Christ" (Colossians 1:28). The following can be an appeal to a child to cooperate in the educative intervention: " ...

respect those who work hard among you, who are over you in the Lord and who admonish you"; and "Hold them in the highest regard in love because of their work" (1 Thessalonians 5:12, 13).

4. FORMS OF ESSENCE BLINDNESS

A pedagogue who is aware of essences knows there has to be a vigilance against formalism, essentialism, structuralism and system thinking.

(a) Formalism

Universally valid structures also can be called **forms** and further there is mention of universally valid (universals) and particular accepted contents as well as a knowledge that "we do need universals in order to talk about particulars".⁽⁵¹⁾ Thus, there is a distinction between **form and content**.

The separation between changing contents and enduring forms (general structures) is always relative and cannot be made absolute.⁽⁵²⁾ Therefore, here there is mention only of a distinction and not of a separation. The contents come to expression in the form and arise therein so that the form determines which contents fit it. When contents are not taken into account and the form is made absolute, one falls into a formalism with its meaningless absence of contents. Together, form and content constitute a meaningful whole (Gabriel) and there is not an empty, fixed form (thus, without content) and a labile, deterioration of contents (thus, without form). **Life** points to a meaningful whole where the ordering of form and the depth of contents constitute a synthesis (Wisser). There is a synthesis of static, ordering forms and dynamic contents (von Rintelen) by which these forms (structures) are drawn into personal existences. This "being drawn into" is an essential characteristic of authentic existence and its denial is existential formalism (Wisser).⁽⁵³⁾ Warnach indicates that an unbiased phenomenological analysis clearly shows that each being has two irreducible but profoundly connected fundamental moments where one follows the other: first a taking in, carrying moment (form) and, second, a content-giving moment. A being always is an essentiality (essence) that acquires embodiment in a carrier (form, structure) and thus becomes a reality. The structure is receptive to contents. Warnach says that when an essence now enters into a structure and

becomes its content it loses its universality in the sense that it becomes individualized, i.e., it becomes the content of this particular structure.⁽⁵⁴⁾ For example, when the essences "experiencing security", "gratitude for experiencing security", "security because of acceptance and because of loving presence" are taken into the structure of "gratitude or thankfulness for pedagogical security",⁽⁵⁵⁾ these essences become its contents. The structure "gratitude for pedagogic security" is universal in so far as its various essences (contents) can be discernible.⁽⁵⁶⁾ There is a polar tension between a structure (form) and its essences (contents) by which it is possible to elevate contents empty of structure and for contents to become independent realities. These contents can be more or less universal.⁽⁵⁷⁾ Thus, there are contents that are universally and particularly valid, the denial of which leads to formalism.

From the above and the relevant literature it is clear that fundamental pedagogics is no formalism just because it accentuates:

- (i) no separation between form and content;
- (ii) no absolutizing of either form or content;
- (iii) rejection of formlessness;
- (iv) rejection of the labile deterioration of contents;
- (v) synthesis of static, ordering forms and dynamic contents;
- (vi) structures as moments of carrying [contents]; and
- (vii) contents becoming reality by being taken into structures.

(b) Essentialism

There has to be a distinction between essence thinking and essentialism.

Essence thinking is genuine phenomenological (i.e., essence revealing) thinking with the knowledge that authentic understanding in reality is knowledge of essences in their meanings and coherencies. Essence thinking is further characterized by a stand against essence blindness because of prejudgment (Husserl), general talk, ambiguity, superficial curiosity and confidence (Heidegger). The essence thinker notices that in thinking about, e.g., the reality of educating there only are two possibilities: either it involves the essentials (essences) or not. Either that which is

essential to educating is sought or there is an involvement with non-essentials and this is not science.

Essentialism is a particular "ism" and, as such, it is guilty of absolutizing. The following are a few indications of essentialism against which the pedagogue must be vigilant:

- (i) that only the pedagogical essences that he has revealed have essence status and an unquestionable right to exist;
- (ii) that he is absolutely certain that each essence that he has disclosed clearly has essence status;
- (iii) that all of the disclosed essences necessarily have to be actualized before there can be educating; and
- (iv) that essences are separate entities each of which has to be actualized in isolation in order to guide a child to proper adulthood. The mutual relations (coherencies) among essences indicating that one is a precondition for actualizing another are denied by essentialism.

Fundamental pedagogics is no essentialism but a particular form of essence-pedagogics because it has overcome the mentioned absolutizing and is authentic essence disclosing thought.

(c) Structuralism

There must be a distinction between structure analysis and structuralism.

Structure analysis is authentic pedagogical work as is apparent from the following pronouncements by pedagogicians: **M. J. Langeveld**⁽⁵⁸⁾ explains that theoretical pedagogics involves a phenomenological illumination of particular **structural** ground relationships. **N. Perquin**⁽⁵⁹⁾ says it must be verified whether educating shows a **structure**, that is, if it possesses particular characteristic qualities that are mutually related and exist all together as a substantial whole. **J. Derbolav**⁽⁶⁰⁾ indicates that pedagogical **structure theory**, among other things, is concerned with categorical moments in the pedagogical situation such as the formability of a child, the mediating role of the educator and the claims of reality. **W. Klafki**⁽⁶¹⁾ agrees and indicates that **W. Dilthey** used the concept **structure** and described it as a meaningful,

functioning interconnection of meaning-carrying moments. Klafki, himself, talks of a **structure analysis** that only is possible if the person who undertakes it has experienced and understood the sense of what is called educating and even is involved in the exercise and accountability of it. H. Blankertz⁽⁶²⁾ is convinced that all conditions for the success of educative activities have to be made rationally obvious and that this occurs by a **structure analysis**. H. Hauke⁽⁶³⁾ indicates that an insight into the dialectic **fundamental structure** of the pedagogical leads to the conclusion that in pedagogics theory and practice are inseparably intertwined, that a science of education and educational reality imply each other. For D.

Hoelterschinken⁽⁶⁴⁾ it is the task of a science of education to methodically unlock or reveal the reality of educating and to penetrate and systematically disclose its **structures**. F. van der Stoep:⁽⁶⁵⁾ "As is the case with any other phenomenon, an event such as educating is assembled, constructed or constituted by particular **structures** or categories that make it possible for a thinker to make the pronouncement: that is educating." M. C. H. Sonnekus:⁽⁶⁶⁾ "It also must be noted that the aim of this work is seen as a search for a categorical **structure** of psychopedagogics as an area of knowledge of the pedagogical ... " C. K. Oberholzer:⁽⁶⁷⁾ "The question is how the **structure** looks out of which the pedagogic event arises and vice versa: how must the **structure** look to allow the event of educating to arise." W. A. Landman: "Phenomenological description and hermeneutics also are fundamental **structure** disclosing reflections. The practitioner of fundamental pedagogics will allow authentic **structures** to arise from the reality of educating which are the preconditions for its being, thus for the total being-there and sense of the pedagogic in its being unconcealed ... "⁽⁶⁸⁾ "The thinker has to bring about clarity. Clarity requires openness and a fight against darkness. Openness guarantees the accessibility of thinking to what is reflected on, e.g., the pedagogic **structures** in their real essentiality. The real essences of these **structures** and their coherencies must appear and be a presence--they must shine."⁽⁶⁹⁾

How is the structure analysis to be distinguished from structuralism?
What is meant by structuralism?

A fundamental axiom of structure analysis is that a structure is a dynamic, functioning basic given, thus is a reality that is objectively available and can be revealed subjectively.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Structuralism begins when "subjective variations" are excluded. The subject is eliminated.⁽⁷¹⁾ In this light it can be said that fundamental pedagogics will fall into a structuralism if it denies the necessity of giving particular contents to the structures (with their essences and their coherencies) to enliven them. Structuralism expounds a sort of all-sufficiency of *fundamentalia* and, as such, is absolutizing. The following basic axiom clearly points to the anti-structuralism of fundamental pedagogics: "awakening to life" (enlivenment) is a hermeneutic step. It gives an additional interpretation to the essences of educating.⁽⁷²⁾ "As a precondition for being able to actualize pedagogic activities (pedagogic activity structures) an authentic philosophy of life that underlies, directs and steers them so that they are goal-directed has to be seen."⁽⁷³⁾ "The essences of a philosophy of life serve as life-giving (enlivening) contents of the essences of educating."⁽⁷⁴⁾ All of these pronouncements refer to subjectivity (not to subjectivism!).

Structuralism is further characterized by the autonomy of the acting subject (e.g., the educator) being replaced by the autonomy of the structures. The "I" (e.g., of the educator) as a constitutive power then is disregarded.⁽⁷⁵⁾ The anti-structuralism of fundamental pedagogics in this sense appears in stressing that the educator is an actualizer, a maker of a practice based on *fundamentalia*.⁽⁷⁶⁾ In addition, when there is reference to the educator as a mover who designs and intensifies movements of actualization in a field of tension of essences of educating as particular values guided by a philosophy of life⁽⁷⁷⁾ --the educator decidedly is not powerless before structures!

(d) System thinking

There is a distinction between system thinking and systematics.

Systematics: Primarily the phenomenological method is a search for essences (with their coherencies) and is not a system. Only secondarily is it determined if the **essences can be incorporated into a system**, always with the recognition that no system can

adequately reflect the essence of being a person (being an educator)--the openness of essences must be maintained.

The search for essences that can be systematically ordered is a thinking search, and thinking essentially is systematic because it involves reality (i.e., real essences) that has to be manifested and **made surveyable**. One searches for the natural systematics that are in the matter itself (e.g., the reality of educating) but always with the knowledge that a true system as a decisive whole of knowledge of a particular reality never will be attained.⁽⁷⁹⁾

The thinking search for essences (with their coherencies) is a dynamic matter. There is a dynamic strategy that is actualized by which a field of reality (e.g., the reality of educating) is **made distinguishable and is organized**; e.g., pedagogical essences are organized in the form of pedagogical structures and thereby are made distinguishable from other life world essences and from non-essentials. This does not involve a mere compilation of available facts but an ordering of what occurs under a particular perspective (e.g., a pedagogical perspective) and from this way of ordering their tenability or untenability appear. Tenability means that this ordering (organization) has to be an event by which a **true-to-reality structuring of essences** becomes clear.⁽⁸⁰⁾

The thinking search for essences and most of the true-to-life ways of ordering are practicing science. All practicing of science requires a systematic approach.⁽⁸¹⁾ All systematics, however, fall under the demands of projectivity, i.e., its results always are provisional and self-transcending made possible by proceeding dialectically.⁽⁸²⁾ In science, also in pedagogics, this has to do with an open system⁽⁸³⁾ because the scientist does not stop making new discoveries. "Open" then refers to the recognition of historical development and further advancement through reflection. It also refers to a being open to criticism.⁽⁸⁴⁾

By **system thinking** is meant the contrary of the above and the following are some of its characteristics:

(i) System thinking assumes that the essence of being human (being an educator and an educand) can be grasped (understood) by a system. Among other things, this can mean that being human is

equated with a particular system chosen and necessarily will lead to a reduction of humanness (being an educator) to less than what it is in reality and in doing so one easily can fall into ideas that are caricatures. In this sense, system thinking is a form of essence blindness. Fundamental pedagogics is anti-system thinking because it emphasizes that a person (educationist, educator and child) is openness⁽⁸⁵⁾ and, as such, is impossible to capture in a system;

(ii) In the second place, system thinking is characterized as forcing something. A system is forced on a particular aspect of reality (e.g., the reality of educating) that is not itself situated in the system. In this sense any way of thinking that tries to make Pedagogics an applied science can be described as system thinking on account of essence blindness. Fundamental pedagogics is anti-system thinking because it stresses and shows the autonomy⁽⁸⁶⁾ of the pedagogic;

(iii) System thinking occurs when there is a dogmatic assumption that complete knowledge is already possessed, i.e., that a formal system can be entirely autonomous and completely closed.

Consequently, system thinking is a type of formalism.⁽⁸⁷⁾ Previously it was noted that fundamental pedagogics is anti-formalism.⁽⁸⁸⁾ On the other hand, an educational doctrine is decidedly dogmatic in nature and it is a particular pedagogic system⁽⁸⁹⁾ that must make the claim of having dogma status. It is the very nature of a particular educational doctrine to make dogmatic pronouncements and prescriptions.⁽⁹⁰⁾ System thinking in the case of educational doctrine is undeniable but then there also is no more movement in the terrain of the science of education based on a doctrine;

(iv) Finally, system thinking sometimes is characterized by the opinion that openness means a suspension and switching off of scientific reflection and thus ignores being scientific.⁽⁹¹⁾ On account of essence blindness, system thinking points to a maximum of speculation and a minimum of being connected with reality itself (reality of educating), and essences will be viewed as nothing more than merely rational constructions.⁽⁹²⁾ Fundamental pedagogics is fundamental precisely because it stresses phenomenological reflection⁽⁹³⁾ and the fact that pedagogical essences are particular realities that are found in the life world.⁽⁹⁴⁾

Fundamental pedagogics, then, is characterized by:

- (1) Essence disclosing thinking;
- (2) Seeing the co-existentiality and co-essentiality of real pedagogical essences;
- (3) Disclosing the fact of being that pedagogical essences are particular *existentialia*;
- (4) Radically rejecting all forms of essence blindness such as:
 - (a) formalism;
 - (b) essentialism;
 - (c) structuralism;
 - (d) systemism.

5. A TASK FOR THE PROTESTANT CHRISTIAN

Not translated.

6. REFERENCES

- (1) Hengstenberg, H-E: "Was ist Existenzialontologie?" in **Zeitschrift für 1 philosophische Forschung**. Band 26, Heft 2, April-Junie 1972, 177.
- (2) Heidegger, M: **Vom Wesen der Wahrheit**, 15, Frankfurt, Vyfde druk, 1967.
- (3) Hengstenberg, H-E: op cit., 177.
- (4) Hengstenberg, H-E: op cit., 177.
- (5) Ibid, 178.
- (6) Hengstenberg, H-E: **Freiheit und Seinsordnung**, 150-151. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1961.
- (7) Hengstenberg, H-E: "Wat is Existenzialontologie?" op cit., 178.
- (8) (a) Husserl, E: **Ideen I**, 124.
(b) Pivcevic, E: **Husserl and Phenomenology**, 68, Hutchinson University Library, London, 1970.
(c) de Boer, Th: **De Ontwikkelingsgang in het Denken van Husserl**, 291, 299. van Gorcum, Assen, 1966.
- (9) Husserl, E: **Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy** (Tranlated by Q. Lauer), 109 footnote 48. Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1965.
- (10) de Boer, Th: op cit., 315.
- (11) Husserl, E: op cit, 102, 110, 116, 117, 121, 147.
- (12) de Boer, Th: op cit., 293, 315.
- (13) See Szilasi, W: **Einführung in die Phaenomenologie Edmund Husserls**, 26, Max Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1959.
- (14) Landman, W. A. and Roos, S. G.: **Fundamentele Pedagogiek en die Opvoedingswerklikheid**, Chapter two, Butterworths, Durban, 1973.
- (15) Kockelmans, J. J. G. A.: **De Fenomenologische Psychologie volgens Husserl**, 358, Lannoo, Den Haag, 1964.
- (16) Marten, R: **Existieren, Wahrsein und Verstehen**, 17, 79. W de Gruyter, Berlin, 1972.
- (17) (a) Heidegger, M: **Holzwege**, 39-41. Klostermann, Frankfurt, 1963.
(b) Heidegger, M: **Zur Sache des Denkens**, 75-78. Max Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1969.

- (c) Heidegger, M: **Unterwegs zur Sprache**, 201, Neske, Pfullingen, 1959.
- (18) (a) Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., Liebenberg, C. R.: **Opvoedkunde en Opvoedingsleer vir Beginners**, 13, University Publishers and Booksellers, Stellenbosch, 1971.
 (b) Landman, W. A. , Roos, S. G.: **Fundamentele Pedagogiek en die Opvoedingswerklikheid**, 149-150, Butterworths, Durban, 1973.
- (19) See Heidegger, M.: **Sein und Zeit**, 20th edition, 57, Max Niemeyer, Tubingen, 1963.
- (20) Heidegger, M.: op cit., 87.
- (21) Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., Liebenberg, C. R.: op cit., 22-23.
- (22) (a) Heidegger, M.: **Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik**, 216-217, Klostermann, Frankfurt, Third printing, 1965.
 (b) Heidegger, M.: **Holzwege**, op cit., 319-322.
 (c) Heidegger, M.: **Was heisst Denken?**, 41-42, 144, Max Niemeyer, Tubingen, Second printing, 1961.
- (23) See Heidegger, M.: **Zur Seinsfrage**, 28, Klostermann, Frankfurt, 1959.
- (24) Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., Liebenberg, C.R.: op cit., 21-22.
- (25) See Heidegger, M.: **Unterwegs zur Sprache**, op cit., 199.
- (26) See Heidegger, M.: **Vom Wesen des Grundes**, 46-48, Klostermann, Frankfurt, 1949.
- (27) *Ibid.*, 18.
- (28) (a) Heidegger, M.: **Nietzsche I**, 393, Neske, Pfullingen, Second printing, 1961.
 (b) Merleau-Ponty, M.: **The Visible and the Invisible** (Tranlated by A. Lingis), 41, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, 1968.
- (29) Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., Liebenberg, C. R.: op cit., 23.
- (30) See Heidegger, M.: **Wegmarken**, 350, Klostermann, Frankfurt, 1967.
- (31) Landman, W. A.: **Leesboek vir die Christen-opvoeder**, 15-16, 39-42, N. G. Kerboekhandel, Pretoria, Third expanded edition, 1974.
- (32) See Bollnow, O. F.: **Einfache Sittlichkeit**, par. [7.17]. Van den Hoeck & Rupprecht, Gottingen, 1968.
- (33) Landman, W. A.: op cit., 14-15, 36-39.
- (34) (a) Landman, W. A.: op cit., 16, 42-45.
 (b) Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., Liebenberg, C. R.: op cit., 79-82.
 (c) Landman, W. A., Kilian, C. J. G.: **Leesboek vir die Opvoedkundestudent en Onderwyser**, 19-20, Juta, Johannesburg, 1972.
- (35) Hartmann, N.: **Ethics I**, 66-69, 86-87, 100. Allen & Unwin, London, 1958.
- (36) See Ballauff, T.: **Systematische Paedagogik**, 73, Quelle & Meyer, Heidelberg, 1970.
- (37) Bollnow, O. F.: op cit., par. [7.17]
- (38) (a) Landman, W. A., op cit., 18-19, 51-53.
 (b) Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., Liebenberg, C. R.: op cit., 89-90.
- (39) Brand, G.: **Die Lebenswelt**, 410-411. W. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1971.
- (40) See Brand, G.: op cit., 411-412.
- (41) See Merleau-Ponty, M.: **Sense and Non-sense** (Translated by H. L. and P. A. Dreyfus), 128, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, 1964.
- (42) See Merleau-Ponty, M.: **The Visible and the Invisible**, op cit., 118, 247.
- (43) *Ibid.*, 220.
- (44) Merleau-Ponty, M.: **Signs** (Tranlated by R. C. McCleary), xiv, 139, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, 1964.
- (45) Merleau-Ponty, M.: **Phenomenology of Perception** (Trnalted by C. Smith), vii, xiv, Routledge & Kegan Paul, New York, 1962.
- (46) Kraft, V.: **Erkenntnislehre**, 91, Springer, Wien, 1960.
- (47) See (a) Wisser, R. (Ed.): **Sinn und Sein**, 457, Max Niemeyer, Tubingen, 1960 and
 (b) Kraft, V.: op cit., 170.
- (48) Polanyi, M.: **Knowing and Being**, 170-171. University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- (49) See Lipps, H.: **Untersuchungen zu einer Hermeneutischen Logik**, 64, Klostermann, Frankfurt, 1959.
- (50) See Ross, S. D.: **The Scientific Process**, 139. M. Nijhof, Den Haag, 1966.
- (51) Zabeeh, F.: **Universals. A new look at an old problem**, 62, M. Nijhof, Den Haag, 1966.

- (52) Bollnow, O. F.: "Zur Frage nach der Objektivitat der Geisteswissenschaften" in Oppolzer, S. Ed.): **Denkformen und Forschungsmethoden der Erziehungswissenschaft**, 55, Ehrenwirth, Munich, 1966.
- (53) (a) Wisser, R. (Ed.): op cit., 136, 150, 678, 681, 688, 698.
 (b) Cohn, J.: **Vom Sinn der Erziehung**, 6, Schoeningh, Paderborn, 1970.
- (54) Warnach, V.: "Satzereignis und Personale Existenz" in **Salzburger Jahrbuch fur Philosophie**, X/XI, 1966/67, 97, Pustet, Salzburg
- (55) (a) Landman, W. A.: op cit.
 (b) Landman, W. A., Kilian, C. J. G.: op cit.
 (c) Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., Liebenberg, C. R.: op cit.
- (56) Cohn, J.: op cit., 18.
- (57) Warnach, V.: op cit., 97.
- (58) Langeveld, M. J.: "Die Ansatzpunkt der Systematischen Paedagogik" in Oppolzer, S.: op cit., 102.
- (59) Perquin, N.: **Pedagogiek. Bezinning op het Opvoedings-verschijnsel**, 33, Romen & Zonen, Roermond, 1967.
- (60) Derbolav, J.: **Frage und Anspruch**, 321, Henn, Wuppertal, 1970.
- (61) Klafki, W.: "Die Stufen des Paedagogischen Denkens: in Rohrs, H.: **Erziehungswissenschaft und Erziehungswerklichkeit**, 168, Academische Verlagsgesellschaft, Frankfurt, 1967.
- (62) Blankertz, H.: "Didaktik" in Speck, J. (Ed.): **Handbuch Paedagogischer Grundbegriffe I**, 265, Koesel, Munich, 1970.
- (63) Buck, G., Hauke, H., Zahn, L.: **Wissenschaft, Bildung und Paedagogischer Wirklichkeit**, 96-97, Heidenheimer Verlag, Heidenheim, 1969.
- (64) Holterschinken, D.: **Anthropologische Grundlagen Personalistischer Erziehungslehren**, 11, Beltz, Berlin, 1971.
- (65) Van der Stoep, F.: **Didaktiese Grondvorme**, 6, Academica, Pretoria, 1969.
- (66) Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): **Psigopedagogiek. 'n Inleidende Orientering**, 187, University Publishers and Booksellers, Stellenbosch, 1973.
- (67) Oberholzer, C. K.: **Prolegomena van 'n Prinsipiele Pedagogiek**, 34, H. A.U. M., Pretoria, 1968.
- (68) Landman, W. A., Kilian, C. J. G., Viljoen, T. A.: op cit., 9-10.
- (69) Landman, W. A.: "Aanwending van die Pedagogiese Kategorie in die Fundamentele Pedagogiek, 8, **Pedagogic Studies** No. 68, University of Pretoria, 1971.
- (70) Schmidt, H.: **Philosophische Wörterbuch**, 594, Kroner, Stuttgart, 1969.
- (71) Ihde, D.: **Hermeneutic Phenomenology**, 174, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, 1971.
- (72) Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G.: **Fundamentele Pedagogiek en die Opvoedingswerklikheid**, 126, Butterworths, Durban, 1973.
- (73) Ibid., 84.
- (74) Ibid., 125.
- (75) Broekman, J. M.: "Russisch Formalisme, Marxisme, Strukturalisme" in **Tijdschrift voor Filosofie**, no. 1, March, 1971, 33.
- (76) Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., van Rooyen, R. P.: **Die Praktykwording van die Fundamentele Pedagogiek**, Chapter seven, Perskor, Johannesburg, 1974.
- (77) Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G.: op cit., Chapter three.
- (78) See Schneider, K.: **Das Problem der Beschreibung in der Erziehungswissenschaft**, 32, 96.
- (79) See Jaspers, K.: **Philosophie I**. Third Edition, 271-273, Springer, Berlin, 1956.
- (80) See van Peursen, C. A.: **Wetenschappen en Werklijkheid**, 38, 104, Kok, Kampen, 1969.
- (81) Oberholzer, C. K.: op cit., 123.
- (82) Ballauff, Th.: op cit., 39.
- (83) Roth, H.: **Paedagogische Anthropologie I**, 413, Schroedel, Hannover, 1966.
- (84) Derbolav, J.: op cit., 8-9.
- (85) Landman, W. A.: op cit., 8.
- (86) (a) Langeveld, M. J.: **Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek**, Tenth Printing, 13f, 101,

- 143f, 153f, 184, 187.
- (b) Langeveld, M. J.: Voorwoord in Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. en van Rooyen, R. P.: op cit.
- (87) (a) Jaspers, K.: op cit., 273.
 (b) Derbolav, J.: op cit., 8-9, 42.
 (c) van Peursen, C. A.: op cit., 54.
 (d) Saylor, W.: **Das Verhältnis von Theorie und Praxis in der Paedagogiek**, 198-199. Reinhart, Munich, 1968.
- (88) Par. (1.4)a.
- (89) Oberholzer, C. K.: op cit., Chapter four.
- (90) Landman, W. A., and Roos, S. G.: op cit., par. [1.13] and [1.14].
- (91) Debolav, J.: op cit., 8-9.
- (92) Saylor, W.: op cit., 195-197.
- (93) (a) Landman, W. A. and Roos, S. G.: op cit., Chapter two.
 (b) Landman, W. A., Kilian, C. J. G., Roos, S. G.: op cit., Chapters one and two.
 (c) Landman, W. A.: op cit., the whole book.
- (94) (a) Landman, W. A. and Roos, S. G.: op cit., Chapter two.
 (b) Barnard, F.: **Voorwetenskaplike verwysinge na die Fundamentele Pedagogiese Essensies**. D. Ed. dissertation, University of Pretoria.
 (c) Swanepoel, E. M.: **'n Ondersoek na die Openbaring van Fundamentele Pedagogiese Essensies in enkele Dramas wat na Gesinsituasies verwys**. M. Ed. thesis, University of Pretoria.
 (d) Jubelius, S. I.: **Die Verskyning van Fundamentele Pedagogiese Essensies in 'n aantal Gesinsromans**. M. Ed. thesis, University of Pretoria.