

In Search of a “New Morality” for South African Education

Part II The Effectuation of Values and Thoughts on “Being Human”

Prof. P.G. Schoeman

Hierdie is die tweede in 'n reeks artikels waarin beoog word om die moontlikhede van morele heropbou deur middel van opvoeding vir Suid-Afrika te ondersoek. In hierdie opvolgstudie tot vorige navorsing betreffende die fundamentele spanning wat bestaan op die terrein van waardes en “morele” opvoeding tussen fundamentalisme en relativisme, word die tweeledige struktuur van waardes, sowel as ander sake rakende hulle implementering ondersoek, waarna gepoog word om, ter ondersteuning van ons standpunt betreffende die aard van waardes en hulle positivering in praktiese lewensomstandighede, 'n funksionele antropologiese model op die tafel te plaas.

1. Review

In our times the overwhelming magnitude of a seemingly rampant global *relativism* has become evident in the alarming disintegration, if not total collapse of the general morality of societies all over the world. It compels everyone who hopes for a better moral fibre of human society in days to come to combine efforts by responding to and vigorously counteracting this impending worldwide cataclysm.

Champions of *irrationalist historicism*, irrespective of its particular manifestation, categorically reject the likelihood of the existence of eternal truths and values¹ (cf. Part I of the investiga-

¹ On account of their ardent and consistent, though uncritical adherence to the *fact-value dualism*, supporters of *irrationalist historicism* deny the incontestable reality of *ontic universality* that “co-conditions” the real world (Strauss, 2005: 6), of universal

tion).² Personalists, pragmatists, existentialists, neo-Marxists and post modernists alike understand *values* as the outcomes of personal predilection, of arbitrary human preference, imagination, ingenuity, innovation and need, completely determined and relativized by ever-changing and unpredictable cultural and historical contexts and therefore essentially *contingent* in nature. At most, a person may claim that something is acceptable or unacceptable (good or bad, just or unjust, right or wrong, valuable or worthless etc.) in as far as it applies to *him-/ herself*.

Unlike laws of nature that are given in positive application to literally all possible circumstances, *pre-effectuated values* simply represent universal and unchanging "*starting points*" for *implementation* by men and women in practical and varying life situations and shifting historical periods (cf. Schoeman, 2006). As this process of implementing (effectuating) universal values in diverse practical life situations is – clearly – completely dependent on *human involvement*, we are, at this point of our investigation, obliged to –

- consider in greater detail the *specific locus* and *bilateral structure* of values, as well as other issues regarding their concrete *implementation* (section 2), and
- put forward a *functional anthropological model* that can corroborate the position we have taken regarding the bringing to bear in practical life situations of pre-effectuated values (paragraph 3), as well as to serve as foundation for our eventual consideration of some educational implications in this regard (cf. Parts III and IV of our study).³

2. The implementation of pre-effectuated values

2.1 Regarding pre-effectuated and effectuated values

In order to facilitate a less ambiguous and more clear-cut use of the term "value", it has become necessary, at this stage of our enquiry, to distinguish

structures emanating from and founded in Divine *principles for creation*. They thereby reject the existence of universal and (relatively) constant criteria that are not – as Dooyeweerd (1957: 158, cf. 157-158; cf. also Part I of this study) aptly points out – subject to historical change but apply to every normative life situation, as well as the existence of the various entity structures that we encounter in everyday life (like the *factual societal relationships*).

2 Schoeman, P.G., 2006, *Journal for Christian Scholarship*, 42(1&2): 81-101.

3 To be published during 2007.

– on the model of Strauss (1978, 1989) – between the status of *pre-effectuated* as opposed to *effectuated* “values”. Thus, we will from now on designate – as Strauss (1978: 64; cf. 64-65) suggests – pre-effectuated, universal, relatively⁴ constant *starting points* for implementation (in all situations) as *principles*, while – on the other hand – the *effectuated outcomes* or *specifications* of the former (in unique and specific situations) will be referred to as *norms*.⁵

Strauss (1978: 65; cf. 63-65) defines a *principle* as a *universal, relatively constant entity that can be brought to bear in dissimilar situations by competent and accountable persons or institutions* (groups of persons) *that are capable of their own free will to come to correct or incorrect* (normative or anti-normative) *implementation of the possibilities offered by such a relatively constant starting point*. As such, every *pre-effectuated principle* is the indispensable *pre-condition* for the dynamic *effectuation* (implementation or validation) of “life values”, so that – in our process of bringing them to bear in practical life situations – these pre-effectuated principles change into “effectuated” *norms* that have been “put into action” (implemented, brought to bear) and are valid for men and women in a particular situation at a specific moment in history. Only a *norm*, that is, an *effectuated principle*, can be said to possess *validity*, as this is an indication that a universal principle has been “made valid”⁶ or “brought to bear”.

As *relatively constant* starting points for their specific implementation by a competent and accountable person or body of persons, universal, pre-effectuated values compel obedience from all subjects. Moral, juridical, aesthetic, economic, social etc. values will always, and despite shifting conditions and changing historical periods, remain of ethic, aesthetic, economic, social or whatever nature. In their pre-implemented or pre-effectuated form they are never subject to historical change, and their universal compass embraces all humans and regulates all human activities.

4 As change is possible only against the backdrop of what is *enduring* (persistent, unchanging), *i.e., constant*, the very constancy of universal principles allows for all diverse *adaptation, dynamics, concretization, application* and *positivizing* thereof (cf. Strauss, 1989: 81). For this reason, *pre-effectuated principles* are *relatively constant* because they can be brought to bear in agreement with the shifting demands of *changing times* and *varying conditions* or circumstances.

5 An obvious advantage of the use of the term “norm” is that it allows for a more convenient and flexible use: an action may be described as either “normative” or “anti-normative”, but not “anti-principle” (Strauss, 1978:65). In the term “anti-normative”, the word “normative” refers to the pre-effectuated universal, relatively constant *principle* with which a specific effectuation is in conflict.

6 The fashionable term “universally valid” is, therefore, self-contradictory (cf. Strauss, 1978:65).

No one – irrespective of personal (or collective) preference – is ever exempt from the normative conditions and limitations that include and control all who act in compliance with (or in defiance of) the logical and post-logical principles⁷ obligated by the Creator of all things for every separate and distinct normative mode of human pursuit (*analytical, historical, lingual, social, economic, juridical, ethical, etc.*) or any societal relationship (*church, state, business enterprise, family, school, university* or whatever).

Notwithstanding the countless idiosyncratic ways in which principles can be brought to bear, no concrete, “hands-on” implementation thereof will ever suspend or invalidate their universal compass. In this regard, Hart appropriately observes that, “... in spite of all that varies, something ‘in principle’ remains invariant through all this historical development” (1984: 59). This means that every *effectuated result* will be either a *normative* (compliant, obedient) or *anti-normative* (non-compliant, defiant) “bringing to bear” of the pre-effectuated principle that presents itself as *universal, pre-positive starting point of concretization* (cf. Strauss, 1978: 64-65).

In sum: pre-effectuated values that are *implemented, applied* or *brought to bear* in specific, concrete situations (in the form of patterns of conduct, formulated instructions, codes of law and the like) can be said to have acquired *validity*. They have become *apposite* and *relevant* for men and women in specific situations, specific locations and at specific moments in time. This is a state of affairs because different times and different situations with their distinct and dissimilar problems and attending exigencies compel varying (possibly even dissimilar) “*concretizations*”. Nonetheless, the demands of changing times and shifting situations may *never* be elevated mistakenly to exclusive conditions for *effecting* or *bringing to bear* values.

As pointed out above, the bringing to bear of a pre-effectuated principle involves a *competent agent* (person or organization/ societal relationship) that possesses (1) the required sensitivity to grasp the normative demands of that specific principle, and (2) the power to initiate and accomplish the actual “*making valid*” or “*positive implementation*” thereof (cf. Strauss, 1978: 63-67). As this process of effectuating a principle obviously involves accountability, the whole matter regarding the *normative freedom of choice* of persons or groups of persons (organizations) is brought into focus and has to be addressed briefly.

7 Intuitively “grasped” by everyone in their non-scientific experience of reality and subsequently “enhanced” by the scientific analysis of subjective facts, phenomena, regularities and lawfulness, patterns and structures encountered in the different areas of scientific expertise (cf. Troost, 1973: 176).

2.2 Normative freedom of choice

Normative freedom of choice rests with every normal and competent subject. As responsible and accountable persons, we are free to opt for either normative or anti-normative behaviour (cf. Strauss, 1989: 33). We may either choose to live in accordance with life principles, or to abandon these altogether and, for instance, conduct ourselves in a peevish, dull or bad-mannered way in social contact with others; live in a miserly or prodigal fashion; produce poor art; use deplorable and offensive language; reason illogically; act unfairly, lead an immoral life and so forth. It is thus possible to implement exactly the same principle in normatively dissimilar ways. This allows the simultaneous existence of, for instance, *Christian* as well as *apostate* norms that lay claim to validity for the very same normative aspect of human life. Nonetheless, anti-normative implementation of principles does not suspend the principle that is transgressed. Anyone pursuing a strictly logical pattern of reasoning can be said to be directing his or her mental efforts in accordance with universal principles of logic. When reasoning in defiance of logic, he/ she is violating these principles. The fact that he/ she is reasoning illogically nevertheless does not do away with either the principles that regulate logical reasoning or the reasoning process itself.

2.3 The locus of pre-effectuated principles

Another issue in this regard is where to search for principles that are to be implemented in real life situations. Norms that pertain to specific cultural areas of life are founded in the Divine cosmic order of creation whence they derive their actuality, legitimacy and authenticity (cf. Troost, 1973: 176). As a result, they must in every case be sought within the corresponding aspect of reality itself. For instance, universal structural principles that allow for the very existence of an aesthetic reality control and regulate all our aesthetic actions (production of any form of art), regardless of shifting personal convictions and commitments.⁸ By virtue

8 Since humans, impelled by some or other religious motivation, always function as the implementers – on the *factual side* of reality – of these universal, relatively constant principles, it is obvious that the most profound motive which impels a specific implementer or group of implementers, also directly influences the distinctive way in which they implement principles. Indeed, the *state of affairs* that it is impossible to disunite any object, event, problem or whatever from the experiencing/ observing

of this premise, we can accept that *pre-effectuated aesthetic principles* are to be found *only* in the aesthetic aspect of reality. This implies that any effort to reveal and designate aesthetic principles must be undertaken within the limits and boundaries of the aesthetic aspect as such, and not, for example, the economic, juridical, ethical or whatever⁹. Naturally, this state of affairs applies to all other normative aspects of reality as well. Norms, positively applied in various life-situations are – under all circumstances – irrevocably correlated to and controlled by *a priori* and *supra-individual* principles.

2.4 Outlining the course to pursue

As human beings we are value-oriented, value-directed and value-driven. This state of affairs elevates our behaviour above the level of sheer instinctive conduct. But, values pertain to human actions alone, and, therefore, any investigation into the realm of values and their application in concrete life situations obliges careful reflection on anthropological matters in general.

Hence, an indispensable precondition for veritable insight into the character of education as a *value-oriented enterprise* that focuses on normatively immature human beings is a realistic and viable *anthropological model*. With this as basis, we can – in due course – attempt to illustrate how so-called “education for morality” can be put into action in the family, as well as in various school subjects in practical classroom situations, with a view to assist normatively immature human

human person, including every scientist, was pointed out by no lesser spirits than Einstein (*theory of relativity*) and Heisenberg (cf. his concept of *relations of incertitude*) (Van Riessen, 1966:34-35, cf. 32-36; Strauss, 1969: 174). The justifiable demand for objectivity and neutrality in science, therefore, relates only to suppositions that are noticeably detrimental to the scientific process itself. The adverse effect of race, nationality, tradition, sentiment, language, and other similarly subjective influences must be eliminated from the scientific process as they prejudice and therefore jeopardize our quest for truth (Strauss, 1969: 174; Van Riessen, 1966: 54. cf. 54 ff). Van Riessen (1966:51, cf. 35) emphasizes that, as there is always a “very real and subjective person engaged in science”, it is impossible to “abstract the self (human selfhood, P.S.) from any activity in which it is engaged”. Freedom from all subjective elements – even during the scientific enterprise itself – is an illusion because the human self, in its religious bond with an Origin (origin) is never neutral and objective, but always completely committed. This profound truth has to be accounted for in a self-critical manner and not be introduced dogmatically as theoretical axiom undergirding an obviously “un-neutral” and all but dispassionate scientific position (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1953: vi).

9 Except in the form of a drive towards enhancement of analogies in *constitutive* and *regulative* directions (cf. Parts III and IV of the investigation).

beings on their way to norm-compliant conduct in the various societal relationships, as well as to facilitate their eventual normative control of cultural material and resources. These two objectives will be explored in the sections below and taken into account in Parts III and IV that are to follow.

3. A functional anthropological model

3.1 *What is Man?*¹⁰

At first glance it may appear somewhat naive to ask: *What is man?* The truth is, however, that we are touching here upon one of the most complex fields of enquiry into which we can ever hope to venture. Even so, nobody will dispute that the prerequisite for all true knowledge is adequate self-knowledge, i.e. an acceptable answer to this central and decisive question. At the same time it is also clear that we, as humans, cannot answer this most profound question, simply because our origin lies outside ourselves. Consequently, all notions about the *true nature of humankind* cannot but accord directly with viewpoints concerning its *true* (or supposed) *Origin* (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1965: 195).

Yet, too often, in the attempt of concerned parties to shed light on this crucial question, we find that matters merely become even further obscured in a haze of speculation. The conflicting and incompatible answers that are presented always reflect irreconcilable (and often hidden and unaccounted for) suppositions and assumptions that *pre-determine* all “ultimate solutions” of the problem regarding the nature of humankind. We are all too familiar with the great number and perplexing diversity of such positions, each of which lays absolute claim to unqualified legitimacy to the exclusion of all others. The human being is seen, for example, as a mere organism and product of organic evolution; a highly evolved animal; a psycho-physical totality; a rational being; a social being; an economic being, a political being, a rational-moral being and the like. Indeed, there is very little consensus as to the *essence of being human*.

3.2 *Unravelling the Problem: metaphysics, theology, science or revelation?*

Metaphysical tenets regarding the super-natural, that is, the supreme being and primary cause of reality, the immortality of the human soul, its so-

10 For the sake of semantic convenience the term “man” is used in a non-discriminatory sense to denote *humankind* in its broadest sense.

called "moral" destination, etc. are purely *speculative* as they originate in the human mind and must, therefore, be rejected as deficient and untenable. On the other hand, the sole objective of the *theologian* is to clarify – on biblical grounds – what it means to be created in the image of the Creator, what our task/ calling as human beings is, what our fall from grace implies, how redemption is possible, etc. Conversely, no *scientific investigation* into the supra-factual depth dimension of human existence will be ever possible. As it has a restricted compass in that it remains ever bound to the analysis and explication of concrete states of affairs and, as such, has no (scientific) access to the Origin of humankind, science must – at this point – remain silent because here it reaches the limits of its capabilities. Indeed, in the final analysis it is clear that an authentic understanding of the human personality is pre-scientific knowledge that depends solely on *revelation* (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1955: 35).

The Christian accepts the Bible as God's Revelation of Himself as Creator of all things, including humankind. In His Self-Revelation the Creator presents this knowledge to the believer in Christ in straightforward and unequivocal terms. Consequently, any viewpoint the basis of which lies outside the Scriptures will be unacceptable on this stance. It is revealed in Scriptures (cf. Proverbs 4:23) that all "*issues*" of human life (and that includes – naturally – our acquisition of knowledge, our formative, lingual, social, economic, aesthetic, juridical, ethical, pistic activities) originate in our "heart"¹¹ (soul, ego or selfhood; cf. *infra*, par. 3.3.2). This "spiritual root of all the temporal manifestations of our life" (Dooyeweerd, 1965: 186) or human "selfhood" that is at all times concerned with the true Origin of all things is capable (in principle, at least), and in the light of the Revelation of this Origin, of truly knowing itself, and in so doing, of obtaining access to the creative will of God. The origin of all true self-knowledge is now evident: God, the Creator, by the power of the Holy Spirit, reveals to us what we essentially are (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1965: 185-187). This revelation is the "only key to true self-knowledge in its dependency on the true knowledge of God"¹² (Dooyeweerd, 1965: 186, cf. 186 ff; cf. Troost, 1973: 171).

11 When the concept "heart" is employed in this paper, it is done so in terms of *oriental imagery* – as it was originally used in the Holy Scriptures – and refers to the human *soul* (ego or selfhood). *Under no circumstances* is the concept "heart" – as used in this context – ever to be identified with the pumping organ that effects the flow of blood in the human body.

12 "Its radical sense can only be explained by the Holy Spirit, who opens our hearts, so that our belief is no longer a mere acceptance of the articles of the Christian faith, but a living belief, instrumental to the central operation of God's Word in the heart, namely, the religious center (*sic*) of our lives. And this operation does not occur in an individualistic way but in the ecumenical communion of the Holy Spirit who unites all the members of the true Catholic Church in its spiritual sense, irrespective of their temporal, denominational divisions" (Dooyeweerd, 1965: 186).

Understanding of the “heart” or soul as man’s true selfhood or ego is revelatory data that cannot be acquired via metaphysical speculation, theological reflection or scientific investigation. While speculation is futile, theology can only explicate and enhance what has already been made known. The scientist, on his/ her part, is limited in this regard *only* to scientific insight into our *temporal body-structure*, i.e. as is revealed in our transient personality (appearance), and of which a *scientific account* is, undoubtedly, possible (cf. Strauss, 1989: 45 ff; also 40-45). The Christian accepts the commonly shared view that man is a being, in whom *body* and *soul* may be distinguished but never separated¹³. And it is precisely this matter that has given rise to such a veritable Babel of tongues.

Nevertheless, the Bible is no textbook providing instant answers to all our questions. For this reason one will not find in the Scriptures a complete and scientific concept of humanity. The vital answer to the question: *What is man?* is revealed to the extent that we know ourselves to be created in the image of our Creator. However, as was mentioned in passing in the paragraph above, it remains the task of the scientist to give a thorough account of the *temporal body-structure* of the human person. This can be accomplished with or without due regard for the import of the revelatory data relating to humanity. Yet, the vital question will always be: what is the true relationship between our *body* and *soul*, which together comprise our temporal human personality? Can the body and the soul function separately in this temporal reality, i.e. as independents or substances? Is the body – as in classical Greek philosophy – inferior and therefore subordinate to the superior soul? Can one – as the German philosopher and religious realist, F.H. Jacobi (1743-1819) maintained – be a heathen in the mind but a Christian at heart?¹⁴ In other words, can we as Christians under certain special circumstances adopt a secular approach, i.e. be neutral with regard to our faith? Does faith begin where science has reached its limits?; etc.

The answers to these questions will depend, in the last instance, on our concept of humankind. If we accept the traditional dualistic view of man as a being possessing a body and a soul, each capable of acting as a substance, each an independent entity, then these questions will be answered in the affirmative. If, on the other hand, man is regarded as a rigid entity in which body and soul may be distinguished but – in this

13 A dichotomist approach that perceives man as composed of two *substances*, namely a mortal, material *body* on the one hand, and of an immaterial, rational *soul* on the other that are united into one substance (cf. the conception of man as a rational and moral being) is untenable on anthropological grounds (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1965: 185 ff).

14 “*Heiden mit dem Verstande, Christen mit dem Gemüt*” (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1953: 459).

transient existence – never separated, then these questions will be answered in the negative.

3.3 Reflections on the temporal embodiment of the human personality

3.3.1 Preamble

In the light of the central theme of the Holy Scriptures, i.e. creation, sin and redemption, a concept of humankind is possible which guarantees in every respect the unity of his/ her temporal existence and which eliminates in principle all dualistic viewpoints that deny the unity of the human body. Only on these terms is it possible to account for man as a complex entity (total-) structure that is characterized by its indivisible and integral unity. What concept of man, then, emerges in the light of the Scriptures?

God's Word teaches us first that we have no earthly destination and are – under all circumstances and in all our temporal activities – concentrated indivisibly on the wholehearted service of God, the Origin of all things (Dooyeweerd, 1965: 189; cf. Strauss, 1989: 47). Created in the image of no less a one than the almighty God Himself, we, unlike animals, plants or matter, have an eternal destination. We are not of this time – nor are our bodies – because on Biblical grounds we acknowledge the resurrection of the flesh.

Humans engage in fifteen modes of existence and among these the faith function has a leading or regulating role. We do not, however, find our destination immanent in any of these, not even in our faith aspect. We are, for example, not "rational beings" – we possess at most a rational function. Likewise, we do not find our destination in, for example, the social aspect of reality, which would qualify us as "social beings" – we merely possess a social function. Nor are we "pistic beings": we do, indeed, possess a faith *function*, yet we are not destined for it; we are destined to serve God through our faith. None of these temporal human functions, including our function of faith, is more important than the rest because we supposedly find our destination therein. They are all concentrated in our selfhood ("heart"), and this selfhood is – in turn – concentrated on the true (or supposed) Origin of all things. As such, humans are not destined for this world, since our final destination lies outside the temporal reality that embraces us (cf. Strauss, 1969: 172-173).

3.3.2 On-going reflection on the human ego: the Essence of Being Human

What, then, is the essence of being human in terms of a Biblical anthropology? In our "heart", the nucleus of our personality, our true

selfhood or soul, we transcend time and all temporal structures and find our destination in the Origin of all things. Being created in the image of God, humankind is the religious¹⁵ crown of Creation and the whole of creation is aligned accordingly. This means that the entire universe finds its purpose and its fulfilment in us, and is directed via our formative activities in the wholehearted service of God. However, because of our fall into apostasy creation was torn asunder into two opposing “domains” or *directional orientations*, namely that of Light and that of darkness.

In terms of this antithesis the full meaning of our existence is no longer focussed on God alone. On the contrary, our “heart” has become unfaithful to our initial and basic calling, which is to serve God wholeheartedly and to labour and build to the honour and glory of His name and the benefit of our fellow humans. However, regardless of its apostate condition, the human “heart” that has rejected the true Origin of all things, by virtue of its *religious nature*, chooses for and secures itself to a surrogate “origin”. In this process, none other than apostate humankind itself illegitimately elevates this self-chosen *idol* to the false position of newly discovered (supposed) “origin of all things” (*human reason, humanity itself, society, economy, material possessions, power, science, state, church* or whatever). Yet, paradoxically enough, in the final analysis this profane surrogate “origin” emerges as being *also* of essentially the very same temporal nature as its *champion* and *advocate*: it is completely limited by the same temporal reality that – even now – constrains and impedes apostate humankind.

Against this background, it can be maintained that we are *religious personalities* whose intentions, aspirations and activities – through our

15 For the purpose of our investigation, we have to distinguish clearly and unambiguously between the concepts “faith” and “religion”. Human *faith* relates to a specific *aspect* of our temporal life. *Religion*, on the other hand, relates to our bond (L. *ligo*; *ligare* = to bind) with either the true Origin of all things, or a supposed origin thereof. Religion is, in the words of Dooyeweerd, “the innate impulse of human selfhood to direct itself toward the true or toward a pretended absolute Origin of all temporal diversity of meaning, which it finds focused concentrically in itself” (1953: 57, also 11). As the absolute central sphere of human existence, religion transcends all modal aspects of reality, the aspect of faith included ... it is “the *ex-sistent* condition in which the ego is bound to its true or pretended firm ground” (1953: 57-58). The “mode of being” of the human selfhood (ego) itself is of a religious character and “nothing in itself” (1953: 58). As such, religion represents a *basic motive*– the most profound *driving force* – that determines the anastate or apostate nature of all our intentions, aspirations and deeds. All scientists, regardless of their special convictions, are obliged to account critically for the particular driving force that impels all their research activities and ultimate scientific conclusions.

“heart” as transcendent focal point of all our temporary functions – find their most profound meaning either in God, the Creator (Origin) of all things or in some supposed origin of our own fabrication.

3.3.3 *The human body as an “enkaptic” totality structure*

Although in certain aspects of our composition we are akin to matter and all living things, we can never be identified with them. As in the case of non-human creatures, the human body is also a complex totality structure in which all individuality structures are “enkaptically”¹⁶ interwoven, though in a typically human way (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1965: 173-195). This typically human totality structure which comprises the human person and which encompasses our whole existence consists of four body structures, viz.:

- The *physico-chemical* body structure that comprises the building materials of the human body and includes the first four modes of our existence, i.e. those of number, space, movement and energy.
- The *biotic* body structure that encompasses our organic life and belongs to the biotic aspect of reality. It is rooted in and dependent on the preceding physico-chemical substratum and cannot exist in isolation from the latter.
- The *psychical* body structure that relates to the sensory-emotive aspect of our life and encompasses the psychical mode of our existence. It is based on our vegetative-biotic and physico-chemical body structures and is dependent upon their pre- (*i.e.*, foundational) existence.
- The *normative* (act-) structure of the human body that is founded on the foregoing three body structures and encompasses the nine normative modes of our existence (*viz. the logical, historico-*

16 The term “enkaptic” (Gr. “enkaptain”) refers to the inner structural coherence that sometimes exists between different and dissimilar but nonetheless interwoven (inter-connected) types of individual totalities or entity structures (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1957: 92; cf. 92 ff; 126-128; also 627 ff). When one entity structure is interlaced with another without forfeiting its own peculiar identity, in other words, when the internal unique characteristics of an entity structure are retained and safeguarded for the duration of its “interwovenness” with yet another unique entity structure, they are related *enkaptically* (cf. Strauss, 1978: 132-135, 305-309). This is apparent in the case of parasitical forms of symbiosis (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1975: 93 ff), or the way in which a sculpture is enkaptically related to the marble from which it was hewn. In our case, it designates the way in which each of the four different body structures that comprise the temporal human body functions in its inter-relatedness with the rest without surrendering its distinguishing and unique features.

cultural, lingual, social, economic, aesthetic, juridical, ethical and pistic). It is not, however, qualified by any one of these nine normative modalities.

In temporal reality these four body structures of the living human being cannot be separated from one another. They are inextricably interwoven. They can, however, be clearly distinguished because each of these body structures functions in an individual and typical manner, exerting its own unique influence on the human totality structure, yet never operating in isolation from the rest. These body structures are human body structures, and they remain so only for as long as they are contained in the totality structure of the human body, i.e. together with the rest. In other words, in this transient reality the human being is never a dualism of, for instance body and soul; matter and spirit; or whatever. The human person is always a *human body*. We remain, under all circumstances, integral unities of four body structures, whatever we do, whether we think or speak or sculpt or pray. We are indivisible, indissoluble and religiously un-neutral, no matter what we may do (Dooyeweerd, 1965: 189-190).

The above-mentioned normative modes of our existence as humans are expressed in three basic directions, namely those of *knowing*, *volition* and *fantasy* (imagination). These basic directions are also concentrated in our religious selfhood, i.e. our “heart”, whence is “the issues of life”. These three basic directions are guided by our faith and oriented in the final instance to certain normative convictions (values) that are ultimately (and in principle) in accordance with the particular *basic motive* that dominates our lives. This is the source of the most profound dynamics that regulate, direct and guide human life and achieve embodiment in the rich diversity of modes of human existence in which the human person, as an indivisible bodily whole, can ever engage.¹⁷

Moreover, when considering the three pre-normative body structures (physico-chemical, vegetative-biotic and psychical), it is important to note that they are controlled and guided in the last instance by our *will* (volition) and are ultimately fulfilled along the avenues of our normative modes of existence when they are given expression in terms of certain values or principles that ultimately shape and determine our behaviour, thereby preventing us from simply succumbing to animal instincts, as will be explained in greater detail below.

17 This matter, including its educational ramifications, will be dealt with in detail in Part III of the investigation.

3.3.4 *Acts and the normative (act-) structure of the human body*

From the outset it is important to distinguish clearly between human *acts* and *actions* (deeds). According to Dooyeweerd (1965: 173 ff), an *act* is something that takes place in the mind of a person, remains fixed there and is not given expression in the sense that it causes any change to the reality in which the specific person is engrossed. In this way one can *knowingly*, *volitionally*, and in one's *fantasy* be "engaged", as it were, in reality without anything actually "taking place". For example, a small child may think about a bicycle, desire it and daydream about being the owner of one. At this stage there is nothing more involved here than *knowing*, *volition* and *fantasy*, and this *act* remains confined to the "inner life" of the child. It may well be that the child never progresses beyond this; that no actual effort to transform these acts into deeds ever takes place. Should it, however, decide to do something about the matter, it may engage in some definite action – perhaps the earning of extra money, saving it and eventually buying the desired item. Should this happen, we can say that the acts of knowing, volition and fantasy have been fulfilled in the purchasing deed. Against this backdrop it can be maintained that *acts* are to be conceived of as part of the dimension of our "inner activities". In our inner acts, we are *intentionally* dealing with reality in the light of certain *normative perspectives* (values) that are derived from the normative (i.e. post-psychical) aspects of reality. In fact, we accept liability for all our deeds (concrete actions) that are yet to occur in the future by evaluating them in advance. In addition, we also evaluate – by means of our inner acts and from normative viewpoints – the potential outcomes of behaviour yet to come. For this reason human deeds, which are preceded by specific inner acts, can be normatively subjected to judgement as actions for which the (normal) person can be held responsible.¹⁸ Because these acts are the necessary and responsible "prologue" to actual deeds, activities and behaviour in general, it means that the whole matter of inculcating norms in the normatively immature person becomes one of vital importance in any educational enterprise. Of the four body structures that mutually constitute the temporal human personality, the remarkably flexible normative or act-structure is the most complex. It has already transpired that it is not only based on all three foregoing body structures (viz. the physico-chemical, vegetative-biotic and psychical) that encompass the

18 In the case of reflex actions, pre-meditation that involves underlying motives is not present and consequently they are not normatively subject to judgement.

natural spheres of our existence, but can never function in isolation from them. Moreover, it has also come to light that this act-structure cannot be restricted to any one of the nine normative modes of our life in which we, guided by our normative insight, engage. It exhibits a remarkably pliable (flexible) character. It is *polymorph*, i.e., of a changeable, varying nature, capable of being adjusted and regulated in the sense that no single human act or action can ever be qualified as for instance a purely logical, purely historical (formative), purely social, purely ethical, purely pistical, etc. act or action that is executed independently of the remaining normative avenues of human life (including the other three body structures). Every human act that originates in the depths of our selfhood moves our whole body to action. As such the whole body as an indivisible unity becomes the *field of expression* of our religious selfhood. Acts, as normative modes of human behaviour, therefore ‘drive’ the entire being (in all four body structures) to action. In every act the human person operates in terms of all fifteen modes of existence. So, kneeling in prayer, for instance, a person is praying as an entity (body) and this deed of praying that has a pistical qualification, can never be separated from the physical presence of the living, intensely responsive/ experiencing, reasoning, communicating, repenting, believing person. In the same way the scientist, engaged in research, is involved as a human entity (body), an indivisible person in his/ her entire temporal personality, and certainly not only in terms of his/ her logical-analytical function. For this reason our faith, for example, can never be ‘isolated’ or “parenthesised”, as it were, during our scientific activities, and consequently we can never perform any so-called religiously “neutral” activity. The human person is not at any one point in time the austere scientist, performing a so-called “disinterested”, uncommitted task (i.e. standing aloof from his/ her faith) and at another point once again the believer, piously attending a service in the church. He/ she acts at all times as an indivisible and wholly integrated entity. With this perspective the (hypothetical) severance of *faith* and *reason* falls away.

As all our acts originate in our “heart”, they are subject to the direct influence and guidance of the fundamental religious motive or driving power (*dunamis*) that has claimed our selfhood (ego). This means that not only our acts, but also all our concrete activities are, in the last instance, religiously-based acts and deeds, each of which becomes in principle a reflection of our deepest, most profound motives, whether we are practising science, socialising with our fellows, engaging in a commercial enterprise or whatever. This remarkable body-structure that encompasses our temporal existence and which is *impelled by religion, controlled by*

faith and *conforms to values*, can be applied – *of our own free will* – to master and control temporal reality either to the glory of God or to His discredit.

In sum: As ultimate concentration point and nucleus of our whole personality, the human “heart” (selfhood) – in which all fifteen temporary human functions are knit together in a typically human way – is the religious focal point of the totality structure of the human body. As such, it expresses itself in religious freedom in every component part of our indivisible temporal human body. Against this backdrop, it seems appropriate to uphold that the human person is a *religious being*, an *embodied soul*, explorer of creation, builder of cultures, heir of God, collaborator in His creation, yet never God, and always subordinate to His creational law.

3.3.5 Character

It is evident from practical life-situations that no two human persons ever react in exactly the same manner under normative conditions. Nonetheless, from our investigation we have established that all acts that originate in the human selfhood and become manifest in the concrete deeds of normal and conscious human beings implicate – *at all times* – the very same prevailing principles that provide the normative guidelines for our value-related conduct as responsible people. The question, therefore, arises as to the nature of the human *character* that so fundamentally *co-controls* the normative behaviour of individual men and women.

Although there are many and varied concepts regarding the authentic nature of the human character, it seems as though the following provisional “definition” may, in fact, be acceptable in so far as it represents a positive attempt to avoid the pitfalls and one-sided presentation of a reductionist tradition. Human *character* (cf. Troost, 1975: 39) should be seen as a *fairly constant grouping* – especially via pedagogical intervention – within an individual person of certain distinguishable *hereditary traits*¹⁹ (namely all dispositions, abilities, etc.

19 Strauss (1989: 45-47) emphasizes that although character becomes manifest in the normative nature of our act-structure, it is important to note that it is established in the psychically qualified temperament and that both character and temperament are, on their part, founded in the genetic possibilities or potentialities which belong to the biotic sub-structure of the human body and are transported by the genes of the gametes. These hereditary “possibilities” or dispositions are rooted in the physico-chemical substructure of the human body and are related to, *inter alia*, the “life tempo” of a specific person.

that exist as part and parcel of an individual personality), with those general influences within a specific *environment* (namely the cohesive complex of cultural, lingual, social, economic, aesthetic, juridical, ethical and pistic norms) that are adhered to by a specific social group against the background of a distinguishable religious driving force. These, in close collaboration with one another, provide a fairly constant determinant that directly impinges on the singular way in which an individual person experiences, relates to and brings life principles to bear in practice.

In Western tradition, one's *moral conduct* is usually seen as the sole manifestation of one's *character*. But, in spite of the fact that traits of character do, indeed, become strongly manifest in our moral activities, character is never to be related to the ethical modality of human existence alone. Indeed, *character* belongs to our total body-structure, to our entire temporal existence, and not only to one aspect (usually mistakenly associated with the *ethical*) or even body-structure (the act-structure).

This fact becomes apparent when it is considered that virtue and vice (good and bad, right and wrong) are not moral issues *alone*, but also appear in an infinite number of logical, cultural, lingual, social, economic, aesthetic, juridical and pistical connotations (cf. also Part I of this study). And as character is regarded as the fairly constant grouping of individual personality traits with principles in general, it is stated categorically that normative decisions are not ethical issues alone. For this reason the educational task regarding the so-called “building” of character encompasses much more than mere training in “ethics” and drills in “morality”: it actually involves identifying, divulging and designating norms in literally all normative spheres of human conduct (from the logical to the pistical) and walks of life (from the home to the state) maybe even in the form of what Troost calls a “praxeology”²⁰, i.e. the *knowledge of how to act in diverse practical life-situations*.

4. On the flexible nature of our normative body-structure

From the moment of birth, the human child is blessed with marvellous abilities and countless dormant potentialities. Nonetheless, it differs from all other forms of life in that these latent possibilities have to be “awakened” and “stimulated”, as it were, in order to develop and expand properly. Responsibility in this area rests heavily upon the educator. Our possession of

20 Troost, 1958: 360 ff; cf. also *ibid.*, *s.a.* for a systematic analysis and thorough clarification of this matter.

special potentialities needing to be stimulated and coaxed into full bloom forms the cornerstone of the whole concept of education as a process of creating a proper environment within which the learner's latent and undeveloped abilities can be led to full fruition and normative maturity by responsible and accountable educators at home, at school, in the church, etc.

This point can be illustrated by means of a simple example: A father visits an art gallery, accompanied by his young child. Enthralled by an exquisite painting, the father stops dead in his tracks until dragged away by his bored offspring. Since both father and child enjoy faculties receptive to impressions (in this case, the sense of sight), both were able to observe the canvas. Yet, each observed it in a basically "different" way. The child, unlike the father, was not emotionally and aesthetically affected by the work of art, leaving its feelings untouched. This should not be interpreted as meaning that it lacks the capacity to be moved or touched by a work of art. Like the father, it does possess this ability; yet, its capacity to be moved by a work of art is still "dormant" or undeveloped. On the other hand, the bug sitting on the frame of the painting remains unmoved by the elegance and splendour of the latter, since it completely lacks the capacity to be affected by the beauty of anything.

Immediately apparent from the above is the fact that, on account of the undeveloped nature of their emotional capacity, neither the small child in the art gallery nor the bug sitting on the frame of the painting experienced any stirrings of feeling at a beautiful sight. Yet, the capacity of the child differs radically from that of the bug. As opposed to an insect, bird or animal, a child bears within itself the potential for the realization of an enhancing development of the psychical and all post psychical (normative) modes of its temporal existence.

With the correct stimulus and guidance from a normatively developed person (educator), the psychical aspect of the small child can be normatively "expanded", as it were, by all (already enhanced) post-psychical aspects of reality, in the sense that a new extent or "broadening" of meaning is in every instance added to the range of its sensitive feeling. It is thus possible for this small child's range of *feeling* to be enhanced (disclosed) to include *aesthetic feeling*, a process that – as was mentioned in passing – is usually brought about by the intercession or mediation of a normatively more developed (i.e. mature) person. When this happens, it implies that the aesthetic modality with its central meaning of *harmony* has added a new and extended dimension to the child's "range of feeling".

In essence, the child's *aesthetic feeling* still remains *feeling*, although it is no longer confined within the limits of *sensory feeling* alone. Similarly, for

all aspects of human life, specific types of sensitivity and feeling may develop: logical feeling, feeling (sensitivity) for culture, sensitivity for language, sensitivity in social relationships, economic feeling (consider, for example, a sense of economic value, or the inclination to save), a feeling for justice, ethical and pistical feeling. The psychological modality, according to the principle of qualified sovereignty in each specific mode of human life, retains in each case its own, characteristic structure. What actually happens is that *feeling* is in each instance “disclosed” or enhanced in an anticipatory direction, thereby achieving a more extensive and complex dimension by reason of the more comprehensive meaning and compass given to it.²¹

These insights have far-reaching implications in the field of education. The act-life of the child starting school is largely undeveloped (undisclosed). The tendency for behaviour to be regulated and controlled by normative insights is very limited in small children. The strongest influence upon their actions is exercised by the straightforward power of the three primary (i.e. pre-normative) body structures. Impulses, urges and emotions that derive directly from the physico-chemical composition of the human person and impinge accordingly upon his consciousness, are the strongest factors in determining behaviour at this stage of its life.

In order to develop, stimulate and expand the child’s still undeveloped act-life to a state where values can commence to play their part in modifying (transforming) and eventually regulating its behaviour, it is imperative that the child’s physical, biotic and psychic maturation should also be complemented by determined and purposeful *intervention* on the part of a normatively developed (adult) person.²² The ultimate goal must be the complete normative enhancement or disclosure²³ of *every dormant facet* of the child’s existence. This will promote complete disclosure of all the learner’s modes of existence in a regulative (anticipatory) sense, i.e. under the expansive and enhancing influence of already developed and more complex modalities. The pinnacle of this process will have been reached when the pistic mode of the human person, motivated by some or other religious driving force, will direct the entire process of normative

21 This matter will be dealt with extensively in Part IV of the investigation.

22 The involvement of both parent and teacher in the enriching, enhancing and expansive development of normatively un- or under-developed learners will – in every instance – be guided by their own normative commitments.

23 Cf. Dooyeweerd, 1963: 63-104 for an informative clarification of this central issue that will form the main substance of Parts III and IV of the investigation.

disclosure of the human act-structure in a specific (anastate or apostate) direction.

Sin has made us beings no longer whole: in our "heart" (soul) we have deviated from our true Origin and Source of Life. Because our "heart", and consequently all the "issues of our life", no longer – naturally – devolve upon God, the inevitable consequence is that the faith which, through its recreant beliefs, turns it aside from God, will also bring about a deviation in the development of all other normative facets of our existence into the same apostate direction. There will certainly be normative development, but only to God's discredit. However, the effect of God's grace is to rescue us (and through us, too, the whole of creation under our rule) from our apostasy, leading us back to the Creator. Once our "heart" has been restored to God through His mercy in Jesus Christ and in fellowship with the Holy Spirit, only then does God's Word, with its basic theme of creation, fall and redemption, disclose our faith (pistical aspect). This achieved, the way is opened for anastate enhancement and development of literally every normative facet of our temporal existence. There is now, in principle, the possibility of directing all the issues of our life – deriving from our "heart" – towards the true Source of all things. And in doing so, we are no longer barred from dedicating our lives and efforts to the glory of God and to the service and benefit of our neighbour. The disclosure of all normative facets of the learner's existence has to be "triggered off", as it were, by his/ her faith. All forms of disclosure are therefore also religiously bound to a particular basic motive that will, in the strongest possible sense, determine the direction of normative disclosure, i.e. oriented towards or away from God.

Finally, we may reiterate that every normative facet of human existence bears countless possibilities that are ripe for disclosure. Regulated, eventually, by faith and developing on the basis of a specific cultural-historic situation, corresponding modal expansion and enrichment will occur. Indeed, this matter lies at the root of the true meaning of Christian education: via the anastate (i.e. God-oriented) development of its normative body structure, the youthful person must have the torch of Christian values placed in its hand. Indeed, there can be no education without values, and without Christian values, there can be no Christian education (cf. *infra*, Part III).

5. Interim conclusion

From the paragraphs above it has become clear that, unless values are directly related to and relativized by a trans-personal and supra-individual

“point of reference” or “firm ground” (the true or supposed Origin of all things), there is in fact no reason why complete value relativism should not become the norm.

On the other hand, values can be designated as *anastate* only when people or groups of people whose religious ground motive is Christian in origin have brought them to bear in practical life situations. For the Christian, the final criterion that determines the acceptability of values is the basic theme of redemption through Jesus Christ in fellowship with the Holy Spirit, consequent upon the premise of creation and fall from Grace. Christians should reject as apostate, false and untenable all values that do not stand up to the test of this basic theme. Under these circumstances, it is quite obvious that the conflict between Light and darkness will be also glaringly outlined in the case of education as the assistance of normatively immature pupils on their passage to normative maturity (i.e. subject to specific, normative points of view). The crux of the matter is the essential decision – for or against Christ.

As noted above, we possess freedom of choice with respect to both our normative inner acts and our subsequent value-related patterns of conduct. This means that, while remaining subject to the principles that were laid down by God, we are nevertheless able to opt either for obedience to these values, or for anti-normative behaviour, depending upon our personal accountability. From this choice originates the great burden of responsibility towards the normatively “maturing” pupil, which must be taken up by the Christian parent and educator. The influence of values upon actions will result in our youth becoming responsible and accountable persons in their own right, in that they, by reason of their normative freedom of choice, will be called to answer for their deeds.

However, true and genuine norm-compliance that unites virtue and happiness cannot be enforced from the outside: it must issue voluntarily from the human “heart”. The important educational implications of this state of affairs will be examined in the next two parts of this investigation.

Bibliography

- DOOYEWEERD, H. 1953. *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, Vol. I. Amsterdam: Paris.
- DOOYEWEERD, H. 1955. *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, Vol. II. Amsterdam: Paris.
- DOOYEWEERD, H. 1957. *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, Vol. III. Amsterdam: Paris.
- DOOYEWEERD, H. 1963. *Vernieuwing en Bezinning om het Reformatorisch Grondmotief*. Zutphen: Van den Brink.

- DOOYEWEERD, H. 1965. *In the Twilight of Western Thought*. Nutley, N J: Craig Press.
- HART, H. 1984. *Understanding our World. An Integral Ontology*. New York:University Press of America.
- SCHOEMAN, P.G. 2006. In search of a 'new morality' for South African education. Part I. Preliminary deliberations: between fundamentalism and relativism. *Journal for Christian Scholarship*, 42(1&2): 81-101.
- STRAUSS, D.F.M. 1969. *Wysbegeerte en Vakwetenskap*. Bloemfontein: Sacum.
- STRAUSS, D.F.M. 1978. *Inleiding tot die Kosmologie*. Bloemfontein: Sacum.
- STRAUSS, D.F.M. 1989. *Die Mens en Sy Wêreld*. Bloemfontein: Tekskor.
- STRAUSS, D.F.M. 2005. The best known but least understood part of Dooyeweerd's philosophy. *Journal for Christian Scholarship*, 42(1&2): 61-80.
- TROOST, A. 1958. *Casuïstiek en Situatie-Ethiek*. Utrecht: Libertas.
- TROOST, A. 1973. Christian Alternatives for Traditional Ethics. In: *The Idea of a Christian Philosophy*. Toronto: Wedge
- TROOST, A. 1975. *Praxeologie. Inleiding tot de Wijsgerige Ethiek*. Unpublished Teaching Guide. Free University of Amsterdam.
- VAN RIESSEN, H. 1966. *The Christian Approach to Science*. Ontario: Guardian.