

**W. A. LANDMAN'S PRONOUNCEMENT:  
PHENOMENOLOGY IS ONLY MEANINGFUL  
AS ONTOLOGY\***

J. J. Pienaar  
University of South Africa

Willem Adolph Landman can only be done justice as a thinker and pedagogician if his academic stature is viewed against the background of his time. Without any risk of contradiction it is asserted that the contemporary scheme of things places a particular premium on the quality of knowledge that has practical significance. In a technological era in which technique and technology make strong demands of a technical nature, academics who have technological knowledge at their disposal necessarily will be respected. In a technically and technologically oriented world, naturally, there is nothing wrong if scientists and technologists are trained to solve its pressing problems. However, a problem arises when technology is made absolute. Diversity of knowledge is of a fundamentally variegated nature and also is sustained by a variety of perspectives on truth. *If during a certain period of time a nation or community of nations is not able to maintain a healthy balance among these perspectives on truth, in the past such a people disappeared ingloriously, anonymously and infamously because their perspective on truth, that transcends temporariness, is neglected or misunderstood.* It is for this reason that Greek thought and its perspective on truth still comes forth today after many centuries. Romano Guardini beautifully summarizes these ideas with the following position: "Dieser jugendstarke Wille zur Wahrheit, welcher die Problem emit so herrlichen Organen des Sehens und Denkens angreift, ist es, was die platonischen Schriften unvergänglich macht." (Guardini, 1962: 172). More will be said about the quality of truth in this quotation later.

At this stage it is important to bring home the thesis that must be very clearly verbalized, namely: *in the contemporary,*

---

\* Translation (2012) of J. J. Pienaar: W. A. Landman se uitspraak: Die fenomenologie is slegs as ontologie sinvol. *Pedagogiekjoernaal*, (1988), 9:1, 49-78.

*technologically advanced Western scheme of things there indeed are a great number of educated academics to be found but great thinkers are not in abundance.* Great thinkers who emerge with a perspective on truth of a Parmenides, a Socrates or a Heidegger must be treated with compassion because each of them is a gift to humankind. These thinkers contribute to the establishment of timeless thought, as Guardini has astutely perceived. The twentieth century, technologically oriented and globally (holistically) inspired person runs the danger of *neglecting and misunderstanding this quality of truth that is so necessary for genuine existence* and the result of this, in so far as it gives reign to displacement and obfuscation, will be catastrophic for the so-called modern state of affairs. In the English translation of “Was heisst Denken?” this pronouncement is summarized as follows: “Thinking defines the nature of being human and the more thoughtless we are the less human we are” (Heidegger, 1968: XII).

Not so much academics but thinkers are needed today to bring a corrective to the earlier mentioned quality of truth so that a thought- and spiritual-climate can be created where these thinkers can flourish because if this doesn’t happen, as already argued, this system will also run the danger of coming to inglorious, anonymous and infamous ruin.

In summary, indeed there are many academics who nourish the truth quality of, e.g., a technological nature with phenomenal achievement in this field but the thinker who has the ability to think about and express fundamental truths, and is able to make authentic *knowledge (aletheia)* unconcealed is particularly scarce. Of necessity it must be indicated that a human being is only really and authentically human to the extent that he has learned to think in order to think about the unthinkable and, in his attempt to do so, to realize that he is only the guardian and not the master of reality.

As an essence- and truth-seeking thinker, Landman appeals to pedagogues in this country (R.S.A.) and elsewhere to become fellow thinkers in this way of thinking. In the present tribute to this partnership in thinking it is assumed that there must not so much be a thinking *about* Landman as a thinking *with* him. However, to venture in thinking with him is not an easy task. To think in a

grounded way with Landman in search of a phenomenological-ontological foundation of the reality of educating requires a particular degree of readiness for thinking and, according to Landman himself, the approach to the essential is granted to only a few (Landman, Roos & Van Rooyen, 1974: 5).

There are particular demands placed on the thinker who will enter with Landman an essence-seeking way of thinking as is evident from the following:

1. It must be kept in mind that Landman is an authority on Heidegger and anyone who has ventured into Heidegger knows that this does not mean an uncomplicated exercise in thinking.
2. Who will think with Landman, from the nature of the matter, must be ready to think in an essence-seeking and category-grounded way and not think timidly or be essence-blind (Landman, Roos & Van Rooyen, 1974: 4).
3. If need be, thinking *about* Landman is the easier way because then there can merely be agreement with him in approving ways. As a thinker who discloses being and seeks meaning, for Landman this would be a humiliation because for offhand repeaters a true thinker usually is given little respect such as what Heidegger also has very clearly demonstrated (Pienaar, 1980: 24). For this reason there is not always agreement with Landman, not so much as a critical interpretation but rather as a co-thinking, re-thinking or further thinking. Landman expects of a thinking partner that he will be a partner in the essence-seeking and unconcealing *way of thinking*. Landman even asks if there is another way of thinking than the one on which he finds himself (Landman, no date, Pedagogiekstudies No. 68: 30).

In summary, this amounts to the fact that Landman must be appreciated as an essence thinker in an advancing technological system and without his thinking attunement we definitely would be poorer. This matter is discussed further in the following section.

## 2. LANDMAN'S STATUS IN A DISPLACED SYSTEM

From the above discussion it is deduced that a people or society acquire those academics and thinkers that they deserve. Consequently, it can be expected that a pragmatically attuned world will provide pragmatists to meet the needs that exist and that are created. Thus, to understand a thinker to some extent the climate of thinking from which he emanates also must be understood. Thus it is difficult to conceive that a pragmatically attuned country such as the United States of America would produce a thinker such as Martin Heidegger and if this did occur it would give a particular status to such a thinker. For this reason, it is particularly encouraging that the University of Pretoria's school of [pedagogical] thought has produced persons such as Landman and Van der Stoep who can be viewed as fundamental thinkers.

If a study were made of thinkers such as Heidegger then one could not come to any other conclusion than that the 20<sup>th</sup> Century system is influenced by displacing factors that have taken global forms and from which pedagogicians in this country (R.S.A.) cannot escape. Given the limited space available, it is not the purpose to go into this problematic of displacement except to very briefly illuminate a few examples. The aim is to show that more than ever before the fundamental pedagogician also has the task and assignment today to think and work to overcome this displacement.

In the first place, the perceptive pedagogician will notice a new nihilism in the present system that, if need be, can be described as a subjectivism. This subjectivism or nihilism or metaphysical obfuscation shows itself in the *Übermensch* that is not so much limited to particular people or countries but increasingly is a basic movement that shows the character of a global displacement. Thus, one who thinks against the background of this climate of thought is in danger of being blinded by this truth-obfuscating milieu.

In the second place, the contemporary system is characterized by the appearance of *homo novus* or *homo univerasalis* that are the consequence of the new nihilism reflected on above. The *homo novus* or new "man" manifests himself as a man of power, a ruler, as self-sufficient by virtue of his technical skills and achievements and who is on the way to a holistic and general system. By means of this calculative, propositional and controlling thinking the impression is

created that complete control over reality is acquired and that then can be controlled and manipulated according to its own dispositions. The result of this is *homo universalis* with a narrowed or reduced view of reality over which he can exercise power and operate. The fundamental pedagogician must take into account this perilous reduction in knowledge and be aware as a thinker that as a person he is related to beings and misunderstands Being by existing in an inauthentic, obscuring of Being (Seinsvergessenheit – Heidegger).

A third and equally important aspect of the displaced system is that everything fundamental and radical changes so that there is little or no returning to the lasting and timeless. This syndrome of changeableness is made possible by the achievements of techniques. By using the demanding and controlling thinking, technological man acquires a continually better and firmer grasp of reality. Of essence seeking, meaning-seeking or reflective thinking there is no mention and the fundamental pedagogician is in peril that the essence-disclosing way of thinking can become concealed or abandoned.

In terms of the few examples of the phenomenon of displacement, the status and place of Landman can now be considered. In a displaced system where, among other things, the new nihilism, the power oriented and manipulative knowledge component and the syndrome of changeableness are strongly in the foreground, a thinker such as Landman is a gift to pedagogical thinking in this country. He does not search for the changeable, the manipulatable or the obscured reality of educating but for the enduring, the universally valid and the coherent phenomenon of educating. As one of the important representatives of the Pretoria school of [pedagogical] thought, Landman has received many honors as a fundamental thinker because, in a time just described, he has thought in search of truth and its disclosure. Later more will be said about the varieties of truth so that this matter also will become clearer.

Since Landman is not carried along by the changeable nature of the contemporary system, but rather as an essence thinker he has chosen another way, his contributions to pedagogical thinking must be highly appreciated.

Everyone who has involved himself with Landman will know that in all of his many writings he is and will be a seeking, grounding, penetrating, essence disclosing, category accountable, illuminative thinker. In his thinking wrestling the above statements are often corroborated by the continual appearance of concepts such as “thinking search”, “disclosing”, “revealing”, “appeal to the thing itself”, “bring to light”, “way of access”, “will acquire insight”, just to mention a few examples (Landman, no date, Pedagogiekstudies, No. 68: 7-9).

In addition, pronouncements such as the following are also conspicuous in this regard:

“... remove lack of understanding and faulty understanding”.

“... fundamental pedagogical essences must be observed and verbalized”.

“... observe essences and structures with the help of pedagogical categories” (Landman, 1974: 1).

As essence thinker, Landman is continually *on the way* to a further thinking that seeks to ground and unveil truth, thinks *through* and *into* essences in an attempt to investigate the concealed and complex reality of educating. Today more than ever before the grounding, meaning seeking and essence disclosing Landman-thinking is needed and pedagogicians in the Republic of South Africa would be much poorer if this way of thinking, begun in this country by C. K. Oberholzer and elaborated on by Landman and others, must be abandoned.

What is of cardinal importance in this thinking search *is, among other things, the nature of truth that must be made unconcealed* because it has already become clear that truth shows a character of perspective. This very important question will be considered again later. In so far as Landman has taken form as an authentic, truth-seeking thinker, he will occupy a particular status as a thinker.

### 3. LANDMAN AND THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL TRIAD

The thinking of Landman is supported on three principles or pillars and although they can be studied separately they are closely

related. These three foundation stones of Landman's thinking indeed are related to and are also interwoven with each other in so far as they strive for a common aim or aims that this pedagogician has striven for with the illuminative possibilities of thinking to disclose the educative reality and its coherencies. The three cornerstones mentioned previously, that can also be viewed as the phenomenological triad, are described as follows:

1. Phenomenology is only meaningful as ontology.
2. Ontology is only possible as phenomenology.
3. Phenomenology is implementable only as categorical thinking.

For the purpose of further pedagogical discussion, only the first thesis is concentrated on.

#### **4. LANDMAN'S PRONOUNCEMENT: PHENOMENOLOGY IS ONLY MEANINGFUL AS ONTOLOGY**

In this connection Landman himself asserts: "Only that scientist (i.e., pedagogician) is a phenomenologist who definitely can explain, interpret and justify that pedagogics is essence pedagogics, thus that pedagogical thinking involves what will be grasped ontologically (understanding real pedagogical essences, meanings and coherencies against the universal lifeworld within which the reality of educating is embedded, as a background of thinking) (Landman, 1974: 23).

The thesis under consideration pronounced by Landman is carried by three postulates that immediately spring into view as reflected in Landman's way of thinking, i.e.:

1. The phenomenological attitude of thinking.
2. Making [something] ontologically understandable.
3. The meaningful and coherent pronouncements from this background of thinking.

This three-fold structure of Landman's thinking can only be understood if it is embedded in the way of thinking that this pedagogician readily follows and to which he invites a conversational partner. In this connection, Landman himself says:

“The pedagogician who wants to acquire insight into what the pedagogical really essentially is, is committed to the phenomenological approach” (Landman, no date, Pedagogiekstudies No. 68: 7).

For Landman the phenomenological attitude of thinking leads in the direction of making the reality of educating ontologically understandable in terms of its essence-structure in order to ultimately appreciate this way of making something unconcealed. This way of thinking can only be followed meaningfully if attention is given to each of these three postulates separately.

#### 4.1 The phenomenological attitude of thinking

For Landman phenomenology is only meaningful if it is considered as ontology. The meaningfulness of the phenomenological way of thinking is evident from the *aim* that the pedagogian entertains with the ontological. It is indeed in this connection that *various aims* can be distinguished among pedagogicians and that from time to time will come forth in further pedagogical discussion.

In the case of Landman this aim can be described as an essence- and ground-seeking thinking activity. Landman views his task as an ontologist in that he wants to verbalize the onticities that constitute the being of the reality of educating. This ontological task and its accurate, faithful to reality execution makes phenomenology meaningful, according Landman. To disclose, name, illuminate in order to make the hidden depths of the reality of educating unconcealed is for Landman, as a phenomenologist, a meaningful act, *par excellence*.

The question that unavoidably comes to mind and that must be answered in a scientifically true way and in good conscience is naturally: Has Landman carried out this way of thinking with distinction? The answer to this radical and particularly important question is not simple as already incidentally indicated because anyone who wants to answer this question in good conscience *necessarily must move in this way of thinking with Landman*. At this stage it can be asserted without fear of contradiction that Landman, more than any pedagogician before him, has prepared for

and fulfilled the demands of this way of thinking with conscientious and industrious thinking and insightfulness and verbalizing the course of such thinking while still fresh, but perhaps he has not given the necessary attention to the periagogic character of this thinking although he has involved himself with the question of the hermeneutic circle. This aspect is returned to later.

In order to demonstrate the above only a few aspects of Landman's application of the phenomenological attitude of thinking are illustrated. Within the context of an article such as this naturally it is not possible to strive for completeness.

#### 4.1.1 The point of departure

Landman does not ask to be excused for choosing the phenomenological approach to verbalizing the reality of educating (Landman, 1969: 3) and in spite of holding many criticisms of the phenomenological school of thought in the past, he has succeeded in reflecting on the study of educating as a science, verbalizing and illuminating it.

Heidegger asserts among other things that the most critical of the precarious (Being-obscuring) times in which the man of power lives is that *he will not think* (Pienaar, 1980: 31, 92). Of Landman it can be said with conscience free courage that he has never been shy about, unwilling to or weary of thinking. As a vigilant thinker Landman, unlike many of his contemporaries, has never taken an *a priori* ideology or a philosophy of life point of departure and in doing so to miscarry the very demanding and effortful phenomenological way of thinking; indeed this approach to thinking places particularly high demands on the pedagogician. Expressed very simply, this amounts to the fact that you must know a lot before you realize that you don't know [much]. Landman expresses this great truth slightly differently: "That the everyday understandings and usual opinions of categories are not known, and also need not be known, means only that the approach to the essential (real essences) is the prerogative of only a few" (Landman, 1974: 5).

The number of publications by Landman in which he demonstrates his thinking struggles in an attempt to illuminate the essentials of the reality of educating are sufficient evidence of the above statement. The phenomenological way of disclosing has been fully incorporated into Landman's thinking abilities. In this connection, he asks himself: "... which activities of thinking are realized by the pedagogician when he allows the pedagogical to show itself in its real essentiality so that he can verbalize, thus express and name its real essences" (Landman, no date: Pedagogiekstudies No. 68: 8).

To correctly carry out this naming and verbalizing task it is particularly important that the correct point of departure is taken. No other pedagogician than Landman has so completely and comprehensively demonstrated that if the phenomenon of educating is taken as the point of departure that indeed pedagogical categories and essences come to light.

Just as Husserl before him, Landman feels himself addressed to turn to the thing itself. For him this return to the matter itself does not amount to an empirical epistemology that often is positivistic in nature because this thinking, just as with Husserl, means to avoid positivism.

Although the phenomenon of educating is taken as the point of departure it is not ended with this because the phenomenological way of thinking is directed to the essential phenomenal nature of the phenomenon. Thus, there must be a clear distinction between the phenomenon of educating and the education phenomenon. Where the phenomenon of educating refers more to the prescientific lifeworld observable in time and space and through particular educative activities, in contrast to this, the education phenomenon refers more to the description of educating refined by the consciously constituted, universally valid, eternal and essential. The fundamental pedagogician, as essence thinker, will not only constitute a knowing relationship with the phenomenal description or verbalization of educating but rather a being-relationship and indeed a relationship of a primordial nature that can claim being timeless.

Educating is a primordial fact of being that cannot be thought or acted away; therefore, it is an onticity (a being that is present) and as such has an inviting character for Landman in so far as it must be reflected on, described and named. Unfortunately there is not space to fully discuss the course of thinking followed by Landman from the phenomenon of educating to the education phenomenon.

#### **4.1.2 Landman views categories as illuminative means of thinking**

With great seriousness and dedication Landman has carried on further conversation about categories initiated in the Republic of South Africa by C. K. Oberholzer. In my humble opinion there are very few, if any, pedagogicians abroad who have so fundamentally and comprehensively dealt with the categories problem with the same insight and clarity of verbalization as has Landman.

Whoever reflects on the phenomenological attitude of thinking (i.e., the first of the three perspectives of Landman's pronouncement that phenomenology is only meaningful as ontology) cannot avoid the importance that categories have for Landman. As far as Landman is concerned, the phenomenological attitude and way of thinking without the conversation about categories is not only incomplete but impossible. Evidence of this is the third thesis of the phenomenological triad, i.e., that phenomenology is only implementable as categorical thinking. The aim, however, is not at all to bring up this postulate because this is not the task. In the present discussion only very brief attention is given to this matter so important to Landman.

Landman views the scientist and thus the pedagogician as someone who seeks. To the question, what does he seek, Landman himself responds that he looks for pedagogical essences. To the question, how does he seek them, his answer is that he seeks them in terms of the illumination via thinking because he has a need for light. For Landman, categories are this light (De Jager, Oberholzer & Landman, 1985: 66).

Landman's phenomenological attitude of thinking is carried by various core concepts of which the following are the most

important, i.e., essences, categories, criteria, *universalia*, *existentialia* to name only a few. It is of cardinal importance for understanding Landman's thinking to determine how he uses these ordering principles. In this connection it must be clearly shown that for Landman and each fundamental pedagogue not only *what* he thinks is important but decidedly also *how* he thinks. Richard Wisser refers to Heidegger in this regard and notes: "Es ist vielleicht weniger das, was er denkt, als die Art, wie er denkt, also die Methode seines Denkens, die auf uns wirken musste ..." (Wisser, 1970: 46).

This pronouncement by Wisser can also readily be applied to Landman because it is at the crux of the thesis: phenomenology is only meaningful as ontology. For Landman the phenomenological way of thinking is only meaningful if it leads to making something (e.g., educating) ontologically understandable.

In order to try to understand Landman there must be a very close look at the truisms and ordering principles that are specifically applied by him. Much confusion arises with fundamental pedagogicians if various, sometimes contradictory, meanings are given to these core concepts without their meaning being clearly illuminated. The following quotations are purposefully provided to stimulate a pedagogical conversation about this very important matter. There ought to be a very strict look at Landman's use especially of concepts such as "essence", "categories" and "structure". In this connection, Landman says: "... category is a central concept, a fundamental, essential concept that carries other concepts and (says) manifests to the thinker (pedagogue) in which character of being a particular being (the pedagogical) shows itself, ...." (Landman, no date, Pedagogiekstudies No. 68: 12-13).

For Landman there is not so much talk of "... categories of thinking" as there is of "categories *for* thinking...." (Landman, no date, Pedagogiekstudies No, 68: 14). With this pronouncement Landman tries to escape from a subjectivism or an objectivism and the previously mentioned pronouncement of Wisser, in connection with Heidegger, also becomes more relevant for Landman.

"Categories that themselves are human essences express real

essences” (Landman, no date, Pedagogiekstudies No. 68: 14).

“Categories then are ontological structures” (Landman, no date, Pedagogiekstudies No. 68: 11, 15).

“The refinement occurs by now implementing the essences observable through the category of child accompaniment (which in reality are essences of child accompaniment) as categories. Because of its essentiality, each essence possesses categorical status” (Landman, 1974: 14).

“A category is an essence that is applied by the pedagogue. Thus, an essence does not automatically become a category but must be elevated to one by the pedagogue” (De Jager *et al.*, 1985: 77).

Of essences and structures, Landman says:

“The real essences are *fundamentalia*, thus the foundations, grounds on which child accompaniment rests. In other words, they are being-structures ....” ( Landman, 1974: 19).

“Thus there is mention of the reality of educating as a structure of pedagogical structures and their additional structures. These “additional” structures can be called essences or essential characteristics” (Landman, 1974: 20).

“Real pedagogical essences are existentials (*existentialia*)” (Landman, Van Zyl & Roos, 1975: 5).

“In order to qualify as an existential a real pedagogical essence must possess ontological status” (Landman *et al.*, 1975: 5).

“In the fifth place, as an existential, a real essence is a particular possibility” (Landman *et al.*, 1975: 7).

“Because a human being is an aim setting being, the existentiality of a pedagogical essence can appear ....” (Landman *et al.*, 1975: 7).

“Further, this status indicates that real essences are being-structures....” (Landman *et al.*, 1975: 6).

“This means that such a pedagogical essence lends itself to application as an illuminative means of thinking, thus as a category” (Landman, 1977: 211).

Regarding the use of [the concepts] categories, essences and structures, Landman himself says that they should not be used arbitrarily and proceeds as follows: “For the uncritical reader it might appear that these three concepts are used arbitrarily. However, the vigilant reader will easily notice the following: an essence is a particular reality that has been phenomenologically disclosed from within the reality of educating and that actually is a way of living pedagogically. A *structure* is a true to reality combination of those essences that belong together. For example, the essences of encounter together form its structure. And a *category* is an essence used by a pedagogician as an illuminative means of thinking” [to disclose more essences] (De Jager *et al.*, 1985: 76-77).

The “vigilant thinker” referred to by Landman above must determine for himself what categories, essences and structures mean in Landman’s ways of using them. However, it must be clearly stated that the aims of pedagogicians diverge on this point and for this reason there is already a distinction made between the analyzing and perhaps atomizing thinkers and the coherency-seeking or configurational thinkers in fundamental pedagogics (Pienaar, 1984: 18).

This very important matter cannot be discussed further at this stage because of a lack of space; therefore, for the sake of brevity a few summary remarks are offered in this regard, namely:

Where the use of concepts such as categories, essences and structures acquire complementary significance for the analyzing thinkers, the configurational thinkers will clearly distinguish among the concepts and this will also be used in pedagogical conversation

such that a clearly possible structure of coherencies and ordering of the pedagogical thinking is made possible for the student.

Where the analyzing thinkers proceed from the standpoint that each part-discipline operates with its own categories and that psychopedagogical categories evolve from what fundamental pedagogics has not concerned itself with, configurational thinkers proceed from the premise that fundamental pedagogics, as a grounding part-discipline, illuminates the categories that have relevance for all of the part-disciplines but that each part-discipline has its own questions.

Where the analyzing thinkers proceed from the idea that part-disciplines are independent, here the configurational thinkers see a clear coherency among the part-disciplines that arise through a collectivity of categories.

In their search for coherencies, the configurational thinkers proceed from the standpoint that the pedagogical is embedded in the agogical and recognize the pedagogical as a regional agogics while the analytic thinkers attend only to its agogical founding. The configurational thinkers, on the model of Hengstenberg and J. van de Wiele, also make a clear distinction between essences and *existentialia*. The nature of the reality of educating is expressed in terms of essences. However, when there is a reflection on the exceptional positionality of the human being as Dasein, these ways of being (essences) are distinguished as existentialia. The *existentialia* of Dasein such as openness, being-appealed-to [addressed], freedom and sense, to mention only a few, are not applicable to any other phenomenon or being. The *existentialia* also have agogical status, and thus, from the nature of the matter, pedagogical relevance. On the other hand, the essences of the phenomenon of educating such as the aim, relationship, sequence, activity and periagogic essences also have agogical status with particular pedagogical relevance, but are only applicable to the phenomenon of accompaniment as such.

The configurational thinkers also do not proceed from a derivatively grounded structure by which the ontological, anthropological and

pedagogical structures arise but follow a temporality-grounded way of thinking that must later be given more thought.

Although there are older and younger advocates of each of these ways of thinking, Landman can be viewed as the most important analytic thinker while P. van Zyl can be described as a configurational thinker.

From the distinctions made, it must not be concluded that one of these approaches to thinking excludes the other because both complement each other in an interesting way and can in the future particularly stimulate pedagogical conversation—a task that younger pedagogicians ought to seize eagerly.

## **4.2 MAKING (SOMETHING) ONTOLOGICALLY UNDERSTANDABLE**

The phenomenological way of thinking or approach that Landman adopts can only be made understandable as ontology as already noted above. Landman asks the following question: Which categories ground the pedagogical categories? To answer this question he indicates that a certain structure of categories can be distinguished. According to Landman, this structure shows itself as ontological, anthropological and pedagogical.

### **4.2.1 The ontological- or reality- or ground-category**

This category is particularized out of the universal reality of life as being-in-the-world. For Landman this category of being is the precondition for the categories that describe the humanness of being human that he then calls anthropological categories of existentialia (Landman, no date, Pedagogiekstudies No. 68: 30-31).

### **4.2.2 The anthropological categories**

By using the ontological category as a light for thinking, according to Landman the anthropological essences are illuminated that are distinguished as follows: co-existence (being-with), temporality, being-someone-oneself and being-in-a-meaningful-world.

### 4.2.3 The pedagogical categories

By further implementing the phenomenological method the anthropological categories can illuminate the pedagogical categories that emanate from them, i.e.: safe space, openness, addressing-listening, normativity, sympathetic authoritative guidance and of a face-to-face relationship, to mention a few.

As already noted there is another way of grounding that can be described as temporality-grounding. In this case, temporality is not an anthropological category but an ontological or ground category. Dasein's being-in-the-world or openness mean that a human being is a being who has a need for time (future and past as present) in order to be able to be (exist). Human being-in-the-world has two connotations, i.e., being-in and worldliness.

*Educative reality and temporality:* Being-in refers to the temporal situatedness of being human. The human being's coming into and leaving the world means that he is temporary and time-bound, i.e., *angustiae temporis*. For this reason future and past do not say so much about time as *something about being human*. The human being has a need for future and past as present to be human. For this reason a human being is not *intuitus originarius* but *intuitus derivates*. Openness as an existential of Dasein expresses just this way of being human, i.e., that the human being must reach outside of himself to be human: by this stepping outside of himself as intentionality he goes out to meet future and past; he can also reach out to God, at the same time in terms of his being Christian, to be a human being. This reaching out by virtue of ontic openness is an ontic matter because a human being must transcend himself. For this reason the appearing existence of the *Übermensch* as a self-sufficient being is inauthentic. It is just this existential situatedness out of which the agogical and then the pedagogical arise. As a reaching-out being, a human being is encountering and being-encountered because he is in intentionality-bondedness with himself, things and the world, involved with other and the Other. Out of this the agogical and dialogical arise.

*Educative reality and spatiality:* A human being's being-in-the-world also implies spatiality. A person encounters the world as

reality. The ontological category of being-in-the-world also embraces temporality and spatiality. However, one must be clearly aware that temporality is ontologically primary to spatiality as Nicolai Hartman directly notes: “Die Zeit ist um vieles fundamentaler als der Raum” (Hartman, 1968: 22).

Heidegger cannot be fully grasped without the particular view of time that he holds—a matter that cannot be dealt with here except to show that for him it is a pivotal concept as is evident from the synthesis between “Sein und Zeit” (his major work) and a much later appearing lecture “Zeit und Sein”. These are particularly fruitful reflections for the pedagogical that must still be worked out regarding its temporal grounding, and this must be postponed for later.

#### 4.3 THE MEANINGFUL AND COHERENT PRONOUNCEMENTS FROM THIS BACKGROUND OF THINKING

When there is reflection on the above matter among other things the *agogica perennis* is considered or closely thought about and it is also the crown problematic regarding Landman’s way of thinking. For Landman sense is expressed in understanding and in the present connection authentic understanding is the understanding of essences.

Making meaning (pedagogical meaning) unconcealed necessarily occurs in terms of language. For this reason in his thinking for essences, Landman is also continually involved in wrestling with language. To verbalize means not only to name but to allow meaning to be illuminated [more deeply] (Landman *et al.*, 1985: 68).

The fundamental pedagogician, along the grounding way that he proceeds, will eagerly come to know the being-character of the reality of educating because the unknown or foreign means insecurity. An unknown reality is for Landman also non-sense (Landman, no date, Pedagogiekstudies No. 68: 23).

The ground of the reality of educating that is interrogated is traditionally referred to with the term “being”. Thus if there is talk

of the being of a being, the ground of that reality (the reality of educating) is what is meant. Thus, the being or ground of the reality of educating has to do with the structure or order of relationships by which the essential coherence of this being is described.

What now is very interesting is that being (ground) and meaning are very closely related. For this reason, to Heidegger grounding means reflecting (Pienaar, 1980: 42). Thus the fundamental pedagogician who is involved in Heidegger's meaning of grounding is also involved in reflecting.

This inferred statement can only be heartily agreed with. Fundamental pedagogics, that at the moment is a threatened part discipline in the Republic of South Africa, for reasons that can be deduced from sections 1 and 2 will be more of a turn to actuality and meaningfulness if this very important attitude of thinking is adopted.

The greatest need of the contemporary system is for meaning or reflection. For this reason the fundamental pedagogician cannot avoid the task of overcoming nihilism and the obfuscation of Being. It is Heidegger who strikingly states in this regard that:

“Ontologische Problematik hat so wenig mit Realismus zu tun, dass gerade Kant in und mit seiner transzendentalen Fragenstellung den ersten entscheidenden Schritt seit Plato und Aristoteles zu einer Ausdrucklichen Grundlegung der Ontologie volziehen konnte. Dadurch, dasz man fur die Realitat der Auszenwelt eintritt, ist man noch nicht ontologisch orientert. Ontologisch – in der popular-philosophischen Bedeutung genommen – meint jedoch – und darin bekundet sich die heillose Verwirrung, das, was vielmehr ontisch genannt werden muss, d. h. eine Haltung, die das Seinende an ihm selbst sein lasst, was und wie es ist. Aber damit ist noch kein Problem des Seins gestellt, geschweige denn das Fundament fur die Moglichkeit einer Ontologie gewonnen” (Heidegger, 1978: 132).

This extremely important pronouncement by Heidegger compels the fundamental pedagogician to once again think about the ontological way of grounding. In this light it is unaccountable that thus far the

periagogic essences have enjoyed so little attention in fundamental pedagogical thinking in this country.

Grounding as reflecting ultimately means a turning to being. A distinction has already been made between great academics and great thinkers and if the fundamental pedagogician does not correctly verbalize the question of truth he will become bogged down in oblivion. The thinker is only a true thinker if his thinking has brought Being to its essence. The question of truth, as the expression of *aletheia*, belongs to the essence of Being and each thinker who is excluded from this question of truth lives in the now-moment of obscurity. Only when the thinker dwells in the illuminative openness of Being can he truly be a *lumen naturale* and penetrate the being (ground) of the being (educative reality), name it and meaningfully relate to it. The relationship that an academic establishes with beings is a first-order relationship and if there is not a grounding or a reflective consideration of the being (ground) of the beings, not only is an inauthentic relationship established but there is also a lack of gratefulness.

## 5. SUMMARY

*Ontological thinking can only be meaningful if both the first and second order structures of truth are considered. In the first order truth means something that is universally valid and necessary and is accessible to all of the pedagogical part-disciplines, but the second order of truth requires a particular frame of mind and is not necessarily accessible to all pedagogical perspectives. It is indeed this latter perspective on truth that appeals to the fundamental pedagogician and asks that further attention be given to a fundamental ontology, but then in the sense meant by Heidegger.*

For this reason it must never be forgotten that with the fundamental pedagogician there also must be the battle of realizing truth and that we, as conversation partners, are grateful to Landman because he was not timid or did not shrink from the path of a foundational way of thinking to a deeper being addressed, and he has shown us that phenomenology can only be meaningful as ontology. Even if this way of thinking is an impracticable battle, we will still be continually thankful to Landman because this is the first step in overcoming nihilism and the *Übermensch*. With Heidegger,

Landman also walks this grounding way of thinking and those of us who have come to these thinkers are invoked to think in a way expressed nicely in the following quotation:

“Das Denken ist des Seins, insofern das Denken, vom Sein ereignet, dem Sein gehört” (Heidegger, 1978: 313-314).

## REFERENCES

1. BRUMMER, V. (1961): *Die vraag na die eksistensieelbepalende waarheid*. Wageningen, H. Veenman & Zonen.
2. DE JAGER, P. L., OBERHOLZER, M. O. & LANDMAN, W. A. (1985): *Fundamentele Pedagogiek: wetenskap, inhoud en praktyk*, Pretoria, NG Kerkboekhandel.
3. GUARDINI, R. (1962): *Der Tod des Sokrates*. Munich, Rowholt.
4. HARTMANN, N. (1968): *Neue Wege der Ontologie*. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer.
5. HEIDEGGER, M. (1968): *What is called thinking? A translation of “Was heisst Denken?”* With an Introduction by J. Glen Gray. London, Harper & Row.
6. HEIDEGGER, M. (1978): *Wegmarken*. Frankfurt am Main, Vittoria Klostermann.
7. HENGSTENBERG, H. (1961): *Freiheit und Seinsordnung*. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer.
8. HENGSTENBERG, H. (1966): *Philosophische Antropologie*. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer.
9. KILIAN, C. J. G. (1974): Kategoriale en/of kriteriale structure in die Fundamentele Pedagogiek. *Educare*, Vol. 3/2.
10. LANDMAN, W. A. (no date): Aanwending van die pedagogiese kategoriee in die Fundamentele Pedagogiek. *Pedagogiekstudies* No. 68. Potchefstroom, Potchefstroom Herald.
11. LANDMAN, W. A. (1977): *Fundamentele Pedagogiek en Onderwyspraktyk*. Durban, Butterworths..
12. LANDMAN, W. A. (1972): *Leesboek vir die Christenopvoeder*. Pretoria, NG Kerkboekhandel.
13. LANDMAN, W. A. (1969): *Op soek na Pedagogiese Kriteria*. Inaugural address. Pretoria, Van Schaiks.
14. LANDMAN, W. A. & GOUS, S. J. (1969): *Inleiding tot die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*. Johannesburg, Afrikaanse Persboekhandel.
15. LANDMAN, W. A. & KILIAN, C. J. G. (1972): *Leesboek vir die Opvoedkundestudent en Onderwyser*. Cape Town, Juta & Kie.
16. LANDMAN, W. A., VAN ZYL, M. E. J. & ROOS, S. G. (1975): *Fundamenteel-pedagogiese essensies*. Durban, Butterworths.
17. LANDMAN, W. A., ROOS, S. G. & VAN ROOYEN, R. P. (1974): *Die Praktykwording van die Fundamentele Pedagogiek met kernvrae*. Johannesburg, Perskor.
18. LANDMAN, W. A., KILIAN, C. J. G. & ROOS, S. G. (1971): *Denkwyses in die Opvoedkunde*. Pretoria, NG Kerkboekhandel.

19. LANDMAN, W. A., KILIAN, C. J. G., SWANEPOEL, E. M. & BODENSTEIN, H. C. A. (1982): *Fundamentele Pedagogiek*. Cape Town, Juta & Kie.
20. LANDMAN, W. A., BARNARD, F., GERBER, A. E., ROOS, S. G., VAN DER WESTHUIZEN, G. J. & SMITH, R. J. (1978): *Opvoedkunde vir onderwysstudente*. Stellenbosch, University Publishers & Booksellers.
21. LANDMAN, W. A. & ROOS, S.G., (1973): *Fundamentele Pedagogiek en die Opvoedingswerklikheid*. Durban, Butterworths.
22. LANDMAN, W. A., ROOS, S. G. & LIEBENBERG, C. R. (1971): *Opvoedkunde en Opvoedingsleer vir beginners*. Stellenbosch, Univeristy Publisher & Booksellers.
23. LANDMAN, W. A. (1979): C. K. Oberholzer as essensiedenker. In: Smit, A. J.: *Die Agein Perenne*. Pretoria, Van Schaik.
24. PIENAAR, J. J. (1980): *Die Kehredenke by onder andere Heidegger en die agogiese betekenis daarvan*. Unpublished D. Phil., Pretoria, University of Pretoria.
25. PIENAAR, J. J. (1984): Die struktuurprogram in die pedagogiek. 'n Pedagogiese herbevraging. *Navoringspublikasie C 22* University of Port Elizabeth. Dispatch, PUD Repro.
26. PIENAAR, J. J. (1975): *Die Temporaliteitsbegronding van die Pedagogiek*. Inaugural address D9, University of Port Elizabeth, Port Elizabeth, Bumlays Printing Works.
27. PIENAAR, J. J. (1976): Die periagogiese karakter van die opvoeding. *SA Journal of Pedagogy*, Vol. 10(2).
28. ROSSOUW, H. W. (1980): Wetenskap, Interpretasie, Wysheid. *Simposia B7*, University of Port Elizabeth. Port Elizabeth, E. H. Walton.
29. VAN ROOYEN, R. P. (1972): 'n Ontologies-antropologiese interpretasie van die sin van opvoederwees. Unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
30. VAN ZYL, P. (1977): *Opvoedkunde. Deel 3*. Braamfontein, Boekhandel De Jong.
31. VILJOEN, T. A. (1969): *Die kenrelasie gesien in pedagogiese perspektief. 'n Studie in die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, Pretoria, J. L. van Schaik.
32. WISSEN, R. (1970): *Martin Heidegger im Gespräch*. Munich, Karl Alber.

## AUTHOR'S ENGLISH SUMMARY (Slightly edited)

### W. A. LANDMAN'S PRONOUNCEMENT: PHENOMENOLOGY IS ONLY MEANINGFUL AS ONTOLOGY

Willem Adolf Landman ought not to be recognized only as a great academic but also as a great thinker. Great thinkers must be

distinguished from great academics in so far as the former concern themselves with second order questions of truth. Second order questions of truth are born out of the postulation of the *aletheia* knowledge structure where one operates not only with the analytical method but also with the deliberative mode of thought.

As an essence-seeking and truth-seeking thinker, Willem Landman calls upon interested fundamental pedagogicians in this country and elsewhere to become fellow thinkers along this essence-disclosing line of thinking. Consequently, one should not so much think *about* Landman as move *with* him on this essence-disclosing line of thinking where *grounding also implies reflecting*.

Landman's status as a thinker in terms of essences can only be appreciated when his findings are viewed against the background of the displaced dispensation (system) in which the *Übermensch* is enmeshed.

The thesis propounded by Landman that *phenomenology is only meaningful as ontology* is the cardinal problem area in his thinking. Hermeneutic insight, as a phenomenological disclosure of essences, makes authentic understanding possible. For Landman authentic understanding is the comprehension of essences. Thus, Landman may be regarded as the fundamental thinker *par excellence* who by ontological means seeks to grasp the essential character of educating. This ontological challenge and the careful and conscientious response to it make the task of the phenomenologist meaningful.

Ontological thinking can only be meaningful when first and second order truth is taken into account. In the first order structure truth has the meaning of general validity and necessity, and this order of truth is available to all pedagogic part-disciplines, *but the second order of truth demands a particular frame of mind and is not necessarily available to all of the pedagogic perspectives*. It is just this perspective on truth that is so necessary in a displaced system, and it is the first step in the direction of overcoming nihilism and the *Übermensch*- obfuscated existence. Each serious-minded pedagogician is hereby called into this meaning-revealing mode of thinking together with Heidegger and Landman.