

CHAPTER FOUR PEDAGOGICAL CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA*

S. G. Roos

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, the fundamental pedagogical structures are disclosed and it clearly came to light that their realization is only meaningful and possible because a child needs support. In this chapter, a further analysis is made of the pedagogical situation to reflectively search for additional pedagogical essences. It must also be verified whether these essences, in their turn, refer to a child's need for support. If indeed this is the case, then a child's need for support must be viewed as a *fundamental pedagogical category*. If this is not the case, then the fact that a child needs support is necessarily deprived of its pedagogical significance.

The analysis here is done in terms of some anthropological categories, thus, in terms of fundamental concepts or truisms which are only applicable to human beings. Categories must be seen as verbalizations of life reality which express the essentials or necessary characteristics of a certain aspect of it. Thus viewed, categories are a form of reality which also is forms of thinking which can later be implemented as yardsticks to judgmentally view the realization of this reality (Landman). In other words, categories can also be applied as criteria. Categories are not contrived or invented but are found after an essence analysis, where a scientist expresses, in appropriate words, the real essences which have been laid bare or disclosed. In this way, it can be correctly asserted that categories announce themselves. The anthropological categories which are to be applied to shed light on childlike need for support are: being-in-a-meaningful-world; being-with (co-existing); temporality (futuraity), and being someone.

Because a human being is a being who is involved in and with reality in terms of values and, thus, continually ventures with value judgments, there is also a search for the implications which a child's need for support holds for an educator when he/she applies the results of his/her theoretical reflections to practice. In other words, in this chapter there also is reflection on the *post-scientific application* or applicability of the theoretically acquired insights where an educator in a real educative situation cannot and, indeed, has little power to distance him/herself from his/her philosophy of life. Indeed, there is an examination of whether the results of his/her scientific reflections can serve as support or reinforcement for his/her philosophy of life. To be able to do this, it is necessary to continually turn to the Bible in which the philosophy of life of the Protestant Christian acquires its deepest foundation and richest content. In this way, the

* Viewed existentially, i.e., in concrete pedagogical situations, these epistemological matters in reality are particular pedagogical activities (pedagogical activity structures)

pedagogical structures can be enlivened so they can function in the lifeworld and will allow a Christian educator to make his/her contribution to educating in a Christian-National context.

Considered first is the anthropological category being-in-a-meaningful-world with the pedagogical categories which flow from it:

4.2 ESSENCES OF BEING-IN-A-MEANINGFUL-WORLD

1. *Introduction*

A responsible educator is addressed by childlike need for support and he/she responds as a support giving being by realizing relationship and sequence structures with a child such that the aim structures gradually take form in his/her life (see chapter 1). To realize these structures an educator must act educatively in educative situations. Such educative help is possible and necessary because of a child's need for support and can be provided by the following educative activities (essences):

2. *Giving-meaning-with-increasing-responsibility*

Human existence is meaningful because he/she has a *responsibility for the world* (aim structure). Now, however, it is the case that a child who is left to him/herself is not yet able to give an adequate response and, therefore, an understanding educator is compelled to support him/her in this. To help him/her carry out his/her *responsibility for the world*, an educator must first help a child *become acquainted with the world* by helping him/her to *give proper meaning* to it and the things in it and even to *test the meanings* so that he/she can arrive at an adequate *world understanding* where his/her *horizon* is continually *broadened*. Proper *horizon broadening*, however, is only possible if a child is further helped to *experience* these *meanings* such that he/she can *identify with the propriety* they express and *live in accordance with them*. Such an *elevation in meaning* can only be possible for a child if he/she is helped to *look beyond* what is *merely worldly* so that deeper meanings become visible. If this is not done, then a child very easily can fall into worldliness because he/she cannot see higher values and deeper meanings.

From the above, it seems clear that a child needs someone to help him/her give-meaning-with-increasing-responsibility, and this underlines his/her childlike need for support in a pedagogic context.

3. *Gradually-breaking-away-from-lack-of-exertion*

At birth, a human being is rich in potentiality but poor in actuality, and since a child cannot actualize his/her positive human potentialities by him/herself, he/she is dependent on the help of an adult. The newborn baby need not exert him/herself too much to be considered to be a proper baby, but because he/she has the potentiality to attain adulthood, it is improper for him/her to remain a baby, and he/she must be helped to increasingly realize his/her positive human potentialities, and this is only possible by means of sustained exertion (Even when adulthood has been reached, a person must continually exert him/herself to be considered a proper adult).

Thus, educating must be seen as help an adult offers a child to *break-away-from-lack-of-exertion*. To help a child *move* in the direction of increasing *exertion*, he/she must be supported to *actively participate* in and *accept responsibility* for his/her own becoming adult because if he/she is left on his/her own, he/she can never do this. He/she needs support because without it, he/she cannot take a *stand for what is proper* and, therefore, will not exert him/herself to live accordingly. In other words, a child has an intense need for an adult who can guide him/her correctly such that he/she can increasingly *choose* for *him/herself* to realize what is proper in his/her life and, in doing so, to *overcome* the *passivity* in his/her life.

In summary: educating is not only possible but necessary because, in the life of a child, there is a fruitful tension between “is” and “ought”, a tension which a child, with the support of an adult, ought to move in the direction of proper adulthood.

4. *Exemplifying and emulating norms*

A child is not born with norms in terms of which he/she can work on his/her own becoming and, therefore, he/she is also in need of support in this respect. He/she has a need for an understanding and trusting adult whose authority he/she recognizes, and who can exemplify norms for him/her so that he/she can emulate them. Initially, he/she associates the proper with this adult, but he/she will become and identify him/herself with this adult, but to the extent that he/she reaches adulthood him/herself, this *personal identification* proceeds to an *unconditional norm identification* until he/she has reached proper adulthood him/herself.

That a child needs someone who must help him/her to accountably give meaning to his/her life so he/she can make the effort to *live according to the demands of propriety*, is now clear. However, it is the case that, although it is generally true, children can only be educated in terms of norms, this can never be separated from specific contents which take form within a philosophy of life. Indeed, each philosophy of life shows its own hierarchy of value preferences.

To now help a child *take a stand for a philosophy of life*, he/she must also be helped to *understand the norms* which underlie it because without this understanding, he/she can never arrive at an independent *judgment of standpoint* and without this, *obedience to a philosophy of life* is not possible and, at most, he/she can be helped to be obedient merely to human authority. Therefore, in practice, giving contents through exemplifying and emulating norms is a post-scientific matter which is of cardinal importance for meaningfully and properly helping a child in his/her becoming.

5. *Post-scientific*

A Christian educator’s philosophy of life addresses him/her to help a Covenant child with giving Christian meaning. He/she knows that there is but one overarching norm or yardstick in terms of which he/she can help a Covenant child with giving such meaning, and it is the Bible, because: “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.” (II Tim. 3:16). This is a terribly responsible task and, therefore, a Christian educator must make a Covenant child familiar with the Bible from an early age on, so that he/she cannot merely

understand it, but understand it in such a way that it acquires life and urges him/her to want to live in accordance with it. To help a child make his/her life meaningful in this way, an educator's own life must show evidence of obedience to a Christian philosophy of life. Indeed, if a Christian educator does not make a Christian philosophy of life a living part of his/her own life, then it will be extremely difficult for a child to see its deeper meaning, and if he/she does not understand it, he/she cannot meaningfully emulate it.

4.3 Essences of co-existence (being-with)

1. *Being-with*

Since a person cannot live a meaningful existence without being-with others, the essence of his/her being-there [Da-sein] is viewed as a "commitment to others" (Strasser).

One person is committed to another, not only for merely being by each other in a geometrical space, but to give and receive help so that his/her life can acquire sense and meaning. It is especially a child who, because of his/her need for support, asks for adults without which he/she cannot form him/herself as a person. A child has a need for a secure space in which he/she can dwell and which he/she can design as a unique lifeworld for him/herself. This designing a life space is characteristic of a person and is a human space replete with humanness. However, a child cannot experience a space as safe if he/she does not live it along with a supportive adult. Also, an adult's being-there means a being-with a child in his/her need, as a fundamental structure of his/her being a child, a structure which can only be elevated to a fundamental structure when being-with a child includes the aim of elevating or giving support [to him/her] and, thus, can proceed to a *being-with* as *we-ness*. Thus, in a pedagogical context, being-with especially refers to childlike need for support which must be complemented by an adult's giving support. Hence, this is a co-existing (being-with) where child-being is complemented with adult-being.

Being-with undoubtedly refers to childlike need for support such that this category has pedagogical significance. Now the real pedagogical essences (thus, pedagogical categories) which flow from this category are illuminated to see if they also shed light on childlike need for support.

2. *Venturing-(risking)-with-each-other-pedagogically*

An educative situation is a shared situation because, as partners, educator and child share it with each other. It is an intimate situation of being-together which also must be an abiding or lingering by each other (Buytendijk) where each partner stands open to the other to be encountered. Such a lingering with and openness for the other, in essence, are nothing more than a venturing-with-the-other. Because a child is a being who increasingly has free will at his/her disposal, he/she withdraws him/herself from all devaluations of, knowing about and, thus, precise predictions about him/her; this makes it necessary for an educator to venture with him/her. Also, for a child, this co-existing with an educator (who he/she trusts) requires a willingness to venture because he/she also cannot predict the outcome of this encounter. The unpredictability of the other makes the

encountering being-with a gamble and, therefore, it also requires courage. Although it requires courage to venture, a pedagogical encounter is not a brave venturing in solitude but, indeed, must be a real essential venturing with the other (Kant), and this is only possible once the pedagogical structures are realized. Only then will both partners be confidently ready to take the risk with each other.

From the previous chapter, it is childlike need for support which calls for the pedagogical structures to be realized. Thus viewed, a mutual readiness and willingness to venture within the framework of the pedagogical structures also refer to childlike need for support. Hence, from a relationship of trust, the possibility and necessity of a pedagogic venturing-with-each-other arises.

On the other hand, venturing-with-the-other makes trusting possible! Indeed, one who will not venture with another will also not linger by him/her and open him/herself to be encountered; then a relationship of trust can never be realized. Consequently, venturing-with-the-other must also be viewed as a precondition for a relationship of trust and, as appeared in the previous chapter, a child's need for support is a fundamental condition for this relationship. A child's need for support must be seen as a double precondition for realizing a relationship of trust which, in its turn, makes venturing-with-the-other possible.

Accepting trust is also only possible where there is a *relationship of knowing*. The readiness of an educator to venture with a child is also seen in the fact that he/she has knowledge and understanding of the essence of a child's need for support. Even so, this is a knowing which, in principle, is unknowable and unpredictable. A relationship of knowing also implies knowledge of the *destination* to which a child is on the way (aim structures). To venture with an educator requires that a child have knowledge of his/her own need for support, as well as knowledge that this need can be overcome through an adult giving support. Thus, in fact, it is childlike need for support which makes educator and child bond as a unity with each other in a we-ness. Hence, a genuine relationship of knowing is possible where both partners are willing to venture with each other in the situation.

On the other hand, it is venturing-with-the-other which makes knowing and understanding possible. If, because of an experience of insecurity, a child is afraid to establish a relationship with an adult, he/she also cannot show him/herself to an adult. Thus, if a child's willingness to venture is lacking, then an adequate relationship of knowing cannot be established. In addition, it is only if an educator ventures with a child that he/she will be able to really learn to know him/her as someone who has a need for his/her presence. Thus viewed, a willingness of an educator is also seen as a precondition for the pedagogical relationship of knowing. Hence, a willingness to venture makes this relationship of knowing possible but, as has appeared earlier, a child's need for support makes a willingness to venture possible.

The above discussion is summarized as follows: It is a pedagogical relationship of knowing which makes a willingness to venture possible which, in its turn, has a child's

need for support as a precondition, but a willingness to venture makes a pedagogic relationship of knowing possible which, in its turn cannot be possible and meaningful without childlike need for support.

In the light of this diversity of perspectives, in all respects, a child's need for support remains the fundamental condition for venturing-with-the-other, which again makes a relationship of knowing possible and, thus, refers to childlike need for support.

In addition, it is because a child experiences his/her own need for support that he/she feels compelled to place him/herself under the *authority* of an educator. Thus, it is his/her need for support which impels him/her to submit to authority but, on the other hand, the exercise of authority is only meaningful and possible where a child in need of support is ready to venture with an educator.

Also, as illuminated from a *relationship of authority*, venturing-with-the-other points in both directions to childlike need for support.

3. *Gratitude-for-pedagogical-security*

Because a child experiences his/her own need for support, he/she experiences insecurity in his/her wanting-to-be-someone-him/herself (Oberholzer). He/she fully realizes that he/she cannot yet stand independently under his/her own authority and that he/she is radically and inexorably dependent on an educator as carrier of authority to whom he/she entrusts him/herself. Therefore, he/she turns to an adult for a secure space, dwelling, or foothold from which he/she can explore so that he/she meaningfully ventures into his/her own future to be able to design his/her own life space. An adult who sees and understands this need of a child can do nothing other than create such a life space as one of experienced security where he/she can experience emotional security which is of undeniable significance for his/her becoming (Sonnekus). As a *person*, a child can only be grateful for the security which he/she can experience by and with an adult. Indeed, he/she also shows his/her real gratitude through the esteem, respect, and regard which he/she shows in associating with an adult.

Who is sincerely grateful will never misuse what he/she is thankful for and the one to whom he/she owes thanks. Thus, a grateful child is prepared to only use the secure space as a matter to overcome his/her own need for support. Therefore, he/she is then also ready to him/herself contribute to realizing the pedagogical structures in his/her life. In other words: "Gratitude, especially gratitude for security, leads to the personal initiative of the child and, in turn, this leads to a willingness to and a thriving of giving meaning which includes a thriving and giving meaning to becoming adult" (Landman).

From the above discussion, a child, because of his/her need for support, is grateful for security. Indeed, if a child were not in need of support, he/she would not need to be grateful for being in a space where he/she needs not be to find him/herself. Besides, such an authority space would rather result in restraining his/her striving to be someone him/herself, and this would be the result of being ungrateful. But now, a child *does* need support and, therefore, he/she *is* also *grateful* for the support given to overcome this need.

If, despite his/her experience of security, a child nevertheless remains ungrateful, then educating would not be possible with him/her. It is out of gratitude that a child contributes to realizing the pedagogical structures. Thus, illuminated from another perspective, as in the previous chapter, a child's need for support seems to be a precondition for realizing the pedagogical structures. In this way, childlike need for support throws additional light on an educative event.

4. Responsibility-for-educative-relationships

If an adult and a child do not need to be held responsible for the quality of the relationships which spring from their being together, then their encountering being together cannot qualify as a pedagogical situation. In this view, responsibility-for-relationships is seen as a precondition for a pedagogic situation.

Now the question is for what relationships must the partners in the pedagogical situation be responsible before there can be an educative situation. The answer is obvious: the responsibility must be of such a nature that the pedagogical relationship structures can be realized and this can occur only if an adult assumes an educative attitude. In other words, this is an attitude of mercy toward a child, thus a sympathetic relationship in which a child is regarded as a human being. In such a relationship, a child must also be grateful, and an adult, as educator under whose authority he/she willingly places him/herself, must be respectful. Such an educative relationship necessarily must be intimate (not merely familiar) so that both partners can open themselves for a knowing encounter without fear of betrayal.

In connection with the previous chapter, where an analysis is made, the pedagogical relationship structures and their real essences, here it also can be concluded that it is childlike need for support which addresses both partners in a pedagogical situation for the proper establishment of the educative relationship structures. In other words, it is because both partners in a pedagogic situation are held responsible for the quality of their relationship of encounter, which makes educating possible and which addresses both for such a relationship, is childlike need for support. Consequently, from this perspective, childlike need for support throws additional light on a pedagogic situation such that it can be continually seen more clearly.

5. Acting-in-faith

Human activities are characterized by the fact that they are carried out in and through faith. Faith is an exclusively human phenomenon which is given directly and cannot be thought away; without it, human existence is not meaningful. Ultimately, all human activities rest on direct personal certainties which one accepts as true, even though they arguably cannot be confirmed. Even a researcher in the exact natural sciences is compelled to accept axioms on which he/she constructs his/her science. This is also the case in the human sciences where it is accepted that not everything can be explained by reasoning alone and faith has an important place. Thus, faith must also be viewed as that which makes educating possible. Indeed, it is through faith that one person turns him/herself to another to receive as well as to give support. Thus, it must be viewed as a fundamental category of human existence with pedagogical significance.

Educating is only possible where adults and children communicate in encountering each other. Associating, which proceeds to a pedagogical encounter is only meaningful where there is faith. It has been shown repeatedly that a pedagogic situation cannot appear without the relationship of trust, but a Christian has need for more, i.e., faith in God. Augustine has indicated that he must believe that God, irrespective of an educator's human weaknesses, will speak through him/her to a child and that his/her educative work will thereby eventually succeed. Such a faith embraces accepting trust but, indeed, reaches much deeper so that, in this regard, there can be trust in God and, finally, a belief in the anticipated educative intervention, as an act of faith. Also, a child is only able to turn to an adult if he/she *believes* he/she will accept him/her so that he/she can be supported to overcome his/her need for support. In other words, faith makes his/her venturing-with-the-adult possible. Thus, the partners in a pedagogical situation must be seen as partners in religion where educative activities acquire a deeper and more exalted significance. It is his/her faith which compels him/her to make a commitment to a child in need of support because he/she clearly knows that, ultimately, he/she is also the one addressed and that, thus, he/she is responsible for the relationships he/she creates with a child.

Finally, it also is indicated that a purely Christian religious faith is not inconsistent with science. Thus, Brunner indicates that only faith, and not science, can vouch that Jesus of Nazareth is Christ, but there is nothing said in this pronouncement of faith which is in contradiction with science. Einstein goes even further and asserts that: "Science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind."

Because faith is so fundamental in all interhuman activities, and includes a wealth of pedagogical significance, in the next section attention is given to a particular religious conviction, i.e., the Christian-Protestant, so that an educative event can be viewed from this perspective with the aim of a Christian educator *post-scientifically* applying these [religious] insights.

6. *Post-scientific*

After a scientific penetration of the phenomenon of educating, it has come to light that the anthropological category of co-existence and the pedagogical categories emerging from it illuminate the need for support of a child as a person who searches for co-existentiality. In the following, the Bible is consulted to see if, in this way, any light is shed on these categories and, if this is the case, a Christian believer fruitfully can and must post-scientifically apply his/her scientific findings in real educative situations so that he/she can fulfill his/her calling with ardor and inspiration. Here only a few representative examples can suffice to illuminate the categories in their contents from The Light.

A clear example of co-existentiality (being-with) between father and son, out of which a relationship of addressing-listening clearly emerges, as well as venturing-with-the-other, gratitude-for-security and responsibility-for-relationships is found in Gen. 22:6-9 where Abraham is going to offer his son Isaac. The manner of address "my father", "my son" immediately affects one. Out of this manner of addressing speaks the profound and

intimate relationship between father and son out of which the readiness of each to accept the other appears. In addition, this points to the obedience of both partners in the situation where both are being addressed. Abraham listens to the instructions from God while Isaac shows obedience to his father. The being-with of both partners is touchingly emphasized twice with the same words: “so they went both of them together” (Gen. 22:6;8). This points to an our-space where mutual trust has proceeded in faith.

The believing educator knows that God’s co-existence with him/her guarantees a space of security in which he/she can venture with the other under all circumstances without any fear (see, e.g., Gen. 28:15; Deut. 20:1; Ps. 73:28; Is. 43:2; Matt. 28:20; Joh. 15 and Jas. 4:8). He/she also knows that he/she must construct a safe space for the children with him and that he/she will be held responsible for the quality of the relationships which flow from this. The believer is aware that he/she is addressed, that God has directed an appeal to him/her to educate children with sympathetic authoritative guidance which must be firm but occur in love (see, e.g., Deut. 4:9, 6:7, 31:13; Prov. 13:24, 19:18, 22:6 and 15; Is. 28:9; Cor. 12:14; Eph. 6:4; I Tim. 3:4). On the other hand, God requires of the children that they respect in obedience old people and especially their parents (thus educators) (Exod. 20:12; Lev. 19:3; Deut. 27:16; Prov. 30:17; Matt. 15:4; Prov. 1:8; 6:20; Eph. 6:1; Col. 3:20).

Because the Bible also throws light on the anthropological category of co-existentiality and the pedagogical categories stemming from it, and thus also on a child’s need for support, each Christian believer has the obligation to realize the pedagogical structures by implementing this category in the pedagogical situation. He/she can only do this by educating, as a person with firm principles and convictions. Neutral educating is not possible.

4.4 Essences of temporality

1. Temporality

It is an indisputable fact that a human being never finds his/her world to be complete (Oberholzer). In essence, he/she is future directed, he/she continually makes designs for the future so that he/she can meaningfully shape and master his/her world. To be able to do this, he/she is dependent on his/her past because he/she builds on it. Thus viewed, his/her future designs codetermine his/her present situation because, in setting his/her aims by which he/she projects him/herself into the future, he/she can clarify and change his/her present situation. In other words, the subject [i.e., he/she] can only be futurity (prospective) in so far as he/she has been, because both past and future are determinants of his/her being situated in the present. A human being’s boundness to time is expressed as follows by Koetze: “Today is born out of yesterday and tomorrow will be born out of today. A human being looks back to the past as a key to the present because the present is the past as it is now being lived.”

Because temporality characterizes the essence of being human in this reality, this means that his/her life is pressing and compelling. He/she lives between two poles—birth and death. With each moment, his/her past becomes longer and his/her end comes nearer.

Therefore, a child cannot be left to him/herself to reach his/her destination (adulthood). Time is too precious, and this makes him/her even more in need of support which makes his/her appeal for support particularly urgent.

Flowing from temporality, as an anthropological category, are real essences with pedagogical significance, thus, pedagogical categories which are now discussed.

2. *Hope-for-future-adulthood*

A person lives out of his/her past but he/she is more than this. He/she is also futurity and, thus, his/her life is characterized as a task: he/she hopes for the future with the aim of realizing it.

Childlike being is characterized as a short past and a long future, but a child cannot independently design a future. In addition to venturing-with-the-other, he/she must also continually venture into his/her own future. If he/she now has confidence that an adult has accepted him/her as a fellow sufferer and ally, he/she will have the courage to venture with him/her in full trust into the future (Oberholzer).

A child's hope for the future is dependent on his/her past. He/she looks back in his/her life and finds that there are things which now seem to be improper to him/her, but he/she also knows that with pedagogical support he/she will be able to change these situations for the future. He/she is progressively able to find fault with his/her own past and can redesign situations through the encountering support given by an adult which not only involves pedagogic intervention but also pedagogic assent so that he/she progressively gives evidence of a normed futurity. Thus viewed, giving support is always future directed and has supported his/her hope for the future. Indeed, an educator helps to also meet the childlike need for support halfway so that a child him/herself can design a future via the form systems of the culture within his/her reach (Van der Stoep).

From the above discussion, it seems that a child has a need for support because he/she is directed to the future. Indeed, if this were not the case, giving support would have expressed the greatest absurdity (Oberholzer). Therefore, hope-for-the-future must be seen as a precondition for giving support; in other words, hope-for-the-future is only possible when relationships of trust, understanding and authority are present. For future-hope a child must trust his/her support giver, and through hope, he/she is able to trust more, and this makes *relationships of knowing* and *authority* possible (see earlier chapter). In other words, a child's futurity necessitates giving support, and giving support calls forth giving educative support as a response to a child's need for support. An educator provides support by realizing the fundamental pedagogical structures. Seen from this perspective, hope-for-the-future throws additional light on the pedagogical ground category of childlike need for support such that it can be understood better.

3. *Designing-possibilities-for-adulthood*

Because of his/her openness, a child is possibility, but for its realization, he/she is dependent on an adult providing support. However, individual self-realization is not a process of nature which must necessarily take a particular course until being fully grown is reached. This requires personally conscious decisions by a child, although he/she is

not always aware of them (Dienelt). This implies that a child must him/herself increasingly and progressively take up his/her thrownness so that his/her given potentialities can become chosen possibilities. This is because an adult knows that a child is gradually compelled, with support, to accept the task of designing his/her own potentialities so that he/she also can be someone.

An adult, who is aware of this childlike task acceptance, must then also give him/her an opportunity to become that someone he/she is “destined” to be, by supporting him/her pedagogically.

As one being addressed, a child increasingly becomes responsible for allowing his/her positive potentialities to fully flourish, and for this, it is necessary that his/her encountering association with an adult must be a *relationship of trust* so that he/she can be pedagogically supported in his/her task-of-designing-possibilities. In addition, such support giving also requires a *relationship of knowing* within which what he/she “can” and “ought” can be clarified, and the proper or normative can only be assimilated with understanding via sympathetic *authoritative guidance*.

The pedagogical relationship structures, which have no existential sense in themselves without the childlike need for support, must thus be viewed as preconditions for the task of designing possibilities, and it is just these possibilities which make giving pedagogical support possible. Indeed, whoever has no possibilities which must be realized also cannot have any need for support in realizing what is not there to realize! Thus viewed, the task-of-designing-possibilities, as a real essence of the anthropological category of temporality, sheds additional light on childlike need for support such that it must acquire even greater value as a pedagogical category.

4. *Gradual-fulfillment-of-destination*

In the two previous sections, hope-for-the-future and task-of-designing-possibilities are dealt with. In this section, there is a brief consideration of the fulfillment of that which is hoped for and, thus, also with the fulfillment of a child’s task so that it can be determined whether this also throws light on a child’s need for support.

Fulfillment-of-destination is not attained in a specific moment but is an event which must have a course in time. By an adult providing him/her support, a child progressively acquires an understanding of how he/she should properly fulfill him/herself to be regarded as a [an adult] person. This occurs by means of a continual elevation in dialogue with values in a field of tension (Landman). This is a tension between what *is* and what *ought* to be. This is properly fulfilled when the aim structures figure forth in his/her life (see aim structures in the previous chapter), although he/she can never completely realize them in his/her lifetime. Hence, his/her life must be always viewed as a striving for a complete fulfillment of his/her destination. Indeed, the essence of being human must not be seen in the attainment of what he/she hopes for but in his/her *striving* to realize his/her future hopes. Therefore, it is correctly asserted that a human being *is* not, but that he/she lives (Ortega). (Living implies becoming while *is* refers to a completeness which excludes the possibility of becoming).

Most importantly, however, is that child being includes the possibility of independent becoming, i.e., that at a certain time he/she can independently strive for what is proper without the support of an adult. In other words: because a child is not yet what he/she ought to be, he/she has need for pedagogical support so that he/she will remain meaningfully directed to his/her eventual self-responsible, self-determination where his/her need for support becomes something of the past. From this, the possibility of educating disappears with the fulfillment of his/her destination (adulthood). That is, when a child is no longer in need of support, then there can no longer be pedagogic interference. Then he/she no longer has need for an adult with whom he/she must enter pedagogical relationships of trust, understanding and authority. Hence, there is no longer an appeal directed that the pedagogical structures must be realized.

Also, from the perspective of this real essence of temporality, additional light is thrown on childlike need for support such that it is more clearly illuminated as a pedagogical ground category.

However, fulfillment-of-destination also refers to something much more than merely reaching an earthly destination. Indeed, a person's eventual earthly destination ends in his/her death, but because he/she is a human being, he/she is able to escape the imprisonment of his/her situation to enter a reality outside of and above him/her. Through his/her being human, he/she also remains the possibility to even transcend death to the Transcendent, the Kingdom of God.

Also, for the fulfillment of his/her human being-there, a child is committed to an adult providing support. The following section attends to this aspect of a child's need for support.

5. Post-scientific

After a scientific penetration of temporality and its real essences which typify a human way of being in the world, an educator also ought to be able to apply his/her pedagogical knowledge in practice. In this way, he//she will better fulfill his/her educative task. He/she will then be able to better understand a child's need for support because he/she knows that a child's need is pressing in that the time for fulfilling his/her destination is not unlimited. This knowledge will compel him/her into a genuine engagement such that he/she will not let any opportunity pass to provide pedagogical support.

The believing educator who has thought about a person's being temporally bound here on earth will *now* listen to the message of the Bible to better understand the voice of God so that he/she also can support a child in this regard. "Behold, now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation" (2Cor. 6:2). "Today if ye will hear his voice" (Ps. 95:7).

The notion of death as the endpoint on earth does not deprive a believing educator of his/her hope for the future. Indeed, it is just in this that he/she finds the hope by which he/sshe can inspire a child in need of support so that he/she can enter into the future with security "... while I believe all things which are written in the law and in the prophets:

And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust” (Acts. 24:14-15) “... to hold on to the hope that lies ahead; and which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast...” (Heb. 6:18-19) (Also see Prov. 14:32; Col. 1:5; Tit. 2:13). Further, each Christian believer also knows that he/she must be ready to answer for each hope which is in him/her (1Pet. 3:15), thus, also for a child and that he/she becomes purified by his/her hope in Christ (1Joh. 3:3). Therefore, such a responsible task rests on the shoulders of a believing Christian educator; he/she must support a child to the genuine hope which is there in Jesus Christ. If he/she is not able to do this, a child will remain in need of support because a future hope, which ends with death, is no real hope for the future. In such a case, a child is still extremely insecure and, thus, remains in search of support and what this category verbalizes remains unrealized.

Hope for the hereafter does not mean that a Christian educator will give up all earthly hope and, thus, also will neglect to help a child conquer an earthly foothold. Indeed, he/she knows from the Word of God that there is first an earthly task to fulfill before he/she can enjoy heavenly peace. Therefore, he/she will attend to his/her obligation to support a child such that he/she also can perform his/her worldly task to the best of his/her abilities, knowing that this also has eternal meaning. “For unto whomever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more” (Luk. 12:48). (Also see Matt. 25:20-26; Mark. 14:8).

In summary, it can be concluded that the anthropological category of temporality is clearly illuminated in the Bible by which a child’s need for support, as well as the task of a Christian educator, become clearer. This compels an educator, who also is a Christian believer, to immediately apply the results of his/her scientific reflections in each educative situation. Only then will his/her giving support be meaningful.

4.5 Essences of being-someone-oneself

1. Being-someone-oneself

Each person is a particular person, i.e., he/she is different from all other persons who have lived before him/her, now still live, or will ever live. Even “identical” twins are not identical, each is his/her own person with his/her own conscience (Langeveld) who must be given the chance to become him/herself, to increasingly acquire his/her own being a person. Thus, it is also one of the most fundamental and most primary purposes of each child to him/herself become grown up (Van der Stoep).

As is shown from the pedagogical essence “task-of-designing-possibilities”, a child *will* not only be him/herself, but he/she *must* also be him/herself, based on his/her being-called-upon as a person, and which he/she must answer as a responsible being. However, a child is not solely responsible for his/her being-someone-him/herself because he/she cannot do this independently. As one in need of support, he/she is dependent on an adult and can only be held co-responsible for his/her own becoming.

For actualizing that which is verbalized by being-someone-oneself as a fundamental anthropological category, a child is in need of support, and his/her being-someone-him/herself cannot take form outside of the pedagogical. In this fundamental anthropological fact of being-someone-oneself lies the possibility of educating, as well as the real essences which stem from it, as having pedagogical significance, thus, pedagogical categories.

2. Increasing-respect-for-human-dignity

Because a human being as person has no equivalent and cannot purchase his/her intrinsically possessed worth with money, he/she is dignity (Kant). Also, a child must be respected as a person and, therefore, also be helped to arrive at the idea of his/her own *dignity*.

An adult who trustingly accepts a child as he/she is with the aim of standing with him/her on his/her way to adulthood, not only acknowledges, in this way, that he/she has respect for a person becoming adult, but to thus also support him/her to discover and recognize his/her own dignity which is given with his/her being a person. Such giving support also requires that an adult understand everything which being a child involves. If the child-being of a child is not understood, then it can become confused with childishness or non-adulthood, in which case a child cannot be respected as a bearer of dignity and, at most, can be considered as an inappropriate person. However, an adult who takes a child's need for support into account, thus, who has knowledge of the childlikeness of a child, and of the pedagogical aim structure, will be able to enter a genuine relationship of knowing with him/her where he/she can be helped to discover his/her own dignity.

In addition to trusting and knowing relationships, which also presume knowledge of the aim structure, support to have respect for his/her own dignity requires a relationship of authority. "Respect for the child's dignity is respect for the fact that he is an addressed being and, thus, progressively, with authoritative educative guidance, must say 'yes' to life as a normative-norming matter" (Landman). Such authoritative educative guidance would be unnecessary if a child could independently give a meaningful answer to the demands of life norms. Thus, here childlike need for support must also be posited as a precondition.

In summary, to be able to support a child to respect his/her own dignity, the pedagogical relationship and aim structures must first be called into being. Earlier it appears that a child's need for support is what makes these fundamental pedagogical structures possible. Now it has come to light once again that it is his/her need for support which makes an adult not consider a child as an inadequate being, but that he/she respects him/her as a becoming person and, in this light, he/she supports a child to have respect for his/her own dignity.

To be able to realize all that is verbalized, the pedagogical structures are mutually dependent on each other, with a child's need for support as the interconnecting power which strengthens their coherence. The pedagogical category "respect-for-dignity" refers, in a variety of ways, to this factor which is common to the pedagogical structures

and which not only unifies them, but also lies at their foundation. Hence, from the perspective of “respect-for-dignity”, additional light is thrown on further clarifying a child’s need for support as a pedagogical ground category.

3. Adulthood-through-increased-self-understanding

Genuine self-understanding includes a person knowing that he/she is addressed by life. With such understanding, Kant’s fundamental question, “what must I do to be considered a person”, becomes meaningful and the task included in it becomes clearer, i.e., it is a person’s first obligation to him/herself to arrive at moral self-knowledge. However, this is knowledge which cannot be acquired by a child overnight but requires the thorough and continual support of an adult. This is support which can only be given if an adult is ready to enter relationships of trust, understanding and authority with a child until he/she reaches his/her destination, and an adult then becomes superfluous as an educator. An adult who opens him/herself for such a relationship with a child will also be able to support him/her to understand the value judgments which are expressed about him/her so that these judgments progressively become embodied in his/her life. Such knowledge is possible because, after a value judgment by an adult, he/she can see for him/herself, in the light of what has occurred.

A further obligation a child has toward him/herself is to understand his/her talents and to make them serviceable so that he/she can treat him/herself with greater respect. As a child in need of support, he/she increasingly worries about him/herself. This implies that he/she must work on his/her becoming. A child must know what his/her positive potentialities are so that he/she can work on his/her task of designing his/her own possibilities so that he/she can properly fulfill his/her destination (adulthood). By him/herself, however, he/she is not able to arrive at genuine self-understanding, and he/she is dependent on an adult’s support for this. This support is given by realizing the fundamental pedagogical structures. Each of the pedagogical structures and their real essences are, therefore, conditions for giving support for self-understanding; and childlike need for support is a precondition for each of them (See previous chapter). Thus, in a variety of ways, a child’s need for support must be seen as a precondition for the emergence and course of the pedagogical event, and the quality of support given to fulfilling the task of self-knowledge is then also a co-determinant of the quality of the educative relationships (Landman).

From the above it has become clear that the task-to-self-understanding throws still more light on the childlike need for support so that it is more clearly seen as a pedagogical ground category and this essence of a child can be grasped even better. An adult is increasingly addressed by this and obliged to support a child pedagogically.

4. Conquering-freedom-to-responsibility

A child is born helpless and does not yet know how to use freedom. He/she is not born free to do what h/she wants, but free to progressively do what he/she ought to do to be regarded as a human being. His/her freedom obligates him/her to answer for him/herself his/her being addressed so that he/she can become. However, he/she cannot answer the demands of propriety without an adult. In other words, a child is possibility to freedom,

but is not yet free enough to be held responsible for his/her deeds and, therefore, must still be supported by an adult so that he/she progressively becomes able to carry and accept responsibility. By such educative support a child is accommodated in his/her need for support and, in this way, is gradually able to conquer his/her own world and, thus, become someone him/herself by gradually living the norm image of adulthood.

Freedom is closely related to responsibility because the one assumes the other. Indeed, if a person is not free to make choices him/herself or to answer his/her being addressed, then he/she also cannot be responsible for his/her deeds and, therefore, he/she cannot be considered a moral being. Freedom must thus also be posited as a strict condition for the possibility and availability of a moral life.

The anthropological categories of co-existentiality and temporality, as well as the pedagogical categories which spring from them are verbalizations of what must be viewed preconditions for a child's acquisition of freedom to responsibility, and only then can his/her being someone him/herself be possible. Thus, anthropologically founded pedagogical categories culminate in freedom to responsibility by which a child can realize his/her being someone him/herself. Because each of the mentioned pedagogical categories refers to and is called into being by a child's need for support, this need, via the other categories, must also be seen as a condition for a child's genuine being-someone-him/herself.

Viewed from all sides, there remains one indisputable fact, and that continually shows itself as that which calls up and makes meaningful all pedagogical interference. It is a child's need for support. Thus, freedom to responsibility, as the point of culmination of the pedagogical categories, also has an indirect (via the other categories) and a direct reference to childlike need for support so that this fact of being becomes continually clearer as a pedagogical ground structure.

5. Post-scientific

Also, here an educator, whose philosophy of life is founded on the Word of God, can do nothing else than apply the results of his/her reflections about pedagogics to practice.

The pedagogical category "task-to-self-understanding" has an obligatory character. Each person must understand his/her talents so that he/she can make them serviceable. Thus, a Christian educator is called to use his/her talents which he/she has built up through hard thought-work, in the service of fellow persons, thus also in the service of a child who urgently requires this because of his/her need for support. In doing so, an educator can give immediate support to children's need for support to fulfill their being-someone-themselves as children of God, by which each also will be ready to put his/her gifts in the service of others and, thus, also in the service of God. This is an imperative which clearly speaks from the Word of God. "As every man hath received the gift, *even so* minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God" (1 Pet. 4:10).

Already the pedagogical essences of the anthropological category being-someone-oneself refer to the fact that a child's self-fulfillment rests on the necessity of his/her being free to choose for him/herself, thus free to responsibility. A believer knows each person is addressed by God and that no one but him/herself will be called to accountability. "So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God" (Rom. 14:12; see also Deut. 24:16 and Job. 19:4).

With this knowledge a believing Christian educator will not miss any chance to support a child in also learning to know and carry his/her responsibilities so that he/she can reach his/her destination on earth, as well as his/her eternal and true destination.

4.6 Summary

After penetrating the anthropological categories co-existentiality, temporality and being-someone-oneself, which are founded in the universal life reality as background, as well as the pedagogical categories which spring from them, the following conclusion is reached: The pedagogical categories are called into being by childlike need for support, but they themselves must also be viewed as preconditions for the pedagogical structures, as they have appeared in chapter 3, which have no right to exist without childlike need for support. Thus, the categories discussed in the present chapter throw light from a variety of sides on childlike need for support such that it must necessarily be viewed as a fundamental pedagogical category.

Also looked at from the Bible, a person is called to give embodiment to that which is verbalized by the pedagogical categories. Hence, this refers to childlike need for support and calls to a Christian believer to pedagogically support the children.