

CHAPTER FIVE THE RELATIONSHIP: PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE AND EDUCATION

C. R. Liebenberg

5.1 WHAT IS UNDERSTOOD BY PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE?

Since here there is reflection about the idea of a philosophy of life, from the outset it is well understood that such a reflection is not an explanation of a specific philosophy of life but merely and only of the phenomenon “philosophy regarding living” which is related to the nature of being human. But, to acquire a more lucid grasp of it, it is necessary to fathom [the form of] any philosophy of life in its essences. Therefore, the following is offered:

5.1.1 The particularity of a philosophy of life

When the concern is with universally valid findings such as the fact that all persons, groups and people hold philosophies of life which, indeed, are based on a particular hierarchy of value preferences, then this is not primarily concerned with which specific philosophy of life is the best, but rather with a philosophy of life in its [essential] particularities. Even so, a specific group or people do view their specific philosophy of life as the best. Now it cannot be denied that different persons do not rate values such as fairness, honesty, truthfulness, justness, chastity, etc. equally high and his/her ranking is viewed (by him/her) as the best. The foundation of the particularities of a philosophy of life lies in this fact. However, when a person or people act in terms of the central values held, i.e., those to which they give highest preference, he/she or they then give expression to a particular philosophy of life. Thus, a community or people who hold and exercise such views of life, just because they are ready to unconditionally obey the underlying values and demands of propriety (norms) which speak from these values, show themselves as a part of or member of a community.

5.1.2 The demanding character of a philosophy of life

As indicated, a philosophy of life embodies the practical natural expressions of a human being, i.e., a person, in his/her willing and valuing dialogic (active) involvement with the world and life within which he/she experiences, lives and moves. In other words, this is taken up by an unfinished person in his/her unending being on the way to a world suitable for him/her, i.e., which must be made habitable in the light of specific demands of propriety. A philosophy of life, thus, in no way is something for only particular matters but commands a person to make something of a matter in the sense that it continually calls him/her to a particular way of acting in all circumstances, i.e., acting in accordance with the demands of propriety which speak and make an appeal to him/her from his/her own philosophy of life.

A philosophy of life embraces the idea of a life worthwhile, from which a person can never withdraw him/herself because he/she is continually confronted with values and their implied norms to which he/she must give form by taking a position with respect to everything which surrounds him/her. Thus, a person is continually subjected to obligations which demand of him/her that his/her life of choices will progress in a particular direction. Thus, his/her philosophy of life allows him/her to never be untouched by his/her daily actions and conduct since he/she is continually subjected to its unconditional validity and demands.

5.1.3 The historicity of a philosophy of life

Philosophies of life are not already finished quantities. They have been and continue as still becoming (Oberholzer). Therefore, a philosophy of life must be qualified as a historical matter in a two-fold respect: It is historical because its origin lies far in the past. For example, It is not unknown that the roots of the South African philosophy of life, to which Protestant Christianity was the greatest contributor, goes back to the Greek and Roman life views, but especially back to the influence of Jerusalem, as carried by the Holy Scriptures and further by the Church Fathers and the Church Reformer, Calvin. In this country, after colonization, the South African philosophy of life was also influenced by Protestants and Huguenots. Thus, a philosophy of life has a long history—so long that the life view which is held by a people is older than they are.

In the second place, a philosophy of life is historical because human existence, as individual existence, plays itself out in a particular social-cultural milieu which has a particular formative influence on a particular person. As a morally independent, becoming person subject to the demands of a particular hierarchy of value preferences, content is given to his/her form of living. Consequently, the fact that someone holds a particular philosophy of life is never attributable to his/her own creativity or ingenuity (Oberholzer).

5.1.4 A philosophy of life is not biologically inherited

As a bearer of a philosophy of life, a person usually inherits material goods and such things as intellectual abilities, physical build, color, temperament, etc. But his/her philosophy of life which directs him/her day to day and, thus, as a rule of conduct for his/her life, is no biologically inheritable matter, and he/she acquires it throughout his life because of the intentional influencing by others. And he/she acquires it because, from childhood he/she responds to the normative influences of specific values which he/she learns from home, school and church, as well as the everyday practices around him/her.

5.1.5 Difficulties in perpetuating a philosophy of life

Since a philosophy of life is something acquired, it also is not a matter which can be completed. Viewed in this way, it does not have a static character but always shows a dynamic in the total event of living. This fact of a dynamic philosophy of life indicates that it is subject to changes, in the sense that circumstances in changing situations can exercise a modifying influence on it. Although a philosophy of life only acquires a degree of constancy when moral independence has been entered on each person's way,

life-rousing and life-declining moments arise which possibly can modify a philosophy of life. In this case, one thinks of matters such as repentance, recognition, safety, despair, desperation, disappointment, etc. which are all part of the human way of existing.

5.1.6 The ideality of a philosophy of life

In another way, a philosophy of life is an ideal matter by which it is meant that it is not a concrete-visible or manageable object. As an ideal matter, a philosophy of life keeps a person on the path to an idea of being human. It is for this reason that there is mention of the openness of a person. In his/her acting and conduct in each day, he/she gives expression to what must be. This idea captures him/her and saturates his/her manner of being on the way to his/her own world in which he/she must properly dwell.

5.1.7 The meta-scientific character of a philosophy of life

A philosophy of life is a matter of conviction and certainty regarding the meaningful and proper which makes the human way of existing what and how it is. This certainty and conviction reach above and beyond human rationality. Convictions indicate that a person is ready to unconditionally accept with a complete confidence in a particular certainty. These matters of acceptance and confidence are not matters of the intellect, but of emotions. Therefore, a philosophy of life is a meta-rational matter by which is meant that it can never be rooted in the theoretical nature of a person and, thus, can *never* be a result of scientific reflection. It is only a matter of creed, a confident and faithful knowing such that Oberholzer describes a philosophy of life as the total conviction regarding the life-valuable and life-obligatory and humanly demanding.

5.2 VIEW OF BEING HUMAN, AXIOLOGY AND DOCTRINE FOR EDUCATING AS CORE COMPONENTS OF EACH PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

5.2.1 Core components in their interconnectedness

Where the above title is an indication of three core components of a philosophy of life, it would be incorrect to view them as isolated because, in human existence nothing is ever disconnected. Rather, there is a matter of *distinguishing*, but only for the sake of theorizing, describing and interpreting. The issue of distinguishability is so important that a dedicated reader and student will note in the following discussion, even though these components are presented in isolation via subtitles, they cannot really be considered in isolation.

5.2.2 A view of being human and a philosophy of life

1) Preconditions for a view of being human

Where the previous explication focuses on a philosophy of life, for many it has come to light that such an explication is not possible without implicating a human being in his/her active association with the world and life. Hence, this means that with the idea of a philosophy of life, one enters the human terrain since, in the entirety of reality it is only a human being who carries out a way of existing in which a philosophy of life shows itself and becomes realized. This statement requires some observations of the human way of being. But before this is ventured, first it is stated that such a view of being human in no

way must be interpreted as making human being an absolute, because that would fall into humanism. It is merely observing being human in his/her daily activities. To subject a person to an interpretation of this active associating with everything that is, it must rest on suppositions. When one then proceeds to a description and interpretation of a view of being human, there are necessary preconditions which must be met.

- a) First, this asks for a critical look, description and interpretation so that the danger that there is an involvement which has nothing to do with determining the essence of being human is neutralized.
- b) Second, it is assumed that a person must be seen and understood in terms of the humanness of his/her being human. It often happens that there is an effort to explicate being human from non-human dimensions or perspectives, especially from the animal kingdom. In fact, this is nothing more than an attempt to view being human in terms of what he/she is not, i.e., to not really see him/her. Rather, one must go to being human, *there where* he/she lived experiences and lives, to see how he/she really exists as a human being, with what he/she is concerned and what he/she embodies.
- c) Third, a condition would be that with such a view of being human, there must always be an awareness that thinking about being human will not and cannot ever be completed. In other words, finished and final answers about being human are entirely beyond his/her sphere of possibilities. There are always searching questions and answers regarding being human by which it is unquestionably acknowledged that he/she is fundamentally more than what he/she knows of him/herself (Jaspers), that he/she is not graspable and cannot be captured in a definition, and, even to a lesser extent, is he/she reducible to a so-called average. Thus, it is no wonder that Immanuel Kant has asked how a way of existing such as that of being human is possible.

2) *World orientation of the human being*

From the above preconditions for viewing being human, it has become clear that, by systematic and critical thinking, there must be a search for that by which a human being is, for what makes him/her a human being, and for what is involved in his/her becoming a person and, thus, what keeps him/her concerned. As indicated, to do this, one must go to where human being *is* in the world. The word “in” means that he/she continually establishes relationships with a world which he/she chooses and by which he/she is chosen (Buytendijk), a world with which he/she carries on a dialogue, which he/she experiences affectively and cognitively, assimilates and masters as a world for him/herself. This assimilating can be realized because he/she is essentially a distanced perceiver who can also distance him/herself from him/herself to reflect on him/herself. As possibility of distancing, he/she, thus, questions him/herself because, in the first instance, he/she wants to know: “Where am I?” This question about where he/she is does not indicate a search for a specific place but gives evidence of a being conscious as a being conscious of the self, i.e., by which it is possible for him/her to appropriate the world for him/herself as his/her own world. In varying situations, he/she builds daily on this world by making it habitable for him/herself. Making habitable means that he/she

continually fills what surrounds him/her with contents, thus also philosophy of life contents, through the relationships he/she establishes with everything that is.

3) *Elucidating (the meaning of human) existence*

According to Jaspers, a human being also is confronted with the question of “Who am I?” With respect to this question, there are almost as many answers as there are thinkers. Human being has been viewed as a rational animal, as a political animal, as adventurous, as a structure-in-function, and more. Because of the mystery he/she is for him/herself, adequate answers are never found about being human, and he/she is also *more* than each definition which tries to explain him/her. Thus, the proper approach certainly will be to return to the person in his/her lifeworld, and to postulate a view of being human in terms of the following subtitles, as he/she reveals him/herself in the world.

a) Human being as castness (thrownness)

The patriarch Augustine has said: “For God ... seemingly unthinking and at random has cast us into this world as into a stormy sea ...” which implies that a human being, entirely without his/her effort, i.e., without his/her own choice, has arrived on earth. Thus, he/she is a cast being, he/she is born an individual (solitary) and in need of support. In his/her solitariness (individuality), he/she remains accountable for his/her willful acts of choice. But it is in his/her solidarity (co-existentiality/fellow humanness) which he/she searches for stability, constructs a philosophy of life, and then vertically or horizontally holds onto somebody or Someone; i.e., by reaching beyond to what is more than he/she is him/herself. With reference to a child-in-educating, initially there are choices made *for* him/her until later choices are made *with* him/her until eventually he/she must *him/herself* choose and carry the full responsibility for them. It is, thus, a stability which he/she finds in his/her co-existence with others, and although this refers to a being cast on others, on fellow persons and/or God, whose existence he/she [if a believer] can never deny. How he/she accepts his/her having been cast, and makes something of it, he/she expresses the philosophy of life which he/she holds. For a fatalist, e.g., his/her being cast will mean something different than it does for a Christian who sees his/her being cast as a task.

b) Human being as possibility

Above it is stated that a human being comes into the world in need of help. And, although he/she cannot rely on natural instincts, drives, etc. to ensure his/her survival, in his/her impotence, he/she is entirely possibility (Viljoen). Thus, a human being is open to the world in the sense that he/she is free of these determinants, and is free to choose by virtue of his/her evaluative consciousness. Freedom of choice implies acting in such a way that it is not only possible for him/her to exist, but to conduct a way of living. Now, because he/she can do this, there is a dynamic or motility in human existence. Consequently, it is possible for him/her to step out of him/herself and go out to others and things so that he/she is always present elsewhere, always ahead of him/herself. Therefore, his/her existence is no mere existence as a being delivered to natural laws, as is a stone or a plant, but an ever self-exceeding existence, and the fact that he/she has a philosophy of life at his/her disposal is evidence of this.

c) *Human being as dialogue*

Viewed in the light of a human being, by virtue of his/her consciousness, always is elsewhere, his/her associations and destination are also outside of him/herself. Thus, it is in dialogue with the reality around him/her that he/she understands him/herself. It is because he/she can say “I” that a “you” is already acknowledged. To be human means to be by and with fellow humans. It is only in the “you” and the “me” that an “I” becomes existentially illuminated. A human being only experiences him/herself in his/her dialogic association with everything that is, and he/she carries out this dialogue as a totality, i.e., he/she is completely and totally in a dialogue and his/her philosophy of life is an indication of the contents of this dialogue. As initiator of the conversation, he/she is initiator of relationships, but he/she is not only an initiative. He/she is also a field of tension of values since, as one being addressed from outside of and Above himself, he/she must continually answer and the quality of his/her answer is evidence of the quality of the realization of his/her philosophy of life. As an addressed and answering being, his/her historicity also arises, as such. This means that a person not only has a past, a present and a future, but that he/she is also born into a particular historical tradition from which he/she can never [completely] disconnect him/herself. Because he/she finds him/herself in the present in terms of the past with a future, he/she also ventures to carry on a dialogue with that which is in advance of him/her, by which he/she can be qualified as future-anticipating. The nature of this future anticipation is evidence of his/her philosophy of life.

d) *Human being as a value-striving and value-realizing being*

As mentioned, a human being does not merely exist but also directs his/her life in accordance with the demands which particular values present to him/her and, indeed, values which express his/her philosophy of life. As such, his/her existence is changed into a way of existing characterized by the realization of values, thus of a philosophy of life which then arises as essential in a culture, as a human-made world. On the basis of a person’s striving for particular values and their implied norms, which carry his/her daily choices, an obligatory unrest is awakened in him/her—not an unrest which refers to restlessness, anxiety or fear, but rather to a never ending being underway, within which he/she gives evidence that he/she is not absolutely contented with everything forever (Luijpen) and, thus, is continually bringing about changes in things for the sake of improving them. Thus, he/she designs an unknown and uncertain future, but not without continually redesigning it. And he/she does this fearlessly and in full responsibility in the light of his/her philosophy of life, i.e., with the certainty of having a foothold or place to stand. And now, it is precisely this certainty and conviction which express his/her philosophy of life and make this foothold possible, not as a matter of rational-critical thinking, i.e., not of the mind but of the heart. Because a human being does not live primarily in his/her knowing, willing and distinguishing association with reality, but in his/her valuing and preference-giving view of life in its dynamic course. With this valuing and preference-giving association with all areas of life where one does not *describe* but *prescribe* what is and ought to be in the situation, one enters the domain of a philosophy of life which can be theorized as a matter of universal validity for all

persons, but which, in its contents, is a meta-rational matter—is the mysterious and essential guiding star on a person’s unknown and uncertain way into the future.

5.2.3 Doctrine of values and philosophy of life

Given that there is a doctrine of values as a core component of a philosophy of life, for clarity, a distinction is made between a study of values or axiology as a science and a doctrine of values as a meta-scientific matter. Where an axiology is concerned with what is, i.e., the universally valid, the fundamental, the form of values, a doctrine of values is involved with what *must* be because it *ought* to be. If an axiology is concerned with theorizing about values in their universal validity and necessity, then a doctrine of values particularizes contents to these values by which there is then movement on the level of the specific. It will not be inappropriate at this stage to provide more insight by means of an example of the widely known triad: *a value, its implied norm* and *inculcating the norm*. In their coherence, they always take a three-fold course:

- 1) If a value such as *honesty* is broached, then
- 2) the norm implied by or correlated with it might be, *You must not steal*.
- 3) thirdly, and lastly, inculcating this norm then amounts to, *If you steal you will go to jail*.

Indeed, there are religious, national, political, esthetic, pragmatic, economic, social values and more. And, if now *Christian-Protestant* values such as love of one’s neighbor, chastity, justice, compassion, unselfishness, fairness, tolerance, honesty, etc. are paired with *national* values such as patriotism, loyalty to country, conservation of the soil and preservation of identity, then it becomes possible to espouse a doctrine of values in terms of these pairs of values as a particular matter which forms the cornerstone in this country, i.e., which lies at the basis of the Christian and national as moments of a philosophy of life which is held in South Africa and is also written into law.

But now, at the same time, it must be clear that when there is mention of Christian and national values must not be viewed as contrary but as complementary, in which case the Christian values are primary and do not take a secondary place. In South Africa, we proceed from the standpoint that the national values are overarched by the Christian, and, indeed, in the sense that all White South Africans (not only speakers of Afrikaans) must be aware that their devotion, anchor is in this soil as their own and that their existence here is mandated by God’s Plan. The mandate to which they are subjected is that here they decidedly must do *something*, i.e., they must cultivate and work this land. God is a God of love, mercy and patience, but if we in our daily being underway do not show *love* and *loyalty* in this land, and will not have and work it, He can give it to someone else to work, manage and maintain. By virtue of His almightiness, we know that He can raise children for Himself out of the stones of this beautiful land to work it with loyalty and respect, but He doesn’t do this. As long as we are willing to do what He has called us, as addressees, to do, i.e., to work at the problems with which we are confronted on our soil and indeed to the best of our insights and confidence in the blessings, help and guidance from Above then we have met our obligation. If we do not do this, He can spit us out of

his mouth, and He teaches us this in the Scriptures. Here National values are overarched by the Christian values and, therefore, these values are not contrary but complementary.

Let us now take the national value of “preservation of identity” which the Whites in this country hold in high regard, then it can correctly be said that out of our Christian convictions we also strive to preserve our own identity from other races, e.g., by providing separate living spaces for them. Because, as human beings, we all are of equal value in His view and we must all be obedient to the same values. It is because of the Christian values of loving one’s neighbors, compassion, justice, etc. that the White South African trusts his/her fellow persons and shows the greatest tolerance—even against abuse outside of our borders. He provides his countryman—irrespective of race or color, their own living spaces and before that he gladly endeavored to see that everyone exercised their right to a unique culture (Viljoen).

But it also is the case that human beings simply are created *unlike* in that all do not have the same intelligence, interests, cognitive abilities, possessed culture, ability to assume responsibility, etc. Thus, to want to make all persons the same is to crush the preservation of a unique identity. And just because of this, the philosophy of the United Nations Organization Charter that “all men are born free and equal” does not have any bite at all.

As already postulated, it is an essential characteristic of a philosophy of life that it gives expression to itself through its underlying values. The consequence is that where, during this argument, there is mention of Christian and national values, then the idea of the Christian and the national as moments of a philosophy of life can rightly be broached. But then here one asks for an open ear, tolerance and a deep consideration regarding the explication which follows, since no person in his/her meta-scientific pronouncements will be guilty of moving in so many areas that, with a discussion of the Christian and the national as moments of a philosophy of life, he/she merely lands in the political arena. In other words, the hope is expressed that it has become clear in the previous discussion that the philosophy of life concept of “the national” has nothing at all to do with the fact that it is under the National Party government that it was legislated into law. It is certainly from the heart so that as a moment of a philosophy of life, in its essence it is stripped of any semblance of “Afrikaner-ism”. It cannot be denied that this is a historical-political concept, which for many South African citizens still carries the stamp of an Afrikaner-ism and thus is not acceptable to all of them, but just because of this, the Education Law of 1967 says that teaching must have a broad national character by which all White groups in the population are included. Indeed, with this, an appeal is directed to those for whom this, as a philosophy of life moment, is not acceptable, to sift on all political biases based on the past and to assert “South Africa is my home” without substituting other differences in conviction.

Viewed metablytically, it must always be kept in mind that the world and life do not stand still. In other words, that which continually makes an impression on a person in his/hr daily involvement, definitely does not remain unchanged just as little as does the content which, during the course of time, has given value to life obligations. With this, it

will become clear that for the sake of the conservation and preservation of a unique South African soil and identity, all White groups in the population are called to a national unity, and indeed, a Christian-national unity which eventually will result in a purely Christian unity among all racial groups because in South Africa there also are non-White Christians. In fact, this is a differentiation which is already underway. And, in essence, this is not a differentiation between White and non-White but between Christian and non-Christian because, among Christians, there are non-Whites and among non-Christians there are Whites. It is my modest opinion that this differentiation eventually will be what is going to prevail in the world. Thus, finally, whenever we speak of national, we mean attached, anchored in our own soil—not to a home elsewhere but here with just the one creed that *South Africa is my home*. Any person who says this avows to the idea of the national Law, just as when someone says that the Scriptures are the highest authority for him, necessarily the Christian creed.

5.2.4 Doctrine for educating and philosophy of life

Just as a distinction is made between a study of values (axiology) and a doctrine of values, a similar distinction is made between a study of educating (pedagogics) and a doctrine for educating because a doctrine regarding educating, as is a view of life, is a meta-scientific matter and, as such, it is not concerned with what is but with what must and ought to be. So viewed, a doctrine for educating necessarily makes prescriptive pronouncements regarding educating so that, in advocating such a doctrine, we will be delimited by three matters, i.e., the educator-ship of the parents, the educator-educand relationship and the view of labor as a criterion for a philosophy of life.

1) The educator-ship of the parents

If there should be a question about what ought to occur in the family with an eye to educating children, one need not return any further than to the Christian-Protestant marriage formulary because here educating comes forth most clearly as an indissoluble connectedness of parent and child.

In the marriage formulary, we learn that “*through marriage humankind must be built and that the parents must educate their children in the true knowledge and fear of God, to His glory and to their salvation*”. Here there first is a discussion of the obligations of the future parents, as a mandate to build humanity, but in the concluding prayer, it is said that God is pleased to give children. In the experience of both truths, i.e., in the “building” of mankind and in the “giving” by God is the art of marriage. Firstly, the *building by man* cannot merely be submissively left to God while, secondly, man in this connection must not merely proceed in his own idle ways (Wielenga).

The demand to educate which arises in the performance of the marriage ceremony, is one of the most beautiful but also most difficult obligations which can be imposed upon the marriage partners. However, it is fortunate that they are met half-way with respect to the fact that those who *beget* children remain responsible in their life for rearing them (Strasser) because everyday reality unquestionably shows that this is a God given natural yearning of each parent. During each day, one sees in the orderliness of God’s creation, that parents will sometimes not only feed (voed) but educate (opvoed) their children at

their own cost. Therefore, a child will not leave home and hearth before he/she has become morally independent.

The task of educating, as an aim of marriage, is briefly but masterfully stated in the marriage formulary in three facets which are variations of one thought, i.e., parents must educate their children:

- a) “In the true knowledge and fear of God,
- b) to His glory, and
- c) to their salvation.”

In the first place, “knowledge and fear of God” not only implies knowledge of the reality created by God but also knowledge of God himself. And since educating, in its deeper dimension, is really conscience forming, the above knowledge and fear of God imply a knowing by one’s conscience. This forming of conscience requires patient sacrifice and most of all love, but also genuine as well as Scriptural knowledge as human knowledge.

In this way the other aims are also reached, i.e., “to His glory” and “to their salvation”. By accompanying a child-in-becoming “to His glory,” all rights of possession of the child, and of the parents as educators, are elevated. It is known that with heathen people. it was customary to view the State as the highest aim and the most important owner of children. And even in our contemporary world, i.e., in communist oriented countries, the individual and the state are deified. Therefore, it is good and right that a married couple, by their marital union, learns of the predominating aim: “to His glory”. Because God has gladly given (children) to him, they are much more children of God than of their parents. Indeed, a child is the absolute property of God and it is a property right that He never gives up. In its essence, married couples are only foster parents, in the true sense of the word, who are temporarily entrusted with the child under the mandate of God.

“To his salvation” also belongs to this mandate because “to His glory” and “to his salvation” are two sides of the same matter, i.e., God’s glory and the happiness of His creature. Only by glorifying God can His creature be happy and true happiness reaches to His glory. Thus, salvation is the crowning quality of the parents as educators such that when it figures in child life and after there certainly is no greater reward than this largely imposed task. For the parents this is a long and sometimes tedious but not meaningless way because in this way the marriage acquires sense and meaning as a point of contact for child guidance to Heaven.

2) *The educator-educand-relationship*

It is an essential characteristic of human being which he/she, in his/her ways of existing, is continually in relationship with all that is. In other words, it is given with being human that he/she continuously establishes or initiates relationships on the basis of which he/she is not described as something with characteristics, but as an initiative of relationships to a world which he/she chooses and by which he/she is chosen (Buytendijk). The essence of such relationships which a person establishes with something or someone is that it immediately calls a specific situation into being which requires a person to *act* or

participate in the situation. When one reflects on the educator-educand-relationship, it is undeniable that the role which an educator is responsible for will largely be determined by the degree of need for help of an educand. And, the greatest role he/she takes by virtue of his/her being addressed from Above is that he/she is not only a surrogate initiative for a child-in-educating, but also a surrogate conscience and, thus, a surrogate responsibility.

To now broach a doctrine for educating, in the light of the educator-educand relationship, the author ventures into a possible distinction in the Christian-Protestant baptismal vows in which the deepest sense of the idea of surrogate responsibility is considered. In the closing argument of these vows, the parents are reminded of their obligations, i.e., "... the children, as inheritors of the Kingdom of God and His Covenant, (must) be baptized". The parents assume so much responsibility in this relationship that the child to be baptized can only be a Covenant child through the intermediation of his/her parents in the situation and because the child is not yet even aware of his/her existence. And, indeed, the infant is no less involved in this event because he/she is no less than his/her parents, called to experience and live the Covenant. But since he/she is still too small to even accept the Covenant, the responsibility falls on the parents as educators to accept this on behalf of their child, and also to hold this Covenant before him/her. Thus, the parents remain the child's surrogate responsibility in the child-God-relationship.

In the relationship in which the educators and young educand are situated, the child is, as any other child, accepted and born in sin. But because God has accepted him/her as His child, given him/her a place in His Covenant, while the parents are obligated to bring to the child the divine message of the Covenant and to teach him/her more broadly about the baptism within which he/she is received. Thus, with the baptism, the parents are obligated to a Christian educating of the child, because they already, by virtue of divine command, and because of the bond of love and blood (Oberholzer) are the natural educators. The educative content in this educator-educand relationship is very clear. Until the time that the child is able to give sense and meaning to reality, he/she must be appealed to by his/her parents to know and experience that, while he/she is still small, something particular and hallowed has happened to him/her in very solemn ways, i.e., he/she was baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity. This baptism in the name of God guarantees that he/she will not be a heathen child but a child of the Covenant. Also, now by means of genuine guidance of the child it, must be indicted that where initially the parents have made choices *for* him/her, henceforth he/she must increasingly accept responsibility for *him/herself* choosing.

If the third baptismal question is now examined, i.e., "... do you promise and is it your intention to the best of your abilities to teach this child (of whom you are the father, mother or witness) the doctrine or let him be taught it?", then it is clear that after this content there is essentially nothing new except that in this part, there is a solemn request regarding what had already been expressed in the baptism doctrine. In the three baptismal questions, the parents vow and promise to accept the educative task on behalf of the child as a child of the Covenant but, as already shown, this promise essentially is a

promise to God because all parents are subjected to a particular obligation to Him and indeed an obligation because of gratitude for the child that He has presented to them.

Now one arrives at the last part of the third baptismal question, i.e., “... to teach this child to the best of your abilities or let him be taught?” from which appears the idea of Christian education by which the teacher is not only called to be a surrogate responsibility but also a surrogate parent. In other words, where the parents, because of their own inabilities or other circumstances beyond their control, cannot fully keep their promise, they are obligated to transfer part of their educative task to one or another authority and, indeed, in this case the Christian school where their baptism can be educated in correspondence with the content of the Christian baptismal vows. This transfer to the school by the Christian parents means that they can, might and ought to demand that the school which supports them in fulfilling their educative responsibilities must be a Christian school.

Thus viewed, such an institution by virtue of the intense responsibility of the parents cannot function outside of the parental authority and then it is obvious that each parent has the right to demand that their Christian-Protestant philosophy of life will be carried into this educative practice.

Finally, the idea of educating is discussed for the third time in the baptismal vows and indeed in the prayer of giving thanks from which it is said: “... so that they might be educated in a Christian and pious way”. Essentially in this prayer the church is implored to provide a Christian education as a benefit from God. But with this the surrogate responsibility of the parents is not at all decreased by virtue of their delegated vows because one day an accounting will be exacted regarding their affirmation of the baptismal vows—an accounting which will be weighed on that particular day and if it is found to be too meager or light the parent-educator, as well as the teacher-educator, must become aware that in their being addressed to establish a pedagogical relationship with that child they have failed and his/her path to Heaven has been obstructed because they have not been bound by the word of God.

3) *Viewing labor as one criterion for a philosophy of life*

Labor in the family and school-pedagogical situations, as far as the child-in-education is concerned, is always a matter of beginning-labor-under-guidance which must and ought to eventually result in meaningful adult labor. Where educating is attuned to guiding a child forward to adulthood, this adulthood necessarily will be expressed in all areas of society such as in the *vocational system* within the overarching *system of labor*. In other words, in his/her being educated, a child gradually and progressively is directed to enter a future vocation with sufficient independence and responsibility and, thus, arrive at self-realization. Therefore, educating and the vocational system must not be viewed as two contrary concepts or areas but as complementary and, as such, can only be *distinguished* but never separated.

Where there was mention of responsibility and independence, now they can be further supplemented with matters such as acceptance and maintenance of authority at work as

well as positive human relationships, and it can now be asked what this has to do with a doctrine for educating and a philosophy of life? The answer decidedly is: Only everything! Because in these so aptly postulated work attitudes, once again, one finds an underlying *value structure* as this becomes expressed in a view of labor as part of a philosophy of life. As such, this view of labor must obey and affirm the demands of one's philosophy of life. I.e., the genuineness of a philosophy of life and the obedience of its demands never speaks so strongly as from a view of labor. Consequently, it is not what a person says that he is, to which value is attributed, but what he/she wholeheartedly does out of his/her own convictions (Landman).

Oberholzer asserts directly: "Tell me what you value uppermost and what your views of labor are and I will tell you what kind of occupation you will choose and how you will practice it" because, as he continues in his Prolegomena, "The human being does what he is and he is what he attributes value to." Of labor, viewed against a philosophy of life as background, it can be said that it is a mode of human existence; that is, it is given with being human. With this, a particularity (of being human) is already advanced and it may never be asked why a human being works but rather why he/she must and ought to work. With the aim of advancing a doctrine for educating, there is a need for an answer to this question and, once again, there is a reaching back to the Holy Scriptures where in Genesis 2:15 one finds: "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it." That a human being *must* labor is essentially a Paradise task and viewed in the light of the fact that this task from the Lord God had occurred before the existence of Eve and, thus, also before the Fall means that it cannot be considered to be a direct consequence of the Fall so that it is not a so-called curse or repayment which rests with the laboring person. It must be stated frankly that God had created human being as a laboring being and Paradise was Paradise precisely because a human being must labor in it (Oberholzer). After the Fall, because of the disobedience of Adam and Eve, the Lord God censured human being and sent them out of the garden of Eden with the judgment, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till you return into the ground" (Genesis 3:19). Although a judgment, a specific normative task appears from these words of God, "*In the sweat of thy face*" because finally this is no longer about *why* a human being works but also and especially *how* he/she ought to work.

Because of the Holy Scriptures, it is clear that irrespective of mankind's alienation from God after the Fall, something of what had originally been created remained unscathed, i.e., his/her labor. Labor must be seen as one of the greatest blessings bestowed on mankind because the Paradise task of Adam and Eve was an affectionate task as well as an indication that God has decided not to withdraw Himself from mankind and the world. And, therefore, labor is a divine privilege and, thus, a prerogative for which gratitude must be shown. In six days, God had created Heaven and earth and on the seventh day He had rested. Thus, each man begins each new week with a Sunday, as a day of rest, and indeed with the knowledge that he/she is sent into the workweek by Christ and in happy expectation through his/her labor he/she can think about the deliverance. Thus, we work in faith, expectation and loving dedication (Oberholzer).

The labor to which God calls mankind must also extend to the benefits of fellow persons because thereby he/she can share the fruits of his/her labor with those who are in need. But now it also is the case that the work which man must do by virtue of God's mandate must conform with the positive potentialities which he/she has received from the beginning because, according to the Scriptures, it will be demands of him/her in accordance with what he/she has received. In other words, mankind must view this as an earthy task to follow the mandate of God with surrender and dedication, to be industrious in accordance with his/her talents and gifts, and which are to the betterment of him/herself, in the service of fellow persons and to the glory of God (Landman).

Strikingly, Oberholzer states that, "If a person professes that he is Christian then the greatest test is if he is ready to bear his cross and carry out his work but especially *how* he is prepared to do so. And if one carries this out joyfully and cheerfully all work leads to human betterment but above all to glorifying God. One kind of work, then, is not grander than another. A street sweeper does work that is just as necessary as that of a judge in a court of justice. We are then persons who are called, whatever this calling might be. All work then is a divine calling and being called by which in the very least it is assumed that work is divine or that we ourselves are. It is divine because God calls us."

From the above Christian view of labor, the values which are held and expressed in working speak very clearly. Related to this is an educative problem of enormous scope because the view of labor held by youths, as a value-laden view, in no way takes form because of intellectual reasoning. This view has its origin in the meta-rational depth of youth itself and results in an attitude toward work that is only made possible by progressively educating. This directs his/her life of choices since this is a matter of personal conviction. The view of occupation indicates an acceptance, it is a matter of faith and trust, it is a meta-scientific conviction of the heart because it is grounded in the manifested Word of God. Consequently, this gives the life of each person a task character and the view of labor essentially is a criterion of a philosophy of life.

5.3 EDUCATIVE PRACTICE AS A PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCE OF A VIEW OF BEING HUMAN AND OF LIFE AS FOUND IN THREE CULTURAL COMMUNITIES

5.3.1 Introduction

From the first two chapters of this book, pedagogics, as an autonomous science, is involved with a systematic reflection, description and interpretation of values, as well as their nature and their actualization. On the other hand, educating as a practical matter, is concerned with the *realization* of these values in a particular hierarchy of preferences. This does not imply that *all* values are entertained because a philosophy of life, as it is expressed in a particular practice, favors a particular value-preference which demands unconditional obedience.

The home, school and church are not educative places where values are created, but where they are preserved and maintained and, therefore, are passed on in simplest form to tomorrow's generation in these situations as valuable cultural goods, as life contents, but

which also are presented for aspiring to and for which opportunities are created for living up to them. It will then possibly be appropriate to examine educating as a matter of practice where the idea of a view of being human and of life is crystallized in these three places.

5.3.2 *Philosophy of life and educating in the family*

Of the family, as the primary educative place, where parents live in close connection with the children they have begotten, it is correctly said that here the first possibility for educating arises, especially because a child is in need of help and, thus, is particularly dependent on his/hher parents. It is because of his intimate being-together with his/her parents that the possibility is created to learn of his/her parents' spiritual and cultural possessions, and to appropriate and assimilate them for him/herself. It is especially in the family circle where a child is formed in his/her earliest receptive years by his/her parents, as his/her natural educators, in terms of a particular hierarchy of value preferences that their philosophy of life underlies and makes possible. The family institution, where a child is received and accepted in love is for him/her a life space where his/her active association with everything surrounding him/her is always subjected to the regulating and judging eye of a parent. But it is under sympathetic, authoritative guidance that he/she (a child) experiences and increasingly accepts the presented norm-behavioral hierarchy of preferred values. Where a philosophy of life continually exercises an influence, it is the task for all parents, during a child's becoming, to initially choose for him/her and later with him/her, but always in light of the power of the demands of a philosophy of life, until eventually he/she will choose and act in a self-determined, self-normative way. To eventually choose in a self-determined way by accepting responsibility for his/her acts of choice indicates that a particular life attitude has crystallized in a child during this way of accompaniment and is a matter of relationships to things, others and to God.

5.3.3 *Philosophy of life and educating in the school*

As far as educating in a school context is concerned, it is important to first remember that the school is a second-order educative institution. And it qualifies as such because educating, in its most original form, was a private matter for which, in former times, the parents took exclusive responsibility. But with the increasing complexity of the cultural contents and demands, in the course of time, the parents could no longer effectively carry it out. Therefore, it became necessary for them to initiate and establish what today are called schools where educating, as a practical matter, could take its course in formal ways. As such, the school is an institution with a temporal-spatial character in the sense that it is a *place*, but also a *way* (Langeveld) because a child must be *in* school and go *through* it, since he/she cannot stay there forever. The school, as a life-stimulating institution, offers many opportunities to give sense and meaning to human existence by directly and indirectly giving form to what is regarded as valuable and worth striving for. But similarly, in its educative work, it must also voice the historical particularities, i.e., what has made society into what it is. Thus viewed, school, indeed, is a powerful establishment of ideological moments, and a task demanded of it is to continually inquire about the view of being human and of life of the group, society or people whose children are brought across its threshold with the aim of educating them to moral adulthood.

It will thus be expected of the school that a thorough forming will occur regarding a philosophy of life. If it is considered that a school educator has already become who he/she is because of his/her confrontation with a past reality as a norm-informed reality through experiencing and living his/her value preferences, it can correctly be asserted that the encounter between educator and educand in a school context, in essence is really an encounter with life itself. And when an educator proceeds to make available a particular content interpretation of the form systems of the culture, in its essence, this really is an interpretation of life and, indeed, because this interpretation has its origin in an educator's philosophy of life (Van der Stoep).

Thus, it is indisputable that giving meaning to and experience the meaning of everything which educators thrust upon a child during the event of schooling cannot be separated from their views of life. In essence, the connection between school educating and a philosophy of life is made so visible that a school educator's philosophy of life is carried into the classroom with him/her and executes work enlivened (by his/her philosophy of life) so that a child, in his/her turn, can carry out and give expression to that particular philosophy of life.

For example, a Christian educator lives as he/she does in terms of certain values and norms whose authority is unconditionally acknowledged and whose demands are unconditionally obeyed. As a result, his/her activities, and in this case especially his/her educative actions, are so saturated with his/her Christian philosophy of life that his/her activity itself is a manifestation of it. Therefore, it also is unthinkable, indeed impossible, for any educator in the context of schooling to take a neutral position in the educative event. To speak of a neutral educating is to speak of something impossible and of things which cannot be understood at all. And when someone asserts that such and such a person in his/her educative practice conceals matters such as philosophy of life moments, or places them between brackets, this will be nothing more than a nullification of the idea of educating because each educator of calling *lives* his/her philosophy of life. Stated more forcefully: He/she is his/her philosophy of life while a child-in-educating becomes his/her philosophy of life and, indeed, especially in terms of the *example* by which this is exemplified, strengthened by the quality of the matters which are created for emulation.

5.3.4 *Philosophy of life and educating in the church*

If, then, a school is a place where a child abides temporarily only because one day he/she must leave it, then a Christian educator can and might never say the same of the Church, as the house and congregation of God. By virtue of its/her being called, the Church is an institution with a particularly strong educative function. As an institution, it had its origin through the particular grace of God, while the members are linked together as a community of true believers and professors of the faith. The Church applies itself to the care and ennoblement of the religious life of its members, while it also watches over the practice of this profession of faith through educating by teaching, organizing and disciplining (Coetzee).

Based on its teachings and creed, the Church, as such, holds a particular moral which is also a measure and guide of conduct for the daily actions and behavior of its members.

Otherwise, it is an institution about which it can be said that it never is in search of truth because it already has and professes the Truth, and this Truth testifies to the future, essence and destination of man as the highest goods for man (Van Staden). Therefore, the philosophy of life which is held here is so imperious that it never will hesitate to judge what is proper and improper, and what is worthy of approval and unacceptable (Oberholzer).

5.3.5 Concluding view

In what is said so far, it must be seen that a child is really a member of the Church from his/her birth, a matter which is confirmed with the baptism. But it is only with taking the oath of the confession of faith (acceptance) that he/she becomes confirmed as a member of the Church. So viewed, there is, thus, a clear connection of the structure of the educative function of the home, school and Church. Where the Church has an obligation to educate from birth to the grave, the commitment of the home extends from birth to adulthood, and the school from being a toddler to adulthood. Thus, it is obvious that these three institutions must work closely together in educating children.