CHAPTER FOUR

PEDAGOGICAL CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA[*]

S. G. Roos

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter the fundamental pedagogical structures
were disclosed and it clearly came to light that their realization is
only meaningful and possible because the child is in need of
support. In this chapter, a further analysis is made of the
pedagogical situation in order to reflectively search for additional
pedagogical essences. It must also be verified whether these
essences, in their turn, again refer back to the child's need for
support. If indeed this is the case then the 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 is in need of support is
necessarily deprived of its pedagogical significance.

The analysis mentioned here will be done in terms of particular
anthropological categories, thus in terms of fundamental concepts
or truisms that are only applicable to human beings. Categories
must be seen as particular verbalizations of life reality that express
the essentials or necessary characteristics of a certain aspect of it.
Thus viewed, categories are a form of reality that also is a form of
thinking and that can later be implemented as a yardstick 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 the scientist expresses in appropriate words the real
essences that have been laid bare or disclosed. In this way, it can be
correctly asserted that categories announce themselves. The
anthropological categories that are going to be applied here to shed
light on childlike need for support are: being-in-a-meaningful-world;
being-with (co-existing); temporality (futurity) and being someone.

---

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

Because a human being is a being who is involved in reality in terms of particular values and thus continually ventures with value judgments, there is also a search for the implications that the child's need for support holds for the educator when he applies the results of his theoretical reflections to practice. In other words, in this chapter there will also be reflection on the *post-scientific application* or applicability of the theoretically acquired insights where the educator in a real educative situation cannot and indeed has little power to distance himself from his philosophy of life. Indeed, there will be an examination of whether the results of his scientific reflections can serve as support or reinforcement for his philosophy of life. To be able to do this it will be 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 pedagogical structures can be enlivened so they can function in the life world and will allow the Christian educator to make his particular contribution to educating in a Christian-National context.

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

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

1. Introduction
The responsible educator is addressed by childlike need for support and he responds as a support giving being by realizing relationship and sequence structures with the child such that the aim structures gradually take form in his life (see chapter 1). To realize these structures the educator must act educatively in educative situations. Such educative help is possible and necessary because of the 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 has a *responsibility for the world* (aim structure). Now, however, it is the case that a child who is left to himself is not yet able to give an adequate response and therefore the understanding educator is compelled to support him in this. To help him carry out his *responsibility for the world*

the educator must first help the child *become acquainted with the world* by helping him to *give* proper *meaning* to it and the things in it, and even to *test* the *meanings* so that he can arrive at an adequate *world understanding* where his *horizon* is continually *broadened.* Proper *horizon broadening*, however, is only possible if the child is further helped to *experience* these *meanings* such that he can *identify with the propriety* they express and *live in accordance with them.* Such an *elevation in meaning* can only be possible for the child if he is helped to *look beyond* what is *merely worldly* so that deeper meanings become visible. If this is not done then the child very easily can fall into worldliness because he cannot see higher values and deeper meanings.

From the above it seems clear that the child needs someone to help him give-meaning-with-increasing-responsibility and this underlines the fact of childlike need for support in a pedagogical context.

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

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

4. *Exemplifying and emulating norms*

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

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

To now help a child *take a stand for a philosophy of life,* he must also be helped to *understand the norms* that underlie it because without this understanding he 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 can be helped to be obedient merely to human authority. Therefore, in practice giving particular contents through exemplifying and emulating norms is a post-scientific matter that is of cardinal importance for meaningfully and properly helping the child in his becoming.

5. *Post-scientific*

The Christian educator's philosophy of life addresses him to help the Covenant child with giving Christian meaning. He knows that there is but one overarching norm or yardstick in terms of which he can help the 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 the Christian educator must make the Covenant child familiar with the Bible from an early age on so that he can not merely understand it but understand it in such a way that it acquires life and urges him to want to live in accordance with it. To help the child make his life meaningful in this way, the educator's own life must show evidence of obedience to the Christian philosophy of life. Indeed, if the Christian educator does not make the Christian philosophy of life a living part of his own life then it will be extremely difficult for the child to see its deeper meaning and if he does not understand it, he 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 being-there 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 life can acquire sense and meaning. It is especially the child who, because of his need for support, asks for adults without which he cannot form himself as a person. The child has a need for a secure space in which he can dwell and that he can design as a unique life world for himself. This designing of 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 does not live it along with a supportive adult. Also, the adult's being-there means a being with the child in his need, as a fundamental structure of his being a child, a structure that can only be elevated to a fundamental structure when being-with the child includes the aim of elevating or giving support [to the child] 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 that must be complemented by the 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 particular pedagogical significance. Now the real pedagogical essences (thus, pedagogical categories) that 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*

The 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 that 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 the child is a being who increasingly has free will at his disposal, he withdraws himself from all devaluations of, knowing about and thus also precise predictions about him; this makes it necessary for the educator to venture with him. Also, for the child, this co-existing with the educator (that he trusts) requires a willingness venture because he also cannot predict the outcome of this encounter. The unpredictability of the other makes the encountering being-with a gamble and it therefore also requires courage. Although it requires courage to venture, the 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 confidently be ready to take the risk with the other.

From the previous chapter it is clear that it is childlike need for support that calls for the pedagogical structures to be realized. Thus viewed, the mutual readiness and willingness to venture within the framework of the pedagogical structures also refer to childlike need for support. Hence, from the relationship of trust, the possibility and necessity of a pedagogical 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 and open himself to be encountered; then the relationship of trust can never be realized. Consequently,

venturing-with-the-other must also be viewed as a precondition for the relationship of trust and, as appeared in the previous chapter, the child's need for support is a fundamental condition for this relationship. The child's need for support must be seen as a double precondition for realizing the relationship of trust that, 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 the educator to venture with the child is also seen in the fact that he has knowledge and understanding of the essence of the child's need for support. Even so, this is a knowing that in principle he is unknowable and unpredictable. The relationship of knowing also implies knowledge of the *destination* to which the child is on the way (aim structures). To venture with the educator requires that the child have knowledge of his own need for support as well as knowledge that this need can be overcome through the adult giving support. Thus, in reality it is childlike need for support that 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 into this with each other in the situation,

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

The above discussion is briefly summarized as follows: It is the pedagogical relationship of knowing that makes the willingness to venture possible which in its turn has the child's need for support as a precondition, but again, the willingness to venture makes the

pedagogic relationship of knowing possible which, in its turn cannot be possible and meaningful without childlike need for support.

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

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

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

3. Gratitude-for-pedagogical-security

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

Who is sincerely grateful will never misuse what he is thankful for and the one to whom he owes thanks. Thus, the grateful child is prepared to only use the secure space as a matter to overcome his

own need for support. Therefore he is then also ready to himself contribute to realizing the pedagogical structures in his life. In other words: "Gratitude, especially gratitude for security, leads to personal initiative of the child and in turn this leads to a willingness to and a thriving of giving meaning that includes a thriving and giving meaning to becoming adult" (Landman).

From the above discussion it has become clear that the child, because of his need for support, is grateful for security. Indeed, if the child were not in need of support then he would not need to be grateful for being in a space where he need not be in order to find himself. Besides, such an authority space would rather result in restraining his striving to be someone himself and this would the result of being ungrateful. But now the child *is* in need of support and therefore he *is* also *grateful* for the support given to overcome this need. If, in spite of his experience of security, the child nevertheless remains ungrateful, then educating would not be possible with him. It is out of gratitude that the child contributes to realizing the pedagogical structures. Thus, illuminated from another perspective, as in the previous chapter, the 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 the educative event.

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

Now the question is for what relationships must the partners in the pedagogical situation be responsible for before there can be mention of 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 the adult assumes an educative attitude. In other words, this is an attitude of mercy toward the child, thus a sympathetic relationship in which the child is regarded as a human being. In such a relationship the child must also be grateful and the adult, as

86

educator under whose authority he willingly places himself, must be respectful. Such an educative relationship necessarily must be intimate (not 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 of all of the pedagogical relationship structures and their real essences, here it also can be concluded that it is the childlike need for support that addresses both partners in the pedagogical situation for the proper establishment of the educative relationship structures. In other words, it is because both partners in the pedagogical situation are held responsible for the quality of their relationship of encounter that makes educating possible and that which addresses both for such a relationship is childlike need for support. Consequently, from this perspective, childlike need for support throws additional light on the pedagogical 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 that is given directly and cannot be thought away; without it human existence is not meaningful. Ultimately, all human activities rest on direct personal certainties that he 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 constructs his 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 himself to another in order to receive as well as to give support. Thus, it must be viewed as a fundamental category of human existence with particular pedagogical significance.

Educating is only possible where adults and children communicate in encountering each other. Associating that proceeds to a pedagogical encounter is only meaningful where there is faith. It has been shown repeatedly that the pedagogical situation cannot appear without the relationship of trust, but a Christian has need

for more, i.e., faith in God. Augustine has indicted that he must believe that God, in spite of the educator's human weaknesses, will speak through him to the child and that his 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 mention of trust in God and finally a belief in the anticipated educative intervention as an act of faith. Also the child is only able to turn to the adult if he *believes* he will accept him so that he can be supported in order to overcome his need for support. In other words, faith makes his venturing-with-the-adult possible. Thus, the partners in the pedagogical situation must be seen as partners in religion where the educative activities acquire a deeper and also more exalted significance. It is his faith that compels him to make a commitment to the child in need of support because he clearly knows that ultimately he is also the one addressed and that he thus is responsible for the relationships he creates with the child.

Finally, it must also be 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 that 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 inter-human 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 the educative event can be viewed from this perspective with the aim of the 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 the 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, the Christian believer fruitfully can and must post-scientifically apply his

scientific findings in real educative situations so that he can fulfill his calling with ardor and inspiration. Here only a few representative examples can suffice to illuminate the categories in their particular contents from The Light.

A clear example of co-existentiality (being-with) between father and son, out of which the 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 guarantees a space of security in which he 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 also knows that he must construct a safe space for the children with him and that he will be held responsible for the quality of the relationships that flow from this. The believer is aware that he is addressed, that God has directed an appeal to him to educate the children with sympathetic authoritative guidance that 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 the 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 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 world to be complete (Oberholzer). In essence, he is future directed, he continually makes designs for the future so that he can meaningfully shape and master his world. To be able to do this, he is dependent on his past because he builds on it. Thus viewed, his future designs codetermine his present situation because in setting his aims by which he projects himself into the future, he is in a position to clarify and change his present situation. In other words, the subject can only be futurity (prospective) in so far as he has been because both past and future are determinants of his being situated in the present. A human being's bound-ness 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 life is pressing and compelling. He lives between two poles—birth and death. With each moment, his past becomes longer and his end comes nearer. Therefore, a child cannot be left to himself to reach his destination (adulthood). Time is too precious and this makes him all the more in need of support that makes his appeal for support particularly urgent.

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

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

90

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

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

From the above discussion it seems that the child has a need for support because he is directed to the future. Indeed, if this were 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 the relationships of trust, understanding and authority are present. For future-hope the child must trust his support giver and through hope he is in a position to trust more and this makes the *relationships* of *knowing* and *authority* possible (see earlier chapter). In other words, the child's futurity necessitates giving support and giving support calls forth the giving of educative support as a response to the child's need for support. The 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 openness the child is possibility, but for its realization he is dependent on the adult providing support. However, individual self-realization is not a process of nature that must necessarily take a particular course until being fully grown is reached. This requires personally conscious decisions by the child, although he is not always aware of them (Dienelt). This implies that the child must himself increasingly and progressively take up his thrown-ness so that his given potentialities can become chosen possibilities. This is because the adult knows that the child is gradually compelled, with support, to accept the task of designing his own potentialities so that he also can be someone.

The adult who is aware of this childlike task acceptance must then also give him the opportunity to become that someone he is "destined" to be by supporting him pedagogically.

As one being addressed the child increasingly becomes responsible for allowing his positive potentialities to fully flourish and for this it is necessary that his encountering association with the adult must be a *relationship of trust* so that he can be pedagogically supported in his task-of-designing-possibilities. In addition, such support giving also requires a *relationship of knowing* within which what he "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, that 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 that make giving pedagogical support possible. Indeed, whoever has no possibilities that 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 were 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 the child's task so that it can be determined whether this also throws light on the child's need for support.

Fulfillment-of-destination is not attained in a specific moment but is an event that must have a course in time. By the adult providing him support, the child progressively acquires an understanding of how he should properly fulfill himself in order to be regarded as a 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 life (see aim structures in the previous chapter), although he can never completely realize them in his lifetime. Hence, his life must be always viewed as a striving for a complete fulfillment of his destination. Indeed, the essence of being human must not be seen in the attainment of what he hopes for but in his *striving* to realize his future hopes. Therefore, it is correctly asserted that a human being *is* not, but that he lives (Ortega). (Living implies becoming while *is* refers to a completeness that 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 can independently strive for what is proper without the support of an adult. In other words: because a child is not yet what he ought to be, he has need for pedagogical support so that he will remain meaningfully directed to his eventual self-responsible, self-determination where his need for support becomes something of the past. From this it is clear that the possibility of educating disappears with the fulfillment of his destination (adulthood). That is to say, when the child is no longer in need of support then there can no longer be mention of pedagogical interference. Then he no longer has need for an adult with which he must enter into 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 all the 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 death but because he is a human being he is able to escape the imprisonment of his situation in order to enter the reality outside of and above him. Through his being human he also remains the possibility to even transcend death to the Transcendent, the Kingdom of God.

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

5. Post-scientific

After a scientific penetration of temporality and of its real essences that typify a human way of being in the world, the educator also ought to be in a position to be able to apply his pedagogical knowledge in practice. In this way he will better fulfill his educative task. He will then be able to better understand the child's need for support because he knows that the child's need is pressing in that the time for fulfilling his destination is not unlimited. This knowledge will compel him into a genuine engagement such that he 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 also can support the 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 the believing educator of his hope for the future. Indeed, it is just in this that he finds the hope by which he can inspire the child in need of support so that he 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 must be ready to answer for each hope that is in him (1Pet. 3:15), thus also for the child and that he becomes purified by his hope in Christ (1Joh. 3:3). Therefore such a responsible task rests on the shoulders of the believing Christian educator; he must support the child to the genuine hope that is there in Jesus Christ. If he is not able to do this, the child will remain in need of support because a future hope that ends with death is no real hope for the future. In such a case, the 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 the Christian educator will give up all earthly hope and thus also will neglect to help the child conquer an earthly foothold. Indeed, he knows from the Word of God that there is first an earthly task to fulfill before he can enjoy heavenly peace. Therefore, he will attend to his obligation to support the child such that he also can perform his worldly task to the best of his 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 the child's need for support as well as the task of the Christian educator all become clearer. This compels the educator who also is a Christian believer to immediately apply the results of his scientific reflections in each particular educative situation. Only then will his giving support be meaningful.

4.5 Essences of being-someone-oneself

1. Being-someone-oneself
Each person is a particular person, i.e., he is different from all other persons who have lived before him, now still live, or will ever live.

Even "identical" twins are not identical, each is his own person with his own conscience (Langeveld) who must be given the chance to be able to become himself, to increasingly acquire his own being a person. Thus, it is also one of the most fundamental and most primary purposes of each child to himself become grown up (Van der Stoep).

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

For actualizing that which is verbalized by being-someone-oneself as a fundamental anthropological category, the child is in need of support and his being-someone-himself cannot take form outside of the pedagogical. In this fundamental anthropological fact of being-someone-oneself lies enclosed the possibility of educating as well as the real essences that 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 intrinsically possessed worth with money, he is dignity (Kant). Also, the child must be respected as a person and therefore also be helped to arrive at the idea of his own *dignity.*

The adult who trustingly accepts the child as he is with the aim of standing with him on his way to adulthood not only acknowledges in this way that has respect for the person becoming adult but to thus also support him to discover and recognize his own dignity that is given with his being a person. Such giving of support also requires that the adult understand everything that being a child involves. If the child-being of the child is not understood then it can become confused with childishness or non-adulthood in which case the child cannot be respected as a bearer of dignity and at most can be considered as an inappropriate person. However, the adult

who takes the child's need for support into account, thus who has knowledge of the child-likeness of the child and of the pedagogical aim structure, will be able to enter into a genuine relationship of knowing with him where he can be helped to discover his own dignity.

In addition the a trusting and knowing relationship, that also presume knowledge of the aim structure, support to have respect for his 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 have been unnecessary if the 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 the child to respect his own dignity, the pedagogical relationship and aim structures must first be called into being. Earlier it appeared that the 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 need for support that makes the adult not consider the child as an inadequate being but that he respects him as a becoming person and in this light he supports the child to have respect for his own dignity.

To be able to realize all that is verbalized, all of the pedagogical structures are mutually dependent on each other, with the child's need for support as the interconnecting power that strengthens their coherency. The pedagogical category "respect-for-dignity" refers, in a variety of ways, to this factor common to all of the pedagogical structures and that 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 the 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 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 himself to arrive at moral self-knowledge. However, this is knowledge that cannot be acquired by the child overnight but requires the thorough and continual support of the adult. This is support that can only be given if the adult is ready to enter into a relationship of trust, understanding and authority with the child until the child reaches his destination and the adult then becomes superfluous as an educator. The adult who opens himself for such a relationship with the child will also be able to support him to understand these value judgments that are expressed about him so that these judgments progressively become embodied in his life. Such knowledge is possible because after a value judgment by the adult, the child can see for himself in light of what has occurred.

A further obligation the child has toward himself is to understand his talents and to make them serviceable so that he can treat himself with greater respect. As a child in need of support, he increasingly worries about himself. This implies that he must work on his becoming. The child must know what his positive potentialities are so that he can work on his task of designing his own possibilities so that he can properly fulfill his destination (adulthood). By himself, however, he is not in a position to arrive at genuine self-understanding and he is dependent on the adult's support for this. This support is given by realizing the fundamental pedagogical structures. Each of the pedagogical structures and all of 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, the 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 all the more clearly seen as a pedagogical ground category and the essence of the child can be grasped even

better. The adult is increasingly addressed by this and obliged to support the child pedagogically.

4. Conquering-freedom-to-responsibility
The child is born helpless and does not yet know how to use freedom. He is not born free to do what he wants but free to progressively do what he ought to do to be regarded as a human being. His freedom obligates him to answer for himself his being addressed so that he can become. However, the fact is that he is cannot answer the demands of propriety without the adult. In other words, the child is possibility to freedom but is not yet free enough to be held responsible for all of his deeds and therefore must still be supported by the adult so that he progressively becomes ready to be able to carry and accept responsibility. By such educative support the child is accommodated in his need for support and in this way is gradually able to conquer his own world and thus become someone himself by gradually living the norm image of adulthood.

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

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

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 the child's need for

support. Thus, freedom to responsibility, as the point of culmination of all 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 the educator, whose philosophy of life is founded on the Word of God, can do nothing else then apply the results of his reflections about pedagogics to practice.

The pedagogical category "task-to-self-understanding" has an obligatory character. Each person must understand his talents so that he can make them serviceable. Thus, the Christian educator is called to use his talents that he has built up through hard thought-work in the service of fellow persons, thus also in the service of the child which urgently requires this because of his need for support. In doing so, the educator can give immediate support to the 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 gifts in the service of others and thus also in the service of God. This is an imperative that 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 the child's self-fulfillment rests on the necessity of his being free to be able to choose for himself, thus free to responsibility. The believer knows each person is addressed by God and that no one but himself 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 the believing Christian educator will not miss any chance to support the child in also learning to know and carry his responsibilities so that he can reach his destination on earth as well as his eternal and true destination.

4.6 Summary

After penetrating the anthropological categories co-existentiality, temporality and being-someone-oneself, that are founded in the universal life reality as background, as well as the pedagogical categories that 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, that again 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 also calls to the Christian believer to pedagogically support the children.