CHAPTER IV

RETROSPECT

In the introduction to chapter I it is shown that there is a close connection between the autonomy of pedagogics and the means that are used in thinking pedagogically. In addition, it is shown that all sciences are life world sciences because each reflects on the life world in terms of means of thinking that are found there.

Although there are life world sciences that implement the same life world categories, because of their **autonomous questioning** of the life world, each science explicates and applies a category **in its own way.** Now it is possible to differentiate between those areas of science that describe and elucidate being-human-in-general, namely, philosophical anthropology and other areas of science that describe and elucidate being-human-in-particular, e.g., pedagogics. Thus there are:

(i) **general anthropological categories**, for example: being-in-the-world, being-with, temporality and being-someone-oneself and

(ii) **particular anthropological categories**, for example:
   a) Giving-meaning-on-one's-own responsibility.
   b) Breaking-away-from-homeostasis.
   c) Norm embodiment.
   d) Venturing-with-another.
   e) Gratitude-for-security.
   f) Responsibility-for-relationships.
   g) Hope-for-the-future.
   h) Designing-possibilities.
   i) Fulfilling-destination.
   j) Respect-for-own-dignity.
   k) Task-of-understanding-self.
   l) Freedom-to-responsibility.

By modifying the names of the above particular anthropological categories to include specific pedagogical contents, Landman, Roos and Kilian changed them to **purely pedagogical categories** in order to emphasize their pedagogical significance, for example:

1. Giving-meaning-with-**increasing**-responsibility.
2. **Gradually**-breaking-away-from-a-lack-of-exertion.
3. **Exemplifying**-and-**emulating**-norms.
4. Venturing-(risking)-with-each-other-**pedagogically**.
5. Being-grateful-for-**pedagogical**-security.
6. Being-responsible-for-**educative**-relationships.
7. Wanting-(hoping)-to-attain-future-**adulthood**.
8. Designing-possibilities-for-**adulthood**.
9. **Gradually**-fulfilling-destination (adulthood).
10. **Increasing**-respect-for-human-dignity.
11. Achieving-**adulthood**-through-**increasing**-self-understanding.
12. **Conquering**-responsible-freedom.

Since there is such a close connection between the autonomy of pedagogics [as a science] and the **means** used in thinking pedagogically it is important to know why contemporary Continental pedagogues such as Langeveld, Strasser, Bollnow, Derbolav, Loch and Klafki, as well as South African pedagogues such as Oberholzer, Landman, Van der Stoep, Gunter, Sonnekus, and Potgieter implement the concept "category" in their pedagogical thinking; to maintain its autonomy **pedagogics must itself be accountable for its means of thinking, thus for its categories**.

A particular problem in this regard is the grounding of these categories. It is clear in studying the relevant literature that pedagogical categories are grounded in life world categories known as anthropological categories. A question that immediately arises is whether or not there is an even more **fundamental category** that grounds the anthropological and thus also the pedagogical categories. The thinking of various South African pedagogicians such as Oberholzer, Landman, Gunter, Van der Stoep, Sonnekus, Kilian, Viljoen, Gous, Van Zyl, Potgieter and Kotze concerns this question and, for the most part, they refer to this fundamental category as **being-in-the-world**.

However, the above-mentioned pedagogicians are not merely concerned with implementing the term "category" but also with a scientifically accountable concern about the essence and meaning of

categories. The word “category”, which means **fundamental pronouncement**, brings to light an essential characteristic of a matter; it immediately brings the scientist to the present matter itself. To disclose the essentials and meaningfulness of a matter demands means of explication, thus illuminative means of thinking (categories) since categories express the essence of a being.

A question that now can be asked directly is how such disclosing and describing of fundamental structures and their real essences are possible. Landman replies that this is possible because a scientist **is-in-the-world** and therefore he designs [designates] this being-in-the-world as the first category, or fundamental category or ontological category of reality.

The concept “design”, as disclosing, means that things, thus also categories, are brought to light. This making present, this bringing to light places high demands on the scientist such as radically thinking-through, further reflecting on and explicating. These activities lead him to greater clarity and to a more adequate understanding of the real essentials of reality, and this is possible on the basis of his being-in-the-world.

Designing categories as receiving meaning is **taking** the essentially real of reality as it shows itself since reality is a carrier of and displayer of meaning. By this **receiving of meaning** the researcher brings things to **meaning and reality now becomes for him a reality of experienced meaning.**

Designing categories as giving meaning refers to the **attribution** of **meanings** and is preceded by experiencing meaning. Thus, giving and receiving meaning presuppose each other and now when there is talk of ‘designing’, both receiving and giving meaning are meant.

The phenomenological method is the only authentic method of designing categories since it is a scientific approach that is free of any obscuring biases, takes its point of departure in the person-world relationship and discloses the real essentials themselves. In addition, phenomenology is only meaningful as ontology since ontology, as a reflection on being, asks the question of the meaning of being and this refers to giving and receiving meaning, i.e.,

designing categories. In other words, this means the phenomenological method is applied because a phenomenological attunement rests on accepting the meaning-giving activities of persons and attempts to disclose this meaning. Landman describes phenomenological description as an essence-disclosing, meaning-structure unveiling and fundamental-structure disclosing reflection and all of this is possible because a scientist posits as his first precondition the ontological category of **being-in-the-world**.

The problem now is what the significance is of this ontological category (being-in-the-world) for pedagogical thinking, i.e., for an autonomous pedagogical perspective on life reality.

In the introduction to chapter II, as a closer essence-analysis of the category "being-in-the-world", the author states that he will attempt to bring greater clarity to the necessity for and the scientific meaning of this ontological category. By positing being-in-the-world as an ontological category it is acknowledged that a pedagogician is going to **let** the real essentiality and meaning of the educative reality **come to speech**. The concept, "come to speech", means to bring to light, clarify, illuminate, to make unconcealed, unveil, disclose and more. In other words, to bring to speech is an unveiling, opening and clarifying of the meaning- and being-structures [of something] as real essences.

The concept "letting-be" refers to a purposeful act of thinking by a scientist as a person and it is a precondition for bringing reality itself to speech. This demands that he banish and eliminate all indifference toward reality because it is always the scientist himself, because of his being-in-the-world, who reaches reality and lets it be seen as it essentially is. This also implies that nothing (non-anthropological obfuscations and particular anthropological conceptions) can be allowed to come between him and reality.

The ontological category of being-in-the-world is the only way in which "coming to speech" and "letting-be" can be realized because they are the juncture where reality as presence is illuminated. Being-in-the-world is an understanding-precondition for a human way of being and all of its distinguishable activities and this also implies that the real essences of being human and human activities

can be disclosed only because of his **presence-in-the-world**. This also holds true for his practicing science.

The concept "practicing science" is a particular way of acting (action) that is an essential mode of his original being-in-the-world. It is one of the ways in which he tries to find a course in the open world in which he finds himself because practicing science is a search for confidence in **how, when** and **why** certain activities are carried out. Also, where appreciating [valuing/evaluating] is part of the description of a phenomenon, i.e., when a scientist appreciates in order to differentiate and to specify his object of study, he is involved in realizing a function necessary for practicing science.

The concept "isolation" in this context refers to a mere being-there as if there is an unbridgeable gulf between a scientist and reality (world). Everything that can be reality-covering throws a cloth or a cover over the essences and meanings of reality and banishes a scientist from reality and hinders him in arriving at the real essentials that he searches for in his thinking. This means that scientific practice in isolation from reality leads to pure speculation by which nothing authentic regarding that life world can be disclosed.

The ontological category makes isolation impossible because being-in-the-world is an expression of a being-by-and-with-the-other, a being-directed-to and standing-open-for reality. The category being-in-the-world refers to a coherency, a co-bondage, a being interwoven of person and world. This means that being human is being-conscious-in-the-world, inhabiting the world, being-acquainted-with-the-world. Thus, isolation is impossible since whoever says human being means world-involvement and whoever speaks of world immediately presumes human being. This also holds for a scientist in his practice of science since his being-in-the-world is the first precondition for him to take a scientific initiative, thus in scientifically accountable ways to try to reach and verbalize real essences and their meaning. Hence, without this world-experiencing life, the practice of science as the search for real essences and their meaning is unthinkable since everything a scientist is and does, he does by being involved and this involvement is not possible if his being-in-the-world is negated. In

summary, this fact of being that the world is saturated with humanness and a person is permeated with world makes possible:

(i) scientific practice as a particular way of being [human] as a scientist,
(ii) finding the fundamentals, as the essential and meaningful, because the scientist's disclosing, uncovering, illuminating and unconcealing [activities] as well as all further thinking, describing and interpreting are **grounded** in the foundation of **being-in-life-reality**.

For pedagogical thinking **being-in-the-world**, as the first and original [primordial] attunement of being a person, means that a pedagogician can radically penetrate and think through the educative reality itself that is embedded in the universal life reality in order to disclose what is essential for its appearance and existence. Also, it is meaningful for a pedagogician to state the contradictories [of his categories]; e.g., a contradictory of being-in-the-world is being-**opposite**-the-world. The pedagogical **meaninglessness** of this contradiction is that a pedagogical event then is impossible because it shows itself as an involvement of a not-yet adult with an adult in **dialogue with a world**. The contradiction 'being-opposite-the-world' thus has no right of existence since being-**in**-the-world is a **fundamental category**, thus a fundamental precondition from which all further thinking regarding the humanness of persons is affirmed and made possible.

The concept "further thinking" implies that there is already thought, i.e., there is a precondition for being **able** to think and to be able to think **further**. This precondition for all thought-work is a scientist's **being-in-the-world**. From this ontological category further describing and interpreting as well as designing categories and criteria are now possible. That is, further thinking is a **thinking search for essences and essences of essences** and this penetrating investigation makes visible and graspable **particular ways of being-in-the-world** that a scientist is going to use as categories in his thinking-work. Hence, further thinking is **categorical thinking** and such thinking has as a precondition a pedagogician's being-in-the-world.

The transition ontological-anthropological: In order to now unveil, grasp and verbalize the essential possibilities and meaning of being human a scientist must implement **anthropological** categories that are constitutive of **human** being-in-the-world. These anthropological categories are grounded in life reality itself and thus are real essences of the **ontological category**. This means that the ontological category is a precondition for the first step of thinking and the anthropological categories are the second precondition for further thinking about being human, human activities and their meaning.

Dasein-in-general to Dasein-in-particular: Dasein, existence, intentionality as world-experiencing living are all synonymous concepts for verbalizing, understanding and interpreting being human as being-**in**-the-world. Dasein-in-general makes understanding Dasein-in-particular possible. That is, only after Dasein-in-general is determined and verbalized as a category can there be a transition to categories that describe Dasein-in-particular. The fundamental category of being-in-the-world attests that a human being is world-relationship and each of the other categories that verbalizes Dasein-in-particular and that have their origin in this category are categories with ontological status.

The conceptual group "ontological-anthropological-pedagogical": As soon as a person is a child as one involved in communicating with reality, the pedagogical arises. Among the variety of human events as modes of being-in-the-world, the pedagogical event appears as a **particular inter-human relation**, as a normative event that **is given with being human**. Through reflective thinking that wants to ground, thus understand the fundamental structures of the pedagogical event, thus the essence of a child's being-in-education, must be illuminated and this occurs in terms of pedagogical categories. Pedagogical categories are particular anthropological categories with ontological status because they verbalize the reality of educating that is embedded in the universal life reality itself in its real essentiality and meaning.

In the introduction to chapter III, as a further exploration of the category "being-in-the-world", it is shown that this category is

fundamental for further thinking, out of which clarity flourishes and by which real essences and their meaning can be categorically expressed. In other words, being-in-the-world is a precondition for logos and it is logos that brings to light real essences so they can be **addressed, discussed** and **penetrated.**

Here the author tries to carry out yet a further exploration of the category "being-in-the-world" and its implication for pedagogical thinking from a Cogito-, Volo- and Ago-perspective. The existing scientist-as-**Cogito** (cogito means thinking, reflecting on, **properly** thinking-through) is able to think scientifically because he is in-the-world, i.e., he is concerned with and committed to reality itself. Thus, a scientific being-conscious is a being-conscious-of-being, hence a being-conscious of being-in-the-world and this makes the world (reality) **real** and **understandable**. Consequently, being-in-the-world makes "Cogito" possible as a reflecting on and thinking-through of reality in its real essentiality.

A scientist-as-cogito [I think] is an immediate presence to a present reality and this requires being-in-the-world; a scientist gives recognition to this fact by positing being-in-the-world as his fundamental category. This means that a "Cogito" as such does not exist but only exists as **Cogito-in-the-world** and therefore a scientist in thinking discloses sense- and meaning-structures as they indeed are manifested in reality. These thinking activities of a scientist are not blind because the **lumen naturale** that a scientist-as-Cogito himself is brings to light a matter itself as it really essentially is.

Implications for pedagogical thinking: A pedagogician-as-Cogito is immediate presence to an educative reality and as intentional directedness to an educative event he can illuminate pedagogical being-structures in their real essentiality and meaning. This means that a pedagogician **encounters** the reality of educating, thus affirms it and hence he is able to formulate further scientific judgments about it.

The existing scientist-as-"Volo" [I will], as an **affective way of being-in-the-world**, is able to **experience** what has appeared to his knowing consciousness (see Cogito) as really essential, necessary

and meaningful. This experiencing as phenomenological lived experiencing of real essences and meaning is possible because a scientist is in-the-world-as-**Volo**. That is, a scientist as Dasein is continually attuned and this attunement opens to him his scientific position in reality from which he directs himself as scientist-in-totality and makes a scientific understanding of reality possible. Without this phenomenological experiencing the life world is not scientifically graspable and thinkable in an authentic way. Hence, a scientist as a subject is not merely a **lumen naturale** but also essentially a **desiderium naturale**.

The affective and the appreciative presume each other and whoever rejects a scientist-as-**Volo** can experience no **meaning**, no **value**, thus not acknowledge [affirm]. A scientist-as-**Volo** is involvement through values and therefore in the first place it is possible that he can design criteria and in the second place by implementing criteria he can critically penetrate reality. Thus, being-in-the-world is a precondition for designing criteria. In addition, affirmation of meaning is not an exclusively cognitive agreeing with reality but also means agreeing on an affective level; thus, a "yes" to reality is a "yes" to oneself.

Implications for pedagogical thinking: A pedagogical situation, as a particular life world, is then also a potential experiential world, an experienced educative situation for a pedagogician. In other words, a pedagogical situation with all of its fundamental pedagogical structures is not only cognitively fathomed but is also illuminated as able to be experienced by a scientist-as-**Volo**. In his search for fundamental pedagogical structures, a pedagogician-as-Volo eventually experiences the possibility and necessity of realizing these strucutes because if they are not realized an educative situation will not exist and educating will not be possible.

A pedagogican-as-**Volo** who wants to perform accountably will continually try to evaluate his educative activities and their proper realization in terms of pedagogical criteria. Illuminating pedagogical criteria is possible because a pedagogician-as-**Volo** is in the world cognitively and volitionally and because a pedagogical perspective is a phenomenological experiencing of particular evaluations.

The existing scientist as "**Ago**" [I act] is not only **in**-the-world but equiprimordially is **at**-the-world. Being-at-the-world refers to activity, to carrying out his scientific-task-in-the-world. In his activities of thinking a scientist reaches beyond his facticity and past, present and future form a unity and hence being-in-the-world becomes a can-be-in-the-world. This means that a scientist-as-**Ago** can, in thinking, fathom present situations in light of their beginnings (past situations) and also regarding their future meanings. In other words, the first category of reality, being-in-the-world, refers to the state of scientific thinking at a particular moment and also indicates that a scientist, on the basis of this state, can open additional perspectives.

Designing is a way of being-in-the-world and what additionally can be. These designs of a scientist cannot be possible if there is not a being-at-the-world, i.e., if a scientist does not know the historical background of the science he practices. His being-in-the-world makes all of these scientific activities possible because if he is not in-the-world he cannot design and continually try to bring new possibilities to light. The openness of a science is maintained on the basis of a scientist's being-in-the-world as a being-**at**-the-world.

Implications for pedagogical thinking: A pedagogician unveils and verbalizes not only what is 'already' disclosed by other pedagogicians but that by thinking he is continually in search of essences of essences of the educative event. This wondering about and admiring [of educating] by a pedagogician necessitate that he know the historical course of the emergence of the fundamental pedagogical structures so that, in light of the current situation, he can design new, improved pedagogical categories, criteria, relationship structures and methods by which a still more accountable grasp of the reality of educating can be acquired.

Representational realism is rejected by a pedagogician, who is a phenomenologist, because it is purported that reality can exist independently of being human and thus also a scientist. He acknowledges his scientific rejection of such a representational realism by positing the first category of reality because this

ontological category of being-in-the-world makes isolation between scientist and reality impossible.

For pedagogical thinking this realism means that a pedagogician is isolated from the reality of educating and thus is not able to illuminate its real essences and meaning. In addition, he will not be able to formulate scientific judgments regarding the reality of educating because this reality and its being-structures appear only in the one place where they are present and that is in the life world.

The world of which phenomenology speaks is the **real** world and therefore phenomenological realism views the world (reality) as the appearing being itself. Knowledge is now the **encounter** of scientist and worldly meaning and this is possible because he is **in**-and-**at**-the-world.

For pedagogical thinking, phenomenological realism means that a pedagogican is immediate presence to the appearing educative event as it is observable in educative situations in the universal life reality; therefore, he is able to unveil and describe in its essentiality and meaning an educative event as it **really** is, as a being that itself appears.

He who cannot say what he thinks does not really think. Speaking that uses reality-expressing words [speaking words] is using **living** words that **really** say something and affirm that reality. **A scientist who will say additional reality-expressing words about a particular reality with which he will involve himself must begin by using the first living scientific words, namely being-in-the-world, the first category of reality**, which is a precondition for his use of additional living words about reality. A speaking scientist and meaning form a unity of mutual or reciprocal implication because a scientist lives in the word and dwells in meaning; through the word, meaning is awakened and addresses him.

Implications for pedagogical thinking: By implementing pedagogical categories (words expressive of the reality of educating) a pedagogician is able to disclose and describe the reality of educating because these categories place the pedagogical essences and their

meaning in the present as they essentially are. By positing being-in-the-world as the first category of reality, a pedagogician acknowledges the first precondition for his understanding and actualization [of the reality of educating] and his scientific practice becomes meaningful.