

Thoughts as to the Location of Ideology within the Sphere of “Belief Systems”

Prof. P.G. Schoeman

Samevatting

In die literatuur word daar veelal op onkritiese wyse na ideologie verwys as diepste dryfkrag onderliggend aan menslike aspirasies, begeertes en handelinge. Die vraag is egter of dit waarlik die mees fundamentele dryfkrag in die denke en optrede van mense en gemeenskappe verteenwoordig, en of daar nie moontlik 'n dieper, regulatiewe dimensie bestaan wat bepalend inwerk ook op die karakter en rigting van ideologieë nie. In die tradisie van die reformatoriese wysbegeerte waar deurgaans erns gemaak word met die stand van sake dat 'n verskeidenheid van voor- of bo-teoretiese motiewe inwerk op menslike denke en gedrag, word die moontlikheid ondersoek dat ideologie veel eerder 'n integrale deel uitmaak van 'n ingewikkelde meta-dimensie wat die handelinge van mense en gemeenskappe grondliggend bepaal.

1. Preliminary remarks

Any extensive survey of current literature on ideology reveals the fact that the indiscriminate use of the term *ideology* to embrace literally all influences that originate in the complex meta-dimension underlying human thoughts, ideals, aspirations, actions etc. is not to be advised. If a more unerring distinction between *ideology* and other “belief systems” is in any way conceivable, avenues in this regard should be explored for the sake of clarity. This possibility will be investigated below. In this investigation we will attempt to distinguish more unequivocally between *ideology* on the one hand and the *pre-ideological suppositions* that underpin and regulate it on the other, thereby locating *ideology* more precisely within the corpus of concepts that are commonly used to convey the theory regarding *extra-rational influences* that control and mould human thought and conduct.

An intriguing, if not perplexing problem that faces us when we reflect on human thoughts, aspirations, interpretations and eventual actions, is the

subtle role of irrational, affective influences that, being part of our situational determination (Mannheim, 1972:69), function as the "more remote antecedents", the "'precursors' of every idea" (Mannheim, 1972:60). From literature relating to the theory of ideology, it becomes apparent that most researchers, either explicitly or by implication, perceive *ideology* to be part of a complex (but comparatively uncharted) "realm" of *a priori* suppositions undergirding human thoughts, aspirations, interpretations, actions and the like.

However, the term *ideology* is often loosely and indiscriminately applied as a common denominator to include what – viewed from another angle – may be meaningfully understood as belonging to either more "immediate", or more profound "dimensions", "realms" or "domains" of postulates, hypotheses and suppositions (cf., for instance, Leatt, *et al.*, 1989:301 where ideology is confused with a basic driving force in the sense used by Aristotle, Thomas and Kant, as is explained in more detail later on in this essay).

Examples of terms used as equivalents for ideology are, amongst others, Mannheim's (non-evaluative) "particular conception of ideology", his (evaluative) "more inclusive total conception of ideology" (1972:49,78) and his "systems of thought" (1972:89), Plamenatz's "world-view" or "total ideology" (1979:17); Habermas's "justifying" (ideological/evaluative) motives and "real" motives (1971:311); Boudon's "belief systems" (1989:33), Gramsci's "conceptions of the world", "systems of thought" and "forms of consciousness" (cf. Hall, *et al.*, 1978:46). Other terms that are also commonly used in this context to convey the idea of being related to the "meta-dimension" of human thoughts and actions, are *symbolic systems*, *assumptions*, *presuppositions*, *convictions*, *dogma*, *all-embracing philosophy*, even *paradigm* or *disciplinary matrix*. That Hall, *et al.*, (1978:46) are justified in disputing the equivalence of *ideology* with the terms mentioned above, is self-evident. Be it as it may, it is abundantly clear that it is untenable to defend the indiscriminate and unqualified use of the term. This practice merely adds to and deepens the general mystification surrounding the concept (cf. Salamun, 1992:40-41; Grieder, 1992:17; Almeida, 1981:237).

The task at hand, then, is to attempt a more adequate taxonomy of the realm of presuppositions that – apart from ideology – co-determine all human thoughts, aspirations, interpretations and actions. In the following paragraphs, an attempt will be made to distinguish between, on the one hand, the *post-ideological* "belief systems" that are directly influenced by ideology, and on the other, the *pre-ideological* suppositions underpinning and regulating ideology itself.

2. On the committed nature of human experience

To understand properly the intricacies of human thoughts and actions, it is necessary to understand their origins. The question can be formulated as follows: Is it not possible that some of the presuppositions or conjectures that underlie human thoughts and actions are – in relation to *practical human behaviour* – of a more “proximate” (short-term) nature, while others are more “remote” (medium-term), and some even of an “ultimate” (long-term) essence? In other words, can we – realistically – regard *philosophy, philosophy of the special sciences* and *disciplinary matrices* – that all relate to the “here and now” of epistemological (scientific) interpretations of reality – as of a more *proximate* nature than, and distinguish them from *world-view, ideology* and the *ethos* of communities that relate predominantly to cosmological issues and are therefore more *remote* than the former, and these – finally – from *basic driving motives* (“*Leitmotif*”) that, on their part, appear to be essentially of archaeological [[The term “archaeological” is used to refer to knowledge of the origin of created reality, truth and the like.]] concern and therefore of an *ultimate* nature?

It would appear as though the application of more explicit and less ambiguous “images” may well allow for the suggested recognition of different levels or dimensions [[i.e. of *proximate* = epistemological, *remote* = cosmological and *ultimate* = archaeological nature, cf. *infra*]] of *a priori*, in terms of which different categories of *apriori* may be “positioned” provisionally. If this can be accomplished, it may eventually be possible to appraise more accurately the precise nature of, and fallacies, prejudices and inadequacies that the various contending ideologies of our times harbour within themselves, as well as their influence on other (“post-ideological”) provinces, and especially in scientific analyses and interpretations of cultural and educational matters.

However, what is suggested in the following lines should be regarded as *qualified* and *provisional*. It is thoroughly understood that human experience of reality is *never fragmentary* and *disconnected*, but *always comprehensive* and *coherent*. What is to follow is of a purely *theoretical* nature. However, this theoretical “dis-uniting” of our essentially integral experience and interpretation of reality is mandatory for an analysis of the problem in question.

3. Post-ideological realm of human suppositions and assumptions

3.1 Pre-scientific experience of reality and the inception of hypotheses underlying scientific investigation

The pre-scientific domain of human experience encompasses our total existence. It is the “world” in which we exist as totalities, in which we live,

love, suffer, hope, struggle, believe, aspire, act and the like. The essence of our naïve (i.e. non-scientific) experience of reality is one of trust (belief). This experience is also complex and concrete in nature. As such it is profound, original and essential (fundamental). It represents the most unfathomable knowledge that human beings have access to. All our activities, including our scientific endeavours, are rooted in this integral "domain" of pre-scientific experience. This world of original and fundamental experiences implies a particular category of human knowledge, namely one that is distinguished by its absolute and unqualified commitment.

In contrast with this pre-scientific way of knowing, our scientific experience of reality displays is characterized by its essentially analytic and abstracting features and style. Therefore, in terms of a scientific attitude, reality is *theoretically separated* into the different (modal) aspects (e.g., physical, biotic, psychical, cultural, social, economic, moral etc.) that constitute it (Dooyeweerd, 1953:43). Our pre-scientific attitude is distinguished by the presence of non-scientific conceptions regarding individual things, concrete events, situations, activities, societal relations, aspects (modes) of existence and the like in the integral coherence of their distinctive constituting aspects. We also experience these individual things, concrete events, situations, aspects of reality etc. as integral, coherent and meaningful parts of one and the same reality (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1955:433,462). For this reason, the naïvely experiencing person resists intuitively any attempt to "disunite" theoretically this integral and coherent experience of reality and "dissolve" it into theoretically abstracted and isolated terrains, as is attempted in the scientific attitude of thought. In our pre-scientific experience, where the typical totality structures of reality are left intact (Dooyeweerd, 1953:43), we find ourselves "in the midst" of empirical reality with all our senses and functions of consciousness. In this attitude of experience and thought, it is never mandatory to isolate theoretically any component element of reality to make it the focal point of theoretical analysis and subsequent scientific interpretation.

In naïve thought, the antithetical relation between knowing subject and knowable (distinguishable/identifiable) object (i.e., the subject-object relation) is of an essentially pre-scientific nature. As everything is experienced in its integral coherence with the rest of reality, there is no question of an epistemological problem. The need for intentional theoretical abstraction (*epoché*), as the "setting apart" and theoretical isolation of component elements of totality structures does not arise. Neither is there any attempt to gain theoretical insight into the typical

(entity) structures of individual things, concrete events, situations, activities and the like. We merely encounter constituent elements of reality as so many separate and concrete entities or structures of individuality (*this* and *that*), each with its distinct and peculiar mode (manner) of existence (*this way* and *that way*), as they appear within the horizon of our everyday experience (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1955:61).

The individual identity (structural principle) of particular entities, concrete events, situations, actions etc. is intuitively “grasped”, correctly understood and properly accounted for by the naïvely experiencing person. Although the pre-scientific attitude of thought is, then, of an essentially intuitive, uncritical and non-scientific (not “un-scientific”) nature, it is never to be regarded as “false” or unreliable (delusive, unsound). On the contrary, it represents a legitimate and perfectly valid experience of the universal characteristics of particular entities, concrete events, situations, activities etc. as they are encountered in everyday life. Pre-scientific knowledge should, however, under no circumstances be mistaken for a *theory of reality*. The construction of the latter, i.e., a theory of reality, is an essentially scientific venture. It involves an intentional attempt to provide a theoretical-logical analysis and interpretation (clarification) of individual entities, concrete events, situations, activities, societal relationships and the like (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1957:31; also 29,36,65).

Science is therefore never practised in isolation, in a void, as it were. It is under all circumstances related to, and undergirded by naïve human experience. Our pre-scientific, integral and essentially committed experience of reality provides the hypotheses from where all subsequent scientific explication of phenomena that are encountered, are launched. As such, science can never replace our naïve experience of reality. It does, however, serve to substantiate the latter in a theoretical manner.

3.2 The disciplinary matrix

3.2.1 Introductory remark

In contrast to the popularly accepted positivist tradition regarding the ostensibly uncommitted nature of scientific investigation, modern exponents of the theory of science have, especially since the early sixties, begun to question the presupposition pertaining to the supposedly “neutral” character of scientific enterprise. Indeed, exponents of the “new” theory of science like, for instance, Kuhn, Hanson, Toulmin, Feyerabend, Polanyi and others, illustrate beyond doubt that the practice of science is an all but neutral affair. For the purpose of this investigation, reference in

this regard will be made largely to the thoughts of T.S. Kuhn. What is offered here is neither a critical estimate, nor a "new" interpretation of Kuhn's ideas concerning the so-called "disciplinary matrix". It is merely a brief and perfunctory survey of main aspects in this regard, tracing the unfolding of Kuhn's interpretation relating to the development of theory that constituted a fundamental deviation from that of classical positivism. To achieve this objective, it is necessary to explain briefly the essence of a positivist concept regarding the development of scientific theories and their status in the practice of science.

3.2.2 The positivist tradition

In terms of a positivist stance, the development of scientific theories is essentially a process of accumulating sensory data, knowledge, perspectives and logical operations on the basis of which generalizations can be established (cf. Bhola, 1992:105). Scientists in a specific field of scientific research subject the initial postulation of every scientific theory to rigorous scrutiny so as to determine its general usefulness. Should a new theory withstand these critical interrogations, and to a high degree confirm accepted scientific theories and prevailing hypotheses, it is incorporated into the ranks of current scientific theories.

Once a "new theory" has become part of prevailing scientific theory, the chances of rejecting it are scant. The scientific community accept a theory only because it contributes significantly to the clarification of prevailing assumptions. A theory may be challenged, but is never refuted. Should a theory, however, fall into disuse, it is solely because it has become obsolete, and up-to-date theories are mandatory for the scientific explication of newly discovered data. New discoveries, developments and perspectives in a special science, therefore, demand novel and modified approaches. Inadequate or obsolete theories are effectively expanded, upgraded and integrated with new ones to explain new data and the like in the scientific field in question. Even scientific language is neutral. All members of the scientific community can understand it, and all hypotheses and theories can be expressed and evaluated in terms of this "neutral" medium that provides for effective communication among scientists.

3.2.3 The myth of neutrality in science

In an attempt to account for the existence of different and divergent scientific schools of thought even within the boundaries of the same science, Kuhn argued that "normal science" is always conducted under the guidance of what he initially (1962) called a "paradigm", but later labelled

a “disciplinary matrix” (1969). It is clear from the outset that Kuhn’s “disciplinary matrix” differs essentially from concepts like “ideology”, “world-view”, “philosophy”, “philosophy of the special sciences” and the like. A disciplinary matrix refers to a much more restricted set of presuppositions than is the case with the concepts mentioned above. [[As Kuhn’s development from “paradigm” to “disciplinary matrix” is not relevant for this study, all reference to his concept of a meta-dimension of the various special sciences will be in terms of the latter – 1969 – phrase.]] As it became evident to exponents of the “new” theory of science that other than rational and perceptual categories are actively at work during the scientific explication of states of affairs, these scientists slowly but surely abandoned positivist epistemology, i.e., the notion of a “single”, uncomplicated reality “patterned in relationships of linear causality” and knowable entirely via sense experience (Bhola, 1992:105). They also rejected the possibility of deriving generalizations from logical operations relating to accumulated sense data, and with it the possibility of isolating the scientist from the knowable, and separating value from fact. Hence, the positivist point of view regarding the formation of scientific theories, as well as the formulation of statements about the field of scientific enquiry in question that are true and therefore “universally generalizable” and suitable for predictions, is also left behind (Bhola, 1992:105).

Kuhn identifies two important “stages” of scientific activity. Firstly, there are the fairly prolonged “calm” periods of what he calls “normal science”, during which scientific communities pursue science without turmoil and tension. Members of scientific communities share common convictions: They operate within the boundaries of the same “disciplinary matrix” to which all members pay total allegiance.

Experienced practitioners of a special science introduce (initiate) “apprentice” scientists to the “trade” and “tradition”, thereby guaranteeing the continued existence of the disciplinary matrix in question. Novices gradually rise to the level of accredited practitioners themselves, and perpetuate the hypotheses and theories of established experts in the field. Proven methods are followed; tested and verified formulae applied; time-honoured textbooks studied; traditional laboratory processes re-established; accepted generalizations applied to the particular field of scientific investigation; selected (appropriate) research reports studied; tried models and examples retained, etc.

A “disciplinary matrix”, then, represents a unitary vision on the field of scientific research in question. It embraces solutions for scientific problems; provides exemplars that prove certain positions and models that

can be copied; directs the use of scientific appliances and furnishes the scientific community with a clear-cut and unambiguous scientific idiom (language) of its own. It thus allows students to develop a definite view of the field of scientific interest (i.e., aspect of reality) in question. In other words, all scientific ventures provide a concomitant "scientific world-view" that all members share, thus effectively closing the ranks of the scientific community. Members become experts following their study of examples that the "alliance" regards as indicative of how science should be practised. Practitioners are unanimous in their interpretation of their field of study. They are appreciative of one another's contributions and attach the same meanings to the same phenomena.

Not only do chosen exemplars suggest the questions that are to be answered; even the types of solutions themselves are implied. There is no need for members of the scientific community to produce "new" and "unfamiliar" factual or theoretical data. Under these tranquil and unproblematic circumstances the pursuit of science continues without turmoil and interruption.

Yet, it does happen that misgivings regarding existing theories arise, or that exceptions to the rule are discovered that produce new facts and theories, or refute old ones. When such anomalies arise, theories not compatible with established perceptions are amended and accommodated to the matrix. However, if persistent attempts at reconstructing an existing matrix, or reconciling anomalies with established theories prove futile, the emergence of a new and more adequate disciplinary matrix is inevitable. Should new theories prove to be totally contradictory to, and entirely at variance with accepted views, a "scientific crisis", and eventually a "scientific revolution" with its attending *Gestalt switch*, follows.

Despite any loss of validity and concomitant authority by a disciplinary matrix, members will not abandon it, unless an adequate and well-defined alternative is available. In sum, the continued pursuit of science is entirely dependent on the existence of a matrix that can successfully account for all recorded anomalies.

The emergence of a new disciplinary matrix implies a fundamentally modernized and redesigned view of a particular field of scientific investigation. It, therefore, also involves new scientific values, altered exemplars, redesigned models, up-to-date generalizations and a "modernized" and adequate scientific idiom. Communication with adherents to the "antiquated" and obsolete matrix becomes problematic at first, and eventually impossible.

Contrary to the positivist idea regarding the “rationality” of scientific development, Kuhn maintains that the choice of a new disciplinary matrix is entirely irrational: “Proselytes” are “converted”, not by logical argument, but by preferences, attitudes, convictions, as well as other non-rational conditions, situations and factors.

That the scope of Kuhn’s concept of disciplinary matrices is not so inclusive as to embrace concepts like ideology, world-view, philosophy, philosophy of the special sciences and the like, is clear. At most, one can describe it as an encompassing scientific theory that is composed of features directly related to the practical pursuit of a modally qualified special science.

3.3 Preparatory remarks on philosophy and philosophy of the special sciences

In terms of a positivist stance, the special sciences (mathematics, physics, biology, psychology, history, sociology, economics and the like) should avoid meticulously all metaphysical obfuscation of scientific interpretations. Philosophy is regarded as essentially foreign to the practice of the so-called “sciences”. However, the positivist precondition that scientific interpretation remain restricted to the description of “facts” alone, is repudiated by the demand that all scientific explications should be as comprehensive and complete as possible. It should, therefore, provide for the *interpretation* of facts as well. For, during their scientific investigations, exponents of the special sciences frequently come to grips with problems that cannot be solved from the limited and limiting (modal) perspectives of these special sciences. Questions relating to the presuppositions with which the special sciences (inevitably, and either explicitly, or by implication) operate, encompass issues like order, law and structure (constant/ variable; order/orderliness; law for/law conformity of); universality and individuality; diversity and coherence of meaning; origin and destination; nature of knowledge and science; unity and diversity; relation whole-parts; being and becoming; etc. These questions that obviously transcend all modal boundaries, have to be cleared up satisfactorily for the sake of respectable and adequate scientific performance and achievement.

All the problems listed above clearly transcend both the scope and competence of the special sciences themselves. Being, per definition, restricted to a modal perspective, the special sciences are all unqualified for and incapable of providing an all-embracing and integral view of reality. Yet, a totality perspective regarding reality is the precondition for an adequate theory regarding the relationship between the constant (“order

for") and the variable ("orderliness of"), also within the scope of a special science. Any attempt at solving these questions from the (modal) perspective of a special science, will inevitably result in a reductionist interpretation, where reality as a whole is accounted for in terms of a limited and essentially restricted outlook.

Philosophers themselves seldom undertake philosophic reflection on the presuppositions of the different special (natural as well as cultural) sciences as such. This is, and justly so, the concern and responsibility of exponents of the various philosophies of the special sciences. Exponents of the philosophies of the special sciences are in reality expert scientists with a special sensitivity for the actuality and demand of a philosophical perspective on matters related to their special fields of scientific investigation.

Similarly, exponents of the different philosophies of the special sciences literally bridge the gap that exists between purely scientific problems and the more embracing philosophical questions that scientists should, in turn, account for against the background of the realm of presuppositions underlying modern thinking. This would imply that there are two classes of scientists: On the one hand, a scientist may be fully aware of the presuppositions that undergird his/her own scientific exposition of reality, and can account for them in a genuinely critical fashion. Such a scientist can be said to exhibit a "philosophic perspective". On the other, the scientist can be the unwitting and uncritical "victim" of presuppositions that directly influence his/her scientific account of reality without his/her actually being aware of them (cf. Strauss, 1978).

3.4 The nature of philosophy

On closer scrutiny, it becomes clear that no philosophy of a special science can adequately clarify problems relating to any special science without the support of some or other comprehensive philosophical viewpoint from which it draws its deeper meaning.

Unlike the various special sciences that all involve the scientific-logical (as distinct from a pre-scientific or naïve-logical) explication of relevant features of some or other individual entity, concrete event, situation, activity, societal relationship or modal aspect of reality, philosophy provides a perspective on the cosmic interrelatedness and coherence of phenomena and their various "modes" of existence.

Exponents of Christian philosophy have always contended that one of the primary objectives of philosophy is the theoretical clarification of the relationship between the universal and the particular, i.e., between the

order for the existence of entities, events, societal relationships, etc. and the *orderliness* of such entities, events, societal relationships and the like. The expression of this fundamental (transcendental) idea regarding the relationship between “law” and “law conformity” is the primary requisite for the practice of science, be it the various special sciences or philosophy. This idea is formulated by the philosopher against the background of extra-scientific presuppositions that pertain to our most profound convictions concerning the meaning and origin of reality.

Inter alia, philosophy endeavours to account for a theory regarding the dimension of modal aspects, including the divergent nature of basic concepts employed by the various special sciences (thus accounting for, for instance, the difference between “growth” (development) in its original biotic sense and analogies like “moral growth”, “economic growth”, “cultural development”, etc.); a theory regarding the dimension of entity structures that allows for the identification of the different phenomena, events, societal relationships, etc., their mutual interrelatedness, as well as fields of competence and concomitant relative authority; cultural and social issues (cf. the tension between technocracy and revolutionary social theory) and their solution; a coherent philosophical anthropology that transcends and embraces all modally specified and restricted anthropologies that are accounted for in terms of the special sciences (e.g., physical, biological, psychological, social, theological, educational, medical, etc. anthropologies), as well as philosophical-ethical questions relating to human existence; and an adequate epistemology in terms of which questions relating to the acquisition of knowledge, the suppositions and boundaries of scientific knowledge, the requisites for scientific communication and the like are accounted for.

From the exposition above, it becomes clear that considerations and deliberations of “more-than-logical” (i.e., cosmological) nature predominate the “domain” of philosophical and closely related fields of interest (philosophies of the special sciences). Even at this initial stage of our enquiry, the influence exerted by the “domain” of presuppositions (and notably ideology) on the eventual practice of science, must be evident.

3.5 World-view

All questions addressed by philosophy originate in our non-scientific experience of reality. These questions, relating to our deepest and most profound convictions, are accounted for philosophically in a “distantial” [[In the sense of *Gegenstand*]], but nevertheless integral and cohesive, fashion. As such, *world-view* (view of life and the world) is the embodiment or concretisation of not only the ideological commitments of

a community, but also its ethos, that is – itself – the consequence of a specific basic motivating force in the sense mentioned above. Though the outcome of deep and sincere reflection on reality and practical life experiences, world-view is neither systematic nor scientific in nature. It is spontaneous, fully practical, incidental, and formulated in non-scientific terms. In essence it represents a perspective regarding the origin, value, deepest meaning and final destination of the human race and the world. This view of human life and the world is characterized by its essentially integral nature. It furnishes us with a coherent and all-inclusive interpretation of reality, i.e., a comprehensive perspective of the world and the place of men and women in it. As such, it serves as a “frame of reference” in terms of which (1) we come to self-knowledge (Who am I? What is my place and function in this world?), and which allows for (2) the identification of and orientation to normative guidelines for our daily conduct in literally all avenues of human existence.

These views that concern matters of decisive importance to ordinary people, not only allow for their general comprehension of daily experiences and events. They also transmit conviction and confidence regarding anticipated actions under different circumstances and in ever changing situations. In this way *certainty* and *security* are introduced into the lives of ordinary men and women. Small wonder, then, that religious convictions play such an important role in the formulation of this all-encompassing view of human existence (cf. Troost, 1983:113).

A view of life and the world cannot be “transferred”, as it were, from one person to another. Every human being accepts it as a normative framework that directs individual behaviour. Acceptance of a definite view of life and the world is, therefore, a highly personal affair and is – undeniably – directly related, via the *ethos* of a specific community, personal faith and worship, to the deepest and most profound motivating forces behind human conduct, viz. the *basic driving motives* that undergird all human aspirations and actions.

Because of its relationship with the ethos of a community, any view of life and the world is essentially community-related. Therefore, it not only touches the “hearts” of individual persons, but motivates entire communities. And as the individual person’s view of life and the world is intimately interwoven, not only with those of other persons, but especially with the world-view of the community in question, a commonly shared world-view provides stability for individual men and women in so far as existing values and objectives of a community are validated. This collective sharing of an all-encompassing interpretation of reality and the place of men and women in it, promotes solidarity, agreement and

compatibility among all members of a community, thereby significantly reducing the potential for internal tension and conflict.

Dooyeweerd offers the following concise explication that highlights the intimate relationship between life- and world-view and philosophy: “A life- and world-view is not individualistic, but truly social in origin. It is *ex-originé* the common conviction, subjected to the norm of full truth, of a human community bound together by a central religious motive” (1953:164; cf. also *mutatis mutandis* Mannheim, 1972:2,30ff). As, in the final analysis, philosophy also emanates from a religious basic motive that impels a specific *philosophic community of thought*, it can never exist in isolation from a definite view of life and the world. However, whereas life- and world-view is essentially “concrete” in its tone, style and intent, philosophy is strictly theoretical in nature. But, notwithstanding this fundamental difference, they influence one another mutually. This means that subtle social bias and intolerance (as becomes evident in ideological interpretations of matters relating to, especially, race, gender, class, faith etc.), may well exercise a harmful and distorting influence on both. Critical reflection on all elements and properties of various views of life and the world is the responsibility of philosophy, for whereas a certain view of life and the world stimulates the philosopher to critical self-reflection, there the former should come to theoretical clarity via the endeavours of the philosopher: “In root, making mutual appeal to each other, they, nevertheless, should remain sharply distinguished, each according to its own task and essential character” (Dooyeweerd, 1953:165).

Thus the domination and pressure brought to bear by *ideology* and its introduction of slanted and prejudiced perspectives and categories as features of a specific view of life and the world will be decisive for the ultimate shaping of the everyday conjectures, convictions and judgements of ordinary folk. The final concretisation of an encompassing, non-scientific view of life and the world, is in this way regulated by ideology, that – as such – is also regulated by ultimate presuppositions embodied in the ethos of a community, and this ethos originates – in the final instance – from the idea we have regarding the deepest origin of all things, behind which no deeper origin can be conceived meaningfully.

4. The ultimate depth dimension of human behaviour

4.1 Preparatory observations regarding the ethos of a community

Underlying, but also partly controlling and directing human pre-meditation, are inherited dispositions (dominant traits of character) that

exert their influence on human conduct. But, apart from, and at a significantly deeper level than these dispositions, are the various philosophical explications of reality, and underpinning these, the collective world-view of a community, directly controlled by subtle nuances of ideological origin, and even more profound motivational forces, amongst them, the human ethos (cf. Troost, 1959:372ff, 1983:108; also Mannheim, 1972:49-50,51). This "mentality" of individual persons and communities is a "basic layer" or "border area", and anthropologically (i.e., not chronologically) the first phase of expression of the human ego (selfhood) in concrete actions. As such the human ethos is a basic motivational force that concentrates all possible motivations and desires into one unified force that impels our actions, directing, regulating and "urging them on" (Troost, 1983:109). Because of its encompassing nature it determines, not only every aspect, facet, sector or function of human life, but also human society, thereby displaying its supra-individual, essentially social nature (cf. Troost, 1983:110; Mannheim, 1972:2,30ff, 49-53; Eby & Arrowood, 1949:589).

As human activities, except for reflex actions, are guided and regulated by normative perceptions, it is clear that premeditation plays an important part in human behaviour. The conduct of the responsible human being is preceded by "inward" contemplation and evaluation ("inner acts"). Therefore, human actions can be regarded as *intentional*, thus rendering every human being *accountable* in the strongest possible sense. The very nature of these normative perceptions seems to suggest an extra-logical "domain" of suppositions: Normative behaviour is not always an exclusively logical matter, but more often than not involves premeditation based on faith, trust, conviction, commitment and the like, all of extra- and supra-logical origin.

Ethos emanates from the most profound convictions that are held by individual persons as well as communities (cf. Eby and Arrowood, 1949:587; Troost, 1959:372, 1983:108). These deepest convictions and suppositions are, via the ethos, reflected in ideologies, world-views, philosophies, scientific certainties and scientific interpretations of naïve experience. Should any basic motivational power possess, latently, an inherent tendency to overestimate anything that is part of our material world, the stage is set for the entrance of ideology, i.e., the deification (absolutization) of something that relates to temporal reality, and attendant reductionist interpretations of the latter.

Absolutization and its concomitant reductionisms that so often characterize scientific findings and statements, and are – on their part –

introduced via the underlying philosophical presuppositions, all relate, by way of the human ethos, to convictions and certainties that are latent in and characteristic of some or other *central driving motive*. As ethos is, itself, regulated by the basic driving forces that influence human actions, it has a relatively constant and durable nature. Troost (1983:110) uses the following image to explain: On the surface of the ocean, the water is turbulent and astir. But on descending into the depths of the ocean, this turbulence becomes less conspicuous until, at great depths, there is no perceptible movement at all. Prevailing winds blow the water masses on the surface in a certain direction, thus producing currents that display a discernible consistency of direction. While the waves on the surface may move in any direction they are blown by regional storms, the main current of the total mass of water moves constantly in the same direction, irresistibly sweeping with it the turbulent waters on the surface. In the same way, human life displays a certain constancy (ethos) that is not necessarily visible in literally every perfunctory (mechanical) activity, but notwithstanding gives a clear-cut and unequivocal direction to human life in its totality. In other words, underpinning the ever-changing activities of humans, there is a deeper influence that is of a much more consistent and continuous nature. Because of its great latitude and depth, this constant “stream” of the human ethos may encompass “centuries, groups of nations” and, in the case of individual persons, “an entire human life” (Troost, 1983:110). In this way one can, probably with justification, even speak of the ethos of cultures (like the ethos of Greek antiquity, of the Middle Ages, of Western civilization, Eastern civilization, modern humanism, a Roman Catholic ethos, a Protestant ethos, also of an African ethos, an Afrikaner ethos and the like) (cf. Eby & Arrowood, 1949:589).

4.2 The central driving motives in the history of Western culture

4.2.1 Preliminary remarks

That there must be a subtle and fundamental relationship between the “meta-dimension” (i.e., ethos, ideology, world-view, philosophy, philosophy of the special sciences and even the various disciplinary matrices) of non-scientific human thinking, as well as all scientific thought, and the most profound forces that shape culture, is clear from the outset (cf. Mannheim, 1972:50-51,52,69). Especially *ethos* is of an intrinsically *religious* nature (*religion* is here understood, not in the – modally restricted – sense of *faith* or *worship* that relate to the meaning nucleus of the *pistic function* of humans, but in the *supra-modal* sense of “in a bond” [*re* = again + *ligo*, *ligare* = to bind] with either the true, or a supposed

archè [origin] of temporal reality, cf. Dooyeweerd, 1953:55,57,60ff; Troost, 1983:110-112).

In the history of Western communities, four great *cultural mainsprings* have been identified. They are considered to have, over the past 3000 years, underpinned and regulated the formation of culture, and thereby all human thought, including every ideology (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1949, 1953, 1955, 1957, 1963). These *most fundamental steering powers* of Western culture are, chronologically,

the profane (pagan) central motive of ancient Greek culture, designated by Aristotle as that of *matter and form*;

the consecrated (divine) biblical motive of *creation, sin and redemption*;

the dualistic (accommodation) motive of *nature and grace* introduced into medieval philosophy and theology by Thomas Aquinas, and maintained in both modern scholasticism and "reformational" scholasticism;

the secularized (irreligious) motive of modern humanism, designated by Kant as that of *nature and freedom*.

4.2.2 *The matter-form motive of pagan Greek culture*

The ultimate driving principle behind all forms of ancient Greek thought was the dualistic motive of *matter* and *form* (Dooyeweerd, 1949; 1953:61). The origin of this dichotomy was the tension that existed between two, directly opposing and clashing religions. The oldest religion was the ancient and traditional conception of the *physis* (nature, matter), i.e., the eternally flowing stream of life, from which all being and existence was supposed to have emerged and to which it would eventually return after death. This pagan religion focused on, and emphasized chaotic matter, i.e., *nature* and the *vital* (natural) *forces* of life. The second religion, of a later period, highlighted human *cultural activities*, i.e., *order, form* and *harmony* (as symbolized by the Olympian gods).

Plato tried to accommodate these two conflicting motivating principles by maintaining that the "order-creating" (creational) activities of the form-giving demiurge, i.e., divine Reason, were completely dependent on chaotic matter, the existence (pre-existence) of which was in no way dependent on the former. In this later religion, the immortal, rational principle of *form* that transcended both the stream of life (*physis*) and chaotic matter, was deified. On his part, Aristotle alleged that the natural world was a unification or blending of these two principles, viz. *matter* (*hyle*) and *form* (*morphe*): Pure matter (*hyle*) did not account for the

individuality of things, but was essentially the same for all beings. The fundamental differences between inanimate substances, plants, animals and humans were related to dissimilarities in “form” that accounted for the individual character (*morphe*) of diverse things (cf. Kalsbeek, 1975:62-63).

4.2.3 *The biblical motivating principle of creation, sin and redemption*

The essence of the biblical basic motive for human life is that of creation, fall and redemption through Christ in communion with the Holy Spirit (Dooyeweerd, 1953:60-61; Kalsbeek, 1975:63; cf., however, Leatt, *et al.*, 1989:301). In terms of this motive, it is clear that, *per definition*, a purely Christian culture and society, the result of an unimpaired Christian principle does not and cannot exist in this broken reality. Yet, despite this impediment, the Christian regulating principle, concentrated in the *central commandment of love* for God and fellow humans, constitutes the unvitiated ultimate ideal for a life of devotion for every believer.

The biblical notion of creation is the direct antipode, the exact opposite of the dualistic matter-form motive of pagan Greek thought (cf. Kalsbeek, 1975:63). In terms of the Revelation, God is the sole and absolute Origin (*Arché*) of existing reality. No other force or reality with a being of its own existed apart of him when he created human persons (not things) in his image, as well as the temporal world of things we live in. Between God and the creatures bearing his likeness there existed, from the beginning, a deep and closely knit fellowship. This “intimate bond of fellowship” (Kalsbeek, 1975:64) centres in the deepest core of human life, designated in Holy Scriptures as the human “heart”, and understood – in terms of Oriental imagery – as the “selfhood” or *ego* of the human being (never to be confused with the corporeal pumping organ in the human body!), and from which springs literally all the “issues of life” (*Proverbs* 4:23). The implication of this intimate relationship between Creator and creature is that human formation of culture is supposed to be the development of the latent potentialities in nature to the glory of God, the benefit of humankind and the protection and safekeeping of nature itself, ever in accordance with the central commandment of love.

The fall into apostasy of humankind (and with humankind, all of temporal reality, of which the meaning is disclosed by human cultural activity), meant a radical “turning away from God in disobedience” (Kalsbeek, 1975:64). It heralded the emergence of the apostate belief in human autonomy, as well as a “re-direction” of human allegiance from the true Origin to idols (irrespective of whether they are ancient or modern), and

the radical corruption of human relationships (with the Origin, fellow humans, as well as the world we live in). Kalsbeek explains as follows: "Intimate fellowship with God spells life for man; disrupting that fellowship brings death, not biotic or physical but spiritual death" (1975:64).

Unlike the Greek *matter-form* motive, there is no dualism in this view of human decline into apostasy. Sin is no manifestation of an "independent principle of origin existing over against the Creator". It merely produces "a false relationship to God". It does not exist independently of God, for "if there were no God, there could be no sin" (Kalsbeek, 1975:64).

The actuality and all-inclusive compass of our fall into apostasy is proven in everyday human relationships. As human society developed and differentiated, an anti-normative tendency on the part of humankind suspended the initial harmony that existed between Creator and creation, the mutual accord among humans themselves, as well as that between humans and their natural environment. It therefore adversely affected all human formation of culture.

However, despite the detrimental consequences of human apostasy, it altered neither the divine principles that regulate human action, nor the basic order of creation, i.e., the various aspects of reality that determine the nature of humankind or temporal institutions:

"Thus a stone falls just as it did before sin entered creation, and God's command to love is still valid. Yet sin prevails, because man uses for evil what God has given him for good. Sin has not disturbed the logical laws for thinking, but fallen man misuses his thinking in an often very subtle way to get ahead at his neighbour's expense ... Sin has not destroyed man's faith function but diverted man's faith away from the Creator toward something creaturely. Sin does not create the colossal forces latent in the atom, nor does sin prompt men to unleash those forces. But sin does prompt him to turn those forces to a wrong use, until he loses control of the satanic effects that follow" (Kalsbeek, 1975:65).

The redemption of Christ in communion with the Holy Spirit was as total and all encompassing as humankind's fall into apostasy. Through regeneration the apostate human selfhood is "re-directed" to the true Origin, and this again allows for the "full renewal of creation" and "fellowship with God" (Kalsbeek, 1975:65). As the original relationship between humankind and its Creator has been blemished by sin, regeneration does not mean a life without strife for the Christian. On the contrary, every day brings a renewed struggle against the tribulations of

sin, and to obey the central commandment of love becomes an obstacle that can only be overcome through the grace of the Lord. Indeed, it is – per definition – only in the heart of the Christian that the battle between the Light and the darkness is waged. Kalsbeek calls this “a struggle with uneven successes”, for “only at the end of the age will God be all in all” and will “every breach be healed and all discord disappear” (1975:65). Small wonder that the positive influence that Christians are supposed to have on life is seldom as powerful as the negative influence exerted by apostasy. Yet, the consequence of sin would have been even more devastating, had it not been curbed by God’s common (conserving) grace, rooted in Jesus Christ: “God causes his sun to rise upon the evil and the good, and he gives gifts and talents to both believers and unbelievers”, so that “traces of the light of God’s power, goodness, truth, righteousness and beauty can still shine everywhere, even in cultures directed away from God” (Kalsbeek, 1975:66).

4.2.4 *The accommodation motive of nature and grace*

The theoretical synthesis between Aristotelian philosophy and the Christian religion resulted in another mainspring of Western culture, viz. that of *nature* and *grace* (Dooyeweerd, 1953:65ff; cf. Kalsbeek, 1975:63). It would appear as though the celebrated medieval scholar, Thomas Aquinas, was not over-sensitive to the fact that the ancient Greek motive of *matter* and *form* was the outcome of pagan religious assumptions and in all respects totally antithetic to, and entirely irreconcilable with a biblical interpretation of creation: On the one hand he tried to “christianise” ancient Greek philosophy (especially Aristotelianism) and thereby to accommodate it in Christian thought. On the other he accommodated Christian principles with Aristotelian concepts by using them in unbiblical connotations (cf. for instance his treatment of “body” and “soul” as commensurate with the Greek *psyche* and *soma*) (cf. Thomas, 1952, I:378ff).

In his *Summa Theologica* the adage: “*gratiae perficit naturam*” is echoed in a variety of contexts. In his propositions on so-called natural (*lex naturalis* = Aristotelian philosophy) and Scriptural (*lex aeterna* = Holy Scriptures) “theologies” (1952, I:12), Thomas maintains that “faith presupposes natural knowledge, even as grace presupposes nature, and perfection supposes something that can be perfected” (1952, I:12). In very much the same tenor, his anthropological theses (1952, I:378ff) are controlled by the same principle: The human being is composed of two essentially different (and dissimilar) substances, viz. the mortal, corporeal

(material) body (*nature* – related to the Greek motive of matter), and a *donum superadditum*, viz. the immortal (incorporeal) rational and spiritual soul (*grace* – related to the Aristotelian principle of rational form) (1952, I:378-379, 385, 388, 393-399), that moreover distinguishes human beings from animals (1952, I:380).

The basis of Thomist epistemology is also dualistic in nature: Apart from a realm of "higher truths" (Revelation, church, theology, Christian dogma) related to God's grace and not attainable via human reason, a realm of "natural reason" is postulated. This latter (neutral and autonomous) domain of (profane) science is taken to be as authentic and as valid as that relating to the realm of "higher" truths of the Christian faith. Like philosophy, the special sciences require only the light of "natural" reason, for all scientific results are the consequences of "autonomous" human reason. *Nature* and *grace* are not regarded as antagonistic realms. According to this line of thought, science (the imperfect consequence of human reason) lays the foundation for the realm of grace, while the latter "perfects", as it were, the former (cf. 1952, I:12ff).

Eventually, Thomistic social theory, too, is torn asunder by this stark and irresolvable dualism: The natural spheres of human society are "perfected" by a supra-natural sacramental *additum* via the church (1952, II:858ff, esp. Articles 2 & 3).

4.2.5 *The nature-freedom motive of modern secularized humanism*

The eventual secularization of the "Christian" component of the accommodation motive of *nature* and *grace*, resulted in the third great motivating force of Western thought and culture, viz. that of *nature* and *freedom* (Dooyeweerd, 1953:63). The essence of this driving force is to be found in the postulate of human autonomy and freedom, and the struggle for complete determination of nature by autonomous humankind. Human reason, as is manifested in science (and more specifically the natural sciences) was seen as the ultimate "origin" (explanation) of the natural environment and interpretation of natural phenomena. Human domination over this natural world is expressed in the "drive to analyse nature in order to master it" (Kalsbeek, 1975:63). And as it was believed that human understanding of reality amounted to only (mechanistic) physical analysis, the realization of human freedom was initially sought in the direction of the natural sciences.

Yet, ironically enough, by understanding the world in terms of mechanistic physical (natural) laws only, human freedom was forfeited in

principle. Similarly, human existence could be understood only as completely determined by external agencies; the mere consequence of natural causes. This *impasse* and fundamental contradiction was theoretically “solved” by Kant’s postulate of two self-sufficient and unconnected “domains” of *nature* (phenomena and their scientific explication) and *freedom* (ethics and human autonomy) (cf. Kant, 1975:490-492), that is, the secularized remainder of the motive of grace of scholastic thought.

Viewed against this background, it becomes clear that, ultimately, human thought, aspirations, interpretations of natural and cultural phenomena and eventual actions, whether of pre-scientific or scientific nature, are either consciously or unconsciously determined and directed by a combination of elements associated with these profound impelling forces that are, themselves, irreversibly related to some idea of either the true Origin, or a supposed (pretended) origin.

The very choice of a supposedly uncommitted starting-point for scientific enterprise is, itself, an act of total commitment involving not merely the logical activities of the ego of a person. As the human ego is of neither a purely logical, purely psychical, purely ethical, purely social, purely cultural, etc. nature, but essentially multi-dimensional, the positing of a neutral, exclusively rational act is therefore certainly not a purely rational matter: Human faith in Reason is entirely irrational and committed in the strongest sense of the word. The idea of a so-called “pure reason” is nothing but a theoretical abstraction. It is the consequence of human commitment to deeper motivational forces, i.e., the nature-freedom motive of secularized humanity.

5. Perspective

Basic driving forces or *ground motives* refer to prevailing supra-modal principles to which is appealed when other (modal) norms are identified and verified. As has transpired in the previous paragraph, attempts at the authentication and validation of norms appeal to an idea of an origin, i.e., the origin of truth and of acceptable norms. This regulative principle is related under all circumstances to either the true Origin or a supposed, pretended, imagined origin of all things. For the Christian, the Origin is God, the Creator of all reality; for the sceptic and the disbeliever, this pretended origin of all truth is the autonomous Reason of the emancipated human being who is *a law unto him/herself*.

It would appear as though the basic driving forces mentioned above, have neither a natural predilection, nor a peculiar preference for any particular

ideology. This is illustrated by the unquestionable state of affairs that the objectives of ideological antagonists like capitalists and communists are more often than not interpreted in terms of central principles that derive from the very same basic driving force, namely that of, on the one hand, the ideal of *unrestricted scientific control*, and on the other the ideal of the *free human personality*. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same can be said of, for instance, the interpretation of the essence of the Christian doctrine (viz. the central commandment of love) by ideologically opposing stances like reactionary adherents to the ideology of national survival and supporters of liberalism, or of revolution.

This perspective is of major importance for our assessment of the true nature of ideology. The disparate application of the same central principles by conflicting groups strongly suggests that ideology, as such, does not represent the most profound driving force(s) in human life. In other words, ideology is clearly not the origin of the basic principles mentioned above, but much rather the source of conflicting interpretations and practical implementation of the latter. It is clear that the "origin" to which the final appeal regarding validation is made, transcends ideology as such. This origin of an indubitably supra-ideological nature, relates to the realm of the basic cultural powers that have been operative in all human societies (*i.c.* Western society) since the beginning of time.

As has been mentioned in passing earlier, every scientist, either explicitly, or by implication, has to relate to an idea of an origin: Any attempt at verification involves an appeal to some or other norm that is held to be true. The last and ultimate appeal regarding truth as such, is to the origin (*archè*) of truth. This means that every scientist chooses a vantage point from which an adequate, authentic and legitimate/valid theoretical perspective of reality can be acquired. This perspective includes an idea regarding the modal diversity of meaning, and is the prerequisite for the identification of that particular (modal) part of reality that is to be scientifically accounted for. Without doubt, every logical theory (scientific activity) departs from an *a priori* cosmological (ontological) idea regarding the diversity of meaning, on the basis of which the special science in question is identified and distinguished from other scientific fields of research. This cosmological idea regarding the cosmic diversity of meaning is obviously of a pre-logical (pre-scientific) nature, and "impregnated" with extra- and supra-logical *assumptions*. In this way, not even the most austere scientist is ever exempt from meta-scientific commitments (cf. Bloch, 1972:78,98).

Human ideas, images and interpretations are, therefore, indissolubly related to the deepest (most profound) *driving* (motivating) *forces* that

regulate not only the thoughts and actions of persons, but also the *ethos* of communities and define their historical (cultural) situation and contingencies. For this very reason, the present actions of peoples, as well as their exploits during different periods in history can be interpreted adequately only against the background of the *central mainsprings* or *motivating forces* that regulate (or regulated) their respective historico-cultural situations.

Thus it may be concluded that every deeper, more profound “force” – in the sense of “*Leitmotif*” – regulates not only the ethos of various communities, but to boot all ideologies, world-views, philosophical systems and even the practice of the various special sciences. The “pin-pointing” of such regulating driving motives will indubitably simplify, amongst others, the appraisal of each ideology by referring it to the principles latent in the specific basic driving motive that underscores it. This means that the prevailing ideals and ultimate aspirations of peoples, as well as their interpretations of reality, all relate to some or other commonly held idea of an origin (*archè*). And as it has become evident that ideologies do not develop in a void, it is clear that they evolve in accordance with the demands, dictates and impositions of the *ultimate driving* (motivating) *forces* that bind them to some or other *archè*, thus revealing their “archaeological” roots.

At this stage of our enquiry, an important question that presents itself, is the following: By what standard(s)/criteria can the (relative) truth/falsehood of presuppositions underlying ideologies be determined? So, for example, it is clear from the outset that the conviction that proletarian consciousness is true *per definition*, rests on a mere *postulate*. It is an assumption that cannot be proven, as it is essentially unverifiable. It relates to the *realm of presuppositions* that underpins the Marxist ideology, namely the motivating force of *nature* and *freedom*.

The ultimate criterion in determining the truth or falsehood of ideologies is the following: When they are weighed, ideologies will have to be judged against the background of their respective *criteria of truth*, i.e., the supra-modal principle(s) to which they appeal, and in terms of which other (modal) norms are authenticated. In the final analysis, all such attempts at verification appeal to the *idea of an origin*. This regulative principle (in terms of which the truth/ falsehood of norms are determined), on its part, is ultimately related to the true (or a supposed) Origin of all truth. In the case of the sceptic and disbeliever, this origin will be the (supposed) autonomous human Reason (*Ratio*). For the Christian, through Christ, it will be the Creator of all things. Ultimately, also the verity of conceptions

regarding truth/falsehood depends upon an appeal to norms that – in the final analysis – appeal to an *archè*, i.e., the true (or *supposed*) Origin of truth.

Along these lines, we will most probably discover the standards that are employed to ascertain why the majority regard only certain ideologies as examples of “false consciousness”, while they will be inclined to vindicate their own.

In terms of a Christian understanding, the religious relationship that exists between creatures and their Creator (I-Thou relationship) is understood as the *primary* relationship that encompasses all individual human beings, as well as all societies of human beings. This I-Thou relationship is of a *transcendent* – that is – supra-modal nature. All other (modally qualified) human relationships have a secondary status in comparison to the former, and are subordinate to the primary relationship between humankind and its Creator. This implies that the *central commandment of love* is the one and only *regulating principle* in the life of the Christian. Like the I-Thou relationship, this principle of love and compassion is also of supra-modal compass. All remaining human activities of a modal scope are therefore – without exception – subjected to and regulated by this all-encompassing principle. In other words, the *central commandment of love* should permeate literally all modally qualified and limited human actions, endeavours, the formation of culture, as well as all societal relationships. As regulating principle for all human cultural activities, the *central commandment of love* is of a *radical, central* and *total* nature: It is *radical* because it lays claim to the religious “root” of humankind, i.e., the human *ego* (selfhood); it is *central* because, by virtue of its relation to the human selfhood, all human activities come together (are converged or concentrated) in this religious selfhood; finally, it is *total* because it encompasses all human activities, thereby focusing all human functions – via the selfhood that is religiously bound in Christ – on the Creator of all things cf. Strauss, 1989:14ff).

Apart from this all-encompassing relationship in which humankind is bound in Christ, humans are also involved in a number of temporal societal relationships (state, church, family, educational institution, business enterprise, etc.) that evolved (differentiated) during the course of our cultural development, and are essentially *co-equal*, i.e., of equal worth and significance. However, none of these co-equal relationships of a *secondary order* can ever produce, in the true sense of the word, a regulating principle to direct all facets of human life. These temporal relationships co-exist on the basis of total equality: None is inferior or

subservient to any other; each is guaranteed its rightful place beside the rest. Every one is of a (modally) limited nature. The postulation of an all-encompassing societal relationship (like, e.g., the nation, or state) is untenable. Only by way of absolutization can any of these temporal relationships (illegitimately) come to be considered as all encompassing, in the sense of enveloping all walks of human life.

Nation, state, church and other human relationships reflect the essential diversity of created reality and belong to the temporal sphere of human life. Their particular influence and competence are restricted to specific modes of human activities (state = jurisprudence, church = faith, business enterprise = economy, family = temporal love, etc.).

Unlike the primary religious relationship in which we are bound in Christ, all temporal human relationships are of a *differentiated, peripheral* and *partial* nature. They are

differentiated because they represent a number of co-equal configurations (embodiments) of the primary and central, all-encompassing relationship which exists between humans and Christ; they are –

peripheral because none of these relationships can (except by way of absolutization) ever occupy a dominating position in human society; lastly, these relationships are of a

partial nature because, according to their specialized competence and functions, each represents but a part (albeit a very special and significant part) of reality as a whole (cf. Strauss, 1989:15-17, 20-22, 115).

Merely to suggest that the demands of any temporal relationship can be regulative for the on-going development of culture, society, morality or whatever, would constitute a serious misinterpretation of the Christian doctrine. [[Kalsbeek (1975:66) emphasizes that the preceding is not the result of theological research. If it had been, this line of thinking would have been based on debatable conclusions of theological reflection. The revelation of God in Scriptures touches every human soul, and not only theologians: The biblical driving force of *creation, sin* and *redemption* is a “fundamental biblical given”, and – as such – not the outcome, but the very foundation of all theology. Moreover, only if we accept that God’s Word influences the human “heart” (spirit) directly, can we recognize and appreciate the proper role of theological reflection in the ongoing explication of the biblical ground motive.]]

In sum, the difference between basic driving forces and ideology is, then, the following: Whereas basic driving forces are of a *radical, central* and

total, i.e., supra-modal nature and relate to perceptions regarding the most basic (elementary) structures of reality (cf. Mannheim, 1972:50 note), ideology remains restricted to reductionist absolutization, thereby displaying an essentially *idolatry, partial, peripheral* and *differentiated* character (cf. Leatt, et. al., 1989:301; Mannheim, 1972:49-50,54). For this reason ideologies are, without exception, dogmatically sealed, enslaving, ambiguous, mystifying and obfuscating in nature (cf. Leatt, 1989:301). They misapply the essences of supra-modal cultural forces for their own purposes, are essentially authoritarian, and the cause of tension, hostility and strife among people.

Bibliography

- ALMEIDA, O.T. 1981. *The concept of ideology. A critical analysis*. Michigan: Brown University.
- BHOLA, H.S. 1992. A model of evaluation planning, implementation and management: toward a 'culture of information' within organizations. In: *International Review of Education*, 38(2): 103-115.
- BLOCH, E. 1972. *Pädagogica*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- BOUDON, R. 1989. *The analysis of ideology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- DOOYEWEERD, H. 1949. *Reformatie en Scholastiek in de wijsbegeerte. Het Griekse voorspel*. Book I. Franeker: Wever.
- DOOYEWEERD, H. 1953. *A new critique of theoretical thought*, Vol. I. Philadelphia (USA): Presbyterian & Reformed Publishers.
- DOOYEWEERD, H. 1955. *A new critique of theoretical thought*, Vol. II. Philadelphia (USA): Presbyterian & Reformed Publishers.
- DOOYEWEERD, H. 1957. *A new critique of theoretical thought*, Vol. III. Philadelphia (USA): Presbyterian & Reformed Publishers.
- DOOYEWEERD, H. 1963. *Vernieuwing en bezinning om het reformatorisch grondmotief*. Zuphten: Van den Brink.
- EBY, F. & ARROWOOD, C.F. 1949. *The history and philosophy of education: Ancient and medieval*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- GRIEDER, A. 1992. "Ideologie" – Unbegriffenes an einem Abgegriffenen Begriff. In: Salamun, K. *Ideologien und Ideologiekritik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- HABERMAS, J. 1971. *Knowledge and human interests*. Boston: Beacon.
- HALL, S, LUMLEY, B. & MCLELLAN, G. 1978. "Politics and ideology: Gramsci". In: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. *On ideology*. London: Hutchinson.
- KALSBECK, L. 1975. *Contours of a Christian philosophy*. Toronto: Wedge.
- KANT, I. 1975. *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, Zweiter Teil. In: *Werke* IV. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

- KUHN, T.S. 1962. *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: Urbana/ London: University of Illinois Press.
- KUHN, T.S. 1969. Second thoughts on paradigms. In: Suppe, F., *The structure of scientific theories*. Urbana/ London: University of Illinois Press.
- LEATT, J., KNEIFEL, T. & NÜRNBERGER, K. (eds.). 1989. *Contending ideologies in South Africa*. Cape Town: Philip.
- MANNHEIM, K. 1972. *Ideology and utopia. An introduction to the sociology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- PLAMENATZ, J. 1979. *Ideology*. London: Macmillan.
- SALAMUN, K. (Hrsg.) 1992. *Ideologien und Ideologiekritik. Ideologiekritische Reflexionen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- STRAUSS, D.F.M. 1978: *Inleiding tot die kosmologie*. Bloemfontein: SACUM.
- STRAUSS, D.F.M. 1989. Die mens en sy wêreld. Bloemfontein: Tekskor.
- THOMAS AQUINAS. 1952. *Summa Theologica*. Vols. I & II. In: *Great books of the Western World*, Vols. 19 & 20. Chicago/ London: Benton.
- TROOST, A. 1959. *Casuïstiek en situatíe-ethiek*. Utrecht: Libertas.
- TROOST, A. 1983. *The Christian ethos*. Bloemfontein: Patmos.