



BASIC  
CONCEPTS  
IN  
CHRISTIAN  
PEDAGOGY

Foundations of Christian Pedagogics

I

PERHAPS it will seem unusual to speak of the foundations of Christian pedagogics. For one might ask: Is it not true that every school of pedagogics is founded on the same principles? Indeed, pedagogics is the theory of education and one may freely concede that a Christian education is different from a humanistic one. But does it follow that the foundations of a science change as the views according to which this science is put into practice are modified?

Furthermore, it is open to question whether pedagogics is generally regarded as a science. In writing about the "International Congress for Teaching Educational Sciences in Universities" at Ghent, in the Scottish *Educational Journal* of October 23, 1953, Norman T. Walker makes the following observations:

Professor Campbell Stewart, in opening the discussion on British practice, remarked that the expression, education sciences, is not much used in this country. Nor can it be said that there emerged any clearly formulated concept of a "science" of education from the contributions of the various speakers. While there are naturally wide differences between countries, the general trend of development is that of education as a subject of University study emerging slowly from its subordination within the department of Philosophy (as a sort of *philosophia minor*) and asserting its claims to independence of other disciplines.

Jan Waterink

This observation defines the existing situation rather well, though somewhat optimistically, for pedagogy frequently presents itself as if it were merely applied psychology.

Accordingly, we are immediately confronted with the question as to whether pedagogy is a science. And if so, how is it related to practical education on the one hand; and on the other, to what extent do the principles, upon which the practice of education is based, affect the science of education?

At the outset, therefore, we must consider the following questions: (1) May the theory of education properly be regarded as a science? (2) In what way are the theory and practice of education influenced by principles? And finally, if there is such an influence, (3) What are the basic principles of Christian pedagogy?

Undoubtedly the questions as to whether there is such a thing as a science of education and whether pedagogy truly is a science cannot be separated from the question as to what is our concept of education. At this very point already we are concerned with principles. Therefore, we should start by regarding the question as to whether pedagogy is a science in the light of the principles upon which our position is based. It is one thing to believe that education merely consists in the removal of obstacles so that the child will be able to follow his natural tendencies, thereby giving free scope for the realization of inherited traits in society. Needless to say, it is quite another thing to regard education as the guiding of human beings in such a manner that they with their talents will be able rightly to serve God, their creator, in the society in which they have been placed.

This suggests at once the question whether or not the concept of education implies the concept of a "norm." Is the purpose of education merely to help the child to grow up according to its own nature, or does education indeed have a more far-reaching aim? At this point there is an immediate clash

of opinion between various views of life on the one hand and Christianity on the other.

However, we must proceed carefully in qualifying the views of life. If we confine ourselves to stating that humanism and Christianity clash at this point, then we are bound to go wrong. There are humanistic trends of thought which certainly do accept norms and which indeed regard education as an activity governed by fundamental norms. There are many humanists who look upon pedagogy as a normative science and who state that it is the highest aim of education to inculcate in the child obedience to these norms so that the scope of education is a broader one than merely enabling the child to exercise its inherited talents. Naturally, these humanists find their norms elsewhere than in Christianity, but, strictly speaking, that is not the question which concerns us at this point. Here we are only concerned with the problem of the positive and formal character of pedagogics. It is true that there are certain schools of thought, also humanistic in character, which have declared themselves emphatically in favor of a system of education which virtually denies religious and social norms. There are all sorts of vitalists, irrationalists, national socialists and adherents of the so-called "Lebensphilosophie" who emphatically state that it is the exclusive purpose of education to allow the child to develop in accordance with his nature. Obviously, the doctrine of pragmatism in the United States, the essential character of which is expressed by the statement that the only good education is the one which is useful, and that the only useful thing is for a man to make himself useful in society both to himself and the community, also fails to recognize a normative education in principle.

Therefore it is not surprising that, wherever pragmatism carries much weight, the idea gradually prevails that education is intended exclusively to guide the child in the develop-

ideas or conceptions of its own and has no scientific aims of its own. In these instances, all that remains is the application of rules, derived from psychology and sociology.

This becomes entirely different, however, when I am confronted by the question as to how I, by taking into consideration known sociological data and known psychological data regarding the child, must acquaint the child with the religious and moral norms, the norms of truth and beauty. How, I repeat, am I to acquaint the child with these religious and moral norms so as to enable him to grow up in accordance with them, under the discipline of that which I acknowledge to be my principle? If there be a pedagogy that can serve this end, such a pedagogy will indeed have a character and a scientific task of its own. Allow me to explain this by a few examples.

The concept of character is a concept from psychology; the concept of growth of character also is a concept from psychology; but the concept of *formation of character is a pedagogical concept.*

Ethics are of importance in the formation of character. But I cannot merely say to the child: "Thou shalt not commit adultery." I must find the pedagogical form for these normative rules. This then is another pedagogical concept: to find the pedagogical forms of the norms. So, too, when I say: "formation of character," I am concerned with the pedagogical concept as such. And I may speak of character formation scientifically only when I also concern myself with that other independent scientific activity, namely, the search for that pedagogical form of the norms which is appropriate to the nature and character of the child and the circumstances under which he is being educated.

This is the process by which a pedagogical science is established. I act on facts which I have derived from psychology and sociology. But as I do so I am a completely independent and scientific individual, engaged in a task, imposed

ment of its natural tendencies, and that the thing to do is to remove the obstacles to the effective development of these natural tendencies as much as possible.

When this view is taken, education indeed becomes merely a technique, operating on the knowledge gained from psychology and sociology. In this case there really is no question of a scientific pedagogy. Of course one can philosophize on education and one may speak of a philosophy of education or a pedagogical philosophy, but a scientific pedagogy as an independent science with a closed system is out of the question. This is due to the fact that the concept of education has been defined incorrectly, and so has actually been emptied of its true meaning.

Such a mistaken conception in turn results from the fact that both psychology and sociology have been dissociated from the more fundamental principles of life. The fact is that these two sciences are frequently reduced to the result of exact investigations in the mental and social fields. Though it may be accepted as a general theory that the whole of life is enclosed within principles superior to life, this is not taken into account in one's science. One may be prepared to state that God exists; one may also be willing to say that there is good and evil; one may even acknowledge that the question as to what is good and what evil is determined by a guiding principle given by God or a higher power. Nevertheless, promising as this may seem, it is not sufficient to provide me with a foundation for a scientific pedagogy based on motives of principle. There will always be the risk that in this way my pedagogy continues to be a theory regarding the practical use of psychology and sociology, even though I then add that the human being, concerning whose education I have formulated a theory, must now live in accordance with God's commandment. By proceeding in this manner, one will never obtain a scientific pedagogy. For in that case pedagogy lacks any

## 14 BASIC CONCEPTS IN CHRISTIAN PEDAGOGY

upon me by my subject, that is, *education*. From the nature of this subject it follows that I shall always have to deal with the following factors:

- First*: the child who has to be educated;
- Second*: the educator who has the vocation to education;
- Third*: the object which is aimed at in education; and
- Fourth*: the method which must be used.

All these points raise questions of a completely individual nature which do not fit in any branch of science and which belong only in pedagogy.

The question as to how I regard *the child from a religious and ethical point of view* is the factor which determines the pedagogical system. If, like Rousseau, I regard children as good by nature, or if, like many moderns, I consider them to be religiously indifferent, this will be reflected in my entire system. And consequently an entirely different system will inevitably follow for him who, in accordance with the Scriptures, views the child as being together with his parents involved in Adam's fall, but also included in the covenant of grace, provided that grace is present. From the very outset these matters confront pedagogy with tasks of a unique character.

This is true also for *the educator*. It is indeed possible to regard parents as educators who are merely related to the child biologically, or as people whose duty to bring up the child stems only from biological ties. But the parent-child relationship will be fundamentally different when the ties between parents and children are primarily regarded as religious in nature. According to the Scriptures, parents are parents in the first place because they sustain the same relationship to God. The duty of the parents arises primarily from a mandate which has its origin in the sovereign good pleasure of God. It is the task of pedagogy to shed scientific light

on the nature of this mandate. That task belongs to pedagogy exclusively, although it in turn will frequently derive certain normative rules from other sciences, for example, from theology. The question, however, as to what concrete measures are incumbent on the parents by virtue of their religious relationship to their children, cannot and may not be answered by theology, but must be answered by pedagogy.

Quite obviously, if someone takes a *normative* view different from that of Christianity, as for instance the view of humanism, he will, in thinking out his science, *formally* arrive at a pedagogical structure identical with that which we have here defined.

Again it will be immediately apparent that the question of principle also predominates in determining *the object* aimed at in pedagogy. The question, which can only be answered by *scientific* investigations, is how to formulate the object in accordance with our principle and how to relate this object to both the psychologically possible and to available sociological data. We need hardly state this results in a very special study of *methodology*.

It will be clear, however, that, regardless of the principles held, every pedagogue who wishes to develop a unified system, must arrive at a scientific pedagogy. This no longer is the application of psychology, this is not the transfer of sentences from theology or philosophy to a different field; this is an independent utilization of data from the auxiliary sciences, psychology and sociology, and the independent application of norms from the normative sciences with a view to the task imposed by one's own science, pedagogy.

If anyone should claim, that, owing to all these borrowings from various sciences, it will be impossible for pedagogy to maintain its independence, I should like to reply: First, that

Accordingly, we have arrived at the conclusion that he who regards the character of education as *an acting according to norms*, must inevitably acknowledge that pedagogy is an independent science.

But now we are also able to understand that the principle upon which we base our education will decide the character of our scientific pedagogy. If anything, the relationship between education and pedagogy will indeed show to what extent life is a unity and how little sense there is in separating theory from practice.

Thus we can answer the question as to what are the foundations of Christian pedagogy. Here we must again make a preliminary remark, however. In every science, especially a science so in the center of living practice as pedagogy, we should hold on to the thought that nearly all vital phenomena contribute to the construction of a scientific totality. And in dealing with the foundations of such a science, we must not forget that this science is concerned with a subject matter obtained from other sciences. These other sciences also have their foundations. In citing certain statements from theology we must not forget, for example, that theological views in turn are also based on certain foundations. The insight into the inspiration of the Scriptures is typical of the result obtained by theology. And we could go on in this manner.

From the foregoing we draw two implications. In the first place, it is out of the question to include all principles with which pedagogy comes into contact among the foundations of scientific pedagogy. A detailed theory of organic inspiration belongs to dogmatics, not to pedagogy. Pedagogy simply accepts the findings of dogmatics. This implies a considerable limitation in describing the foundations of pedagogy. The foundations of pedagogy should be provided by the bases of its own structure. In Amsterdam houses are built on piles. These piles are obtained from a forest, which possibly grows

today there is not a single science that is able to manage without borrowing from other sciences. Theology takes counsel with Hebrew and Greek philology and literature, with logic and with history; chemistry consults physics and mathematics; medicine cannot possibly manage without physics, biology and chemistry. In the last resort not a single science is completely independent of the others. Second, I should like to challenge my opponent to show me any other science in which specifically pedagogical features are the predominating factor. Education always wishes to change, to call into being that which does not exist; it wants to realize ideals which do not exist as yet by means of concretely available data on the one, and by appropriate measures on the other hand; but all activity is invariably aimed at this changing and this accomplishing of ideals. Hence concepts such as formation of character, formation of personality, and education are highly specific of a science such as pedagogy.

It follows that pedagogy is largely a *theoria ad praxin*. But these practical aims are not its sole aspect. For the seeking of the pedagogical forms of the norms, the determination of the child's moral structures, the definition of the boundaries of the rights and obligations of the parents, and many other similar points are theoretical in nature and all these activities have a specific character.

If anyone should remark that therefore pedagogy is after all a kind of *philosophia minor*, it will be obvious that such a remark suggests a considerable misapprehension. Philosophy can never be a *theoria ad praxin* and philosophy can never be directed towards a concrete act; though philosophy may speak of man in its anthropology, philosophy by its very nature can never speak of the significance of man's God-given mandate to attain a certain end with his children, nor of the concrete formulation of that object in the instance of a particular child.

in Sweden or Switzerland. But these piles are ready for use when they arrive at the building site and the architect is not concerned with the structure of these piles, the structure of their cells, and the history of all the years in which the trees were growing. He will accept these piles as means of support. He will ask only: are these piles usable? And upon these piles he will build the foundations of his house.

It is the same in science and in pedagogy. Therefore we should here attempt to ascertain the nature of our own pedagogical foundations of pedagogical science.

At the very outset, however, we must make one further observation. If we accept a certain material prior to building our pedagogical house, this material should fit into the system which we devise. It must be usable for our house. This means that if we wish to build a Christian pedagogy, we cannot borrow any fundamental tenets from humanistic philosophy or liberal theology. For the fundamental tenets, even those of the great among our colleagues who hold views based on different principles, do not fit into the structure we are building. He who intends to speak of Christian discipline cannot borrow certain fundamental tenets regarding the nature of parental authority from a book written by a radical jurist, or rather, he may do so, but in that event he is doing something that is not scientifically justified. For the ideas which he borrows from that book are at variance with the meaning of the system which he is attempting to build. It follows that there must always be harmony between the principles of the fundamental and auxiliary sciences on the one hand, and between these and pedagogy on the other hand.

Just now I have defined the auxiliary and normative sciences as two different groups. In doing this, I regard auxiliary sciences as those sciences from which we may borrow any material we may require. These auxiliary sciences are psychology and sociology. These sciences cannot compel peda-

gogy to adopt particular data. Pedagogy merely accepts their help, in so far as it has need of it.

The case is different with regard to the fundamental—or normative—sciences. They lay down the norms to which pedagogy has to adjust itself. Pedagogy, however, accepts full responsibility for incorporating these norms in such a way that they take on a particular form in the pedagogical system.

I sense that an objection will be raised at this point. Someone will remark that in this way I tend to build a pedagogical system which is completely isolated in life, in that it makes for a Christian pedagogy and a Christian education which are more or less antagonistic to all sorts of non-Christian systems and which have no use for anything from non-Christian systems.

Here we touch on a point about which there is considerable misconception. But this misconception exists only for those who do not completely understand the situation. Naturally, even if it were true that Christian pedagogy were in such a position that scientific material could be obtained only from fellow Christians, I would still have to accept this situation. For indeed, Christians are not afraid of being isolated. At Golgotha there also was a small group which said "yes" to the cross, whereas the majority cried "no" to the Lord of the universe.

Yet the pattern is not a simple one of black and white, as might initially be imagined. This is indeed the case when we are dealing with normative sciences; in that event it is a matter of accepting or rejecting the Word of God. But the situation is entirely different with regard to those sciences which offer us all sorts of material: psychology and sociology. In this case we must indeed also be extremely careful. For someone's view, based on principle, may all too readily affect the results which he obtains. We must be sure that, in borrow-

ing the findings of a psychologist or sociologist, we do not allow all to swallow a principle which we have rejected.

Nevertheless, owing to God's common grace, people still possess so much common sense that they are able to identify all kinds of data, particularly concerning the facts of daily life, which are correct and which they are able to describe correctly, regardless of the views which they hold. As soon as activities assume a more or less technical character, the conclusions drawn by Christians and non-Christians will frequently be identical. As a result people of all sorts of opinions are able to live together. When the temperatures in the house of a Christian and a non-Christian are identical, the thermometer will indicate an equal number of degrees; a stone will fall down perpendicularly both in the garden of a Christian and in that of a heathen; and an appendectomy is performed by a Christian physician and a non-Christian physician in the same hospital according to an identical procedure.

Accordingly, there need be no fear of a complete isolation of Christian pedagogy. The child's process of development, its use of conceptions and concepts, the degree to which it is capable of a reaction of neurotic tensions in the playroom, its response to unjust discipline, and a variety of other things are identical, regardless of the system of education employed. Two people, driving down the same road, the one to a brothel and the other to church, use the same road surface, breathe the same kind of air and see the same trees and houses along the road. But their *hearts* are different and subsequently at a certain moment their paths will diverge. But they also come from different houses and they also hold different views and essentially they are also doing something different in driving along that road. In social intercourse, however, they are not isolated from each other. This may also be our view with regard to pedagogy.

Bearing in mind what we have said above, we may now seek to establish the foundations of Christian pedagogy.

One of the first questions confronting pedagogy is the question as to the character and nature of children. We have deliberately formulated this in a general way and have not qualified character and nature by an adjectival modifier. For we indeed mean that the character and nature of children in every relationship are concerned, that is, the child's character and nature in the religious sense, the ethical sense, the emotional sense, and the like.

The question of our position with regard to children will of course be determined predominantly by our view of man as defined in our basic principles. And, as we have stated previously and will frequently repeat later on: in the first place we consider man to be a creature of God, created after God's image and therefore a religious entity. This is far more significant than if we merely say: we view the child as created by God and as a sinful child requiring regeneration. Man is a rational and moral being; but he is so merely because he is a religious being. Accordingly, the rational and moral features do not constitute two aspects of existence, which are separately governed like independent provinces, but they are two organically interlocking aspects of existence, which may both be attributed to the fact that man is religious. This "being religious" has a very broad sense. It means much more than that man should fear God in his life. That too. But it also means that man can and should live human life in its fullest sense. All his specifically human relationships result from the fact that man is religious. Emotional attachments, ambitions, evaluations, social attachments—in short, all that which is humanly sublime in the life of man exists only because man is the offspring of God. Thus one may say that in the marriage bond, in the ties between parents and their children, in true

Now we also know from the Scriptures that man has fallen away from God. This fall means that his "self" has taken a different direction. The "self" of man did retain the image of God in a broader sense, so that it has preserved the need to serve and it has also preserved the need to serve in the three aspects, the three offices. However, since this service has taken a different direction, man by nature no longer serves God, but virtually serves creatures, preferably himself. Thus the *object* of man's life has shifted completely. Man thus becomes a prophet, priest and king in the service of his own self; and self-glorification becomes the ultimate goal of his existence. Ego-centrism and subsequently egoism becomes the trend of all his moral actions. And even when man succeeds in freeing himself, at least of *conscious* self-glorification, he will get no further than serving the creatures by which he is surrounded. According to the Scriptures one of the fundamental characteristics of sin is to *miss* the purpose of life. Accordingly, sin is not a quantitative thing and, we might even state, it is not a qualitative thing in the positive sense. Sin does not impart a particular quality, it merely deprives of a particular quality. Owing to sin we miss our object, and our need to serve in the religious sense—which perforce is present in the self—is aimed at the wrong object.

The grace which enters into life—that is the significance, the meaning of the coming of Christ in human flesh. And the significance, the meaning of the Word, is that God has seen fit to find a way by which life may be restored, so that man may find God again as the One whom he serves, as the One toward whom his religious existence was aimed originally. This implies three things: In the *first* place it implies a merciful disposition on the part of God to pardon the blame which man has incurred by turning away from Him. In the *second* place it implies a work of God in man, by which the inner man is transformed, so that in principle the object of his service no

friendship, in commiseration with social distress, there is something of the religious which causes man to be man.

Regarding the character and nature of this religious being of man, we accept the Holy Scriptures, the Word of God, as the source by which truth may be known. It is from this source that we receive light on the nature and significance of man as a religious entity.

Thus we also know that man has been created towards God and that in his inner self, at the inmost core of his existence, there is a religious bond with God. Whatever this core may be called, whether it is called "heart" (with reference, incorrectly in my opinion, to the Scriptures), "religious root" or, as I believe to be more correct, the "self" proper, is immaterial. We here prefer to use the term "the self of man." The Bible warrants such a use.

Now the essential characteristic of this "self" of man is that it is religious, that is, that it has been created with a view to service. Religion is more than a mere *Abhängigkeitsgefühl* (feeling of dependence). Religion is being active in submission to Him whom one adores and worships; being active in the service of the adored. Now this service, this devotion to Him, to whom we have surrendered ourselves because He has conquered us, manifests itself in the threefold aspect of man's existence. It manifests itself, first, in and through man's cognitive approach to God himself and to God in all his works, and therefore also in his creation; second, it manifests itself in the surrender, in the dedication to God and his works in all the cosmos, which He has created; and third, it manifests itself in the wish to reign and plan in this cosmos in the service of God. Accordingly, the fact that man is religious presents three aspects: that of knowledge, that of surrender, and that of rule. These three aspects, according to the Scriptures, are those of the three offices of prophet, priest and king.



be an educator" always bears the character of carrying out an official mission.

Accordingly, education also includes an element of responsibility. This responsibility, however, can only be realized in the way of love. But we hope to discuss this in detail in our third lecture.

And here we have to draw attention to a problem which plays an extremely important part in Christian pedagogy. The danger is not imaginary that we sometimes wish to solve the problems arising in the various areas of life's relationships directly from our religious starting-point. In doing so, we but too readily forget that this solution frequently is an activity of logical thought, rather than of our faith and religious function.

If we wish to see education take its correct place in the relationships of life and if we wish to form a correct idea of educational practice, we shall indeed have to resist any dualism in our starting-point on the one hand, but on the other hand we shall also consistently have to take the view that duality is an acknowledged fact. *Duality*, not as though there were an eternal conflict in the *dualistic* sense between two principles which are mutually exclusive, but rather in the sense that we understand that we can reflect believingly on the truth regarding life and God's relation to life according to his revelation only if we see the two-sidedness inherent in the whole of life and every relationship of life.

This immediately concerns our relationship with and our knowledge of God. God is transcendent and immanent. He is the sovereign Lord of all creatures and independently of every creature he worketh all things after the counsel of his will. But God is also immanent. We are in him, but he also is in every creature. Indeed, we can never conceive this im-

longer is the creature, but again becomes the Creator. And in the *hivá* place it implies guidance by God's Spirit, which enables man to die to the attitude of creature-glorification, that he may learn to live increasingly in sanctification according to the will of God. Viewed objectively, this forgiveness of sin is the reckoning of the righteousness, which Christ has acquired, by God to man, who receives grace in regeneration and justification.

The transformation of man is a fruit of regeneration, which is worked by the Spirit of God in the heart of man and which manifests itself in conversion, which implies a change in mind on the one hand, and a change in walk of life on the other hand. Regeneration enables man to accept salvation in Christ, because God works that faith in the heart of man by regeneration. This faith is not a new creation. Natural man also believes. But he directs his faith toward things other than God. The man who lives by the faith which God has given him will direct his faith toward God's promises and toward God's grace in Christ; he will also direct that faith toward the obedience which he owes God by virtue of the fact that God has the right to command obedience and because God is God and therefore his Lord and Master.

The foundations of Christian pedagogy are of course also concerned with the educator. One can only be an educator when charged with this mission. "To be an educator" always implies a particular legal relationship with the individual to be educated. This relationship to the young person who is to be educated does not primarily result from a voluntary decision made by the educator. In some cases this voluntary decision may be required in the second instance. But invariably the educator will be one who is entitled to be an educator by virtue of the fact that he has been charged with a mission. "To

as dualism, but which, on the other hand, we can also never rationally conceive as a unity.

It is impossible for man to think simultaneously in the one and in the other category. This applies to every relationship of life. For the duality of which we spoke does not obtain merely in the religious sphere. The relationship of love between man and wife is characterized by a permanent tension between cause and effect on the one hand, and between ends and means on the other. Loving because one is loved, and loving in order that one may show the partner one's love, and again receive love, may be comprised within a single loving activity. But we cannot rationally think of these two as one.

Here we are confronted with the problem, universally admitted in philosophy, of the relationship between the causal and the final or teleological. The law of cause and effect and the law of object and effective use of the causal means aimed at an end, are by no means mutually exclusive. In the practice of daily life we intuitively experience the unity of these two. But it will be impossible for us to think *rationally* of these two as a unity, if at least by thinking we wish to obtain more than a dead formula with which we seem to state something, but with which we really do nothing else than find a sanctuary for our lack of insight.

In the practice of pedagogy we shall therefore continually come up against the fact of duality. One may try to get away from this fact of duality by saying that it is not a true duality, since the relationships continue to present themselves in a different connection. One may draw attention to the fact that, for example, in the problem of God's counsel and our responsibility things may, in the one case, be regarded as being within the sphere governed by the laws laid down by God himself unto himself with respect to his own creative acts and his own foresight concerning creation; and in another case, the same event may be viewed within the sphere of our own actions to-

manence and this transcendence as a unity. We may believingly accept that these two are united in God and in his relationship to the creature, but we can only experience this truth concerning God as duality—once again, this is something else than dualism. Therefore unity can be found only in the religious starting-point; in the acknowledgement of the fact that we are there to serve God and that we also have to subject ourselves to God in our thinking. We must know and accept this duality not only with regard to the revelation which God has given us concerning himself, but also in other respects:

We wish now to draw attention to some aspects of this duality which also are of particular importance in education. He who accepts God's ordinance of life and believes that God works all things after his counsel and his ordinance according to an eternal plan, but simultaneously accepts the full responsibility of man and the causal relationship governing his actions, must acknowledge that he accepts those two side by side, but that he can never think of them as united. To be sure, in faith we may avow that they are united in God and we may formulate terms such as these: that God has also included our talents and our responsibility in his counsel, but we can never intellectually comprehend the nature of this relationship between God's counsel and our responsibility.

Another example: inducement to repentance also has a place of its own in education. Now the Scriptures tell us on the one hand that man must repent; "repent ye" is a recurrent exhortation of the Scriptures. But on the other hand it is equally true, that God *gives* repentance. Repentance is conceivable without regeneration and the Scriptures themselves tell us that God gives Israel repentance and remission of sins. The prayer: "Turn thou us unto thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned," points in the same direction. Here again we arrive at the duality of our mission in the work of God—a duality that we may not accentuate into a twofold principle such

ward our fellow-men, toward ourselves or toward God. But none of these arguments solves the difficulty, by any means. At most they will explain why we always see things as a duality. But even possessing this explanation, no one can imagine and think of these two, God's counsel and our responsibility, as a unity. Indeed, the Bible itself very accurately defines this duality in a text like the following: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:12-13).

The acceptance of this *duality* entails extremely important consequences upon pedagogy from the point of view of principle. To begin with, there is a point to education only when God uses this education as a method to bring the child where he wishes him to be. Ultimately any use of methods will only yield results when God blesses these methods. This implies that education should always occur in dependence on God. But this also means that nothing is to be subtracted from the absolute demand made by God that parents shall educate their children and that one day the parents shall have to give an account of this education. And it is not merely in this field that duality is operative. This law of the twofold aspect of life operates throughout education.

The educator must lead the child to the goal which he proposes in accordance with the norms which he has adopted. And at the same time the educator must develop that which is present in the child, for he cannot introduce what God has not placed in the child. Development and formation, growth and education, inner entelechy and being directed toward an end as an object—these invariably are two aspects which should be a real unity in educational practice. Not such a unity, I repeat, that they may also be *conceived* as a unity. Once more, to our thinking they will at best always represent two aspects of a *single* matter. But it should be so that man

*experiences* the unity of his actions and God's work as a *unity in faith*. And in educating the child in wisdom according to those forms of the norms which are particularly adapted to the child in view of the child's age and nature, he should accept the unity of ability and goal in a faithful optimism as to what God will allow this child to grow into.

Although to our thinking duality always actually exists and although only faith is able to comply with the demand to accept this duality as a unity, we have not thereby reached the end of our considerations.

God as the Creator of all lives is One. Likewise his creatures are one. The Scriptures more than once stress the unity of creation far more consistently than we as a rule observe it in daily life. Probably we should not dare to say that the whole creation waiteth with earnest expectation for the day that the glory of the children of God shall be revealed (Rom. 8), if it did not say so in the Bible. The fact that plants and trees, insects and fishes, are looking forward to the *parousia*, in earnest expectation at that, be it that this expectation is not a conscious act, suggests a unity of the whole creation that we may not disregard. Hence we must teach our children a regard for life not only, but we must also view their life as being wonderfully in harmony and at one with all that buds, grows, blossoms, bears fruit, and dies around us. The law of life applies to everything that lives; this is also true of the law of death. And if the educators were merely engaged in helping children to pass through the process of maturation preliminary to death as elegantly as possible, they would be faced with a tremendous task. The education of children would be an anxious and hopeless work. But the meaning of life is not death; we can only understand the meaning of life, if in this life we know ourselves to be bound to him who is the Creator and who creates life only so that one day life may be triumphant.

Hence we can detach neither life nor education from Jesus Christ. Through him and in him people are not only prepared for a new heaven and a new earth, but the whole creation, purified and glorified, shall one day live to the glory of God. The object of the work of education is not to manage the parade for death, but rather the organization, with Christ, of the victory over death and the grave. This is indicated by our form for baptism: "And when we are baptized in the name of the Son, the Son seals unto us that he washes us in his blood from all our sins, incorporating us into the fellowship of his death and resurrection."

Thus we see that, from the very outset, education means establishing the relationship between the lives of children and Jesus Christ. And this not only in the sense of "acquainting these children with the salvation of redemption from their sins." That also. But Christian education cannot even isolate from the totality of life this bringing of Christ as Savior, for Christ does not deliver part of man merely, nor part of creation merely, but he delivers the whole of human life and the whole of creation. Accordingly, redemption in Christ encompasses the whole of life and all relationships of life; so that in this sense it is completely universal.

That this does not mean that every man participates in redemption need not be emphasized here. It remains true that the tree of God's planting will be redeemed, but that those who by their own fault will be dry branches shall wither from the bough and not commune with the root.

From this something more follows as well. If Christ governs the whole of life, there cannot even be an inner contradiction in that life. When contradiction appears to manifest itself, this is primarily due to the rule of sin in creation; consequently, this results from the fact that there are tendencies in the fallen world which resist Christ and God. This also

explains how Paul, in Romans 7, can complain of the sin which still dwells in him. In this life sanctification is merely partial and incomplete, so that it is an unceasing process. But in principle life is under the dominion of Christ, so that Paul is able to say: "So it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me."

As a result of this unity of life, there can be no breach between the various spheres of life. Someone may say, "This man or that industry will benefit socially, but will be harmed from an economic point of view if a certain measure is taken." But without a doubt that statement is incorrect, at least if we consider more than just the immediate results of the deed or act which we observe. Essentially social and economic events are closely related. To assume a contradiction between these spheres in the sense that something by which life benefits socially might be harmful from an economic point of view, would lead to the acceptance of a complete division of life into spheres incompatible with one another.

And this does not only apply to the general sphere of life; it applies also to the life of the individual. At this point we enter an area which may be of fundamental importance in the practice of education. There are educators who believe that a child may benefit by certain measures from an intellectual point of view; but then they will sometimes conclude that this measure is not conducive to the formation of character in that child. For example, a child which has difficulty in learning, which is constantly being hounded with private lessons and always being urged to earn better grades, will become peevish, surly, tiresome and later perhaps untrustworthy. The remark then made by certain educators, that what is essential to the intellectual education of the child apparently is detrimental to his character formation, is incorrect. He who regards this child as a manifestation of an individual life which is a unity in itself should understand that those things which this child cannot bear, cannot stand, cannot cope with because of the limited

character of his intellectual faculties, will naturally also spoil the child's character. This is not due to physical influences, but to the fact that the demands made upon this child disturb its emotional life, interfere with its inner life, destroy its courage, mar its moral sense, and imperil the whole of its character; for all this learning is not suited to this child.

It is *this unity of life* which we are continually able to observe and which we are able to experience with joy, time and again. Consequently, to him who has regard for life and the laws of life as instituted by God, the experience in daily life of the dualities, as described previously, will only be a reality when he approaches the problems solely from an intellectual point of view. A rational approach to the problems must lead us to the recognition of duality. Therefore a purely scientific analysis of the problems will always confront us with these dualities.

But he who lives by faith cannot express himself only in the acceptance of the unity of all God's work in faith; in the practice of daily life he will also—if he simply accepts life, as God has placed it before him—find little or no occasion to take offence at the poignancy of any duality.

And thus we naturally come to the conclusion that there is a *danger* to life itself in a *one-sided rational* approach. The human intellect, which dissects everything, analyzes everything, counts everything and measures everything, is itself a product of a life-dissolving activity. Therefore any science and any pedagogy which arises merely from this isolated *ratio*, is doomed to death; for though the man who tells you exactly how many sepals, and petals, how many stamens and what pistil he has picked from the flower you gave him may speak very accurately and very scientifically, he is not speaking of the *flower* which God has caused to grow. For in nature, stamens and pistils, petals and sepals do not grow: God has made *flowers*.

And he who understands this, who is able to attain the harmony between head and heart, who learns to know with his heart and to love with his intellect—and this is the knowing and loving repeatedly mentioned in the Scriptures—he will also experience the unity of life in education. He will not today be engaged in religious education and tomorrow in intellectual education, nor will he be occupied now in morally educating the child, and then in esthetically training him. He will understand that life is one, and that both in himself, the educator, and in the child which he is educating, this one life must express itself and develop according to the rule given by the Creator, in order that he may be, and the child may become, a man of God.