

HUMAN INTEGRATION AS A FUNDAMENTAL
ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEM IN NEO-
HUMANISTIC EDUCATION

SONG-GUK JOH

HUMAN INTEGRATION AS A FUNDAMENTAL
ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEM IN NEO-
HUMANISTIC EDUCATION

SONG-GUK JOH

B.A., M.DIV., M.A. (KOSIN UNIV.)

Thesis accepted in Philosophy of Education in the
Faculty of Education of the *Potchefstroomse*
Universiteit vir Christelike Hoër Onderwys for the
degree *Philosophiae Doctor*.

Promoter: Prof. Dr. J.L. van der Walt

Potchefstroom

1997

OPSOMMING*

Neo-Humanistiese opvoeding (of "humanistiese opvoeding" - in Neo-Humanistiese terme) is 'n irrasionalistiese onderwysbeweging wat ontwikkel het in die VSA gedurende die 1960's en 1970's op die basis van die Progressivisme, Eksistensialisme, Humanistiese Psigologie, Romantiese kritiek en sommige godsdienstige bewegings. Neo-Humanistiese opvoeding poog om menslike integrasie te bewerkstellig as een van dié belangrikste doelstellings in die konteks van opvoeding.

Hierdie navorsing fokus op menslike integrasie as 'n fundamenteel antropologiese probleem in Neo-Humanistiese opvoeding. Dit beskryf die aard waarop menslike integrasie in Neo-Humanistiese opvoeding na vore kom. Verder word 'n analise gemaak van die fundamentele (prinsipiële) tekortkominge van hierdie benadering. 'n Vergelyking word getref tussen menslike integrasie in die konteks van die Neo-Humanistiese opvoeding en met menslike integrasie in die konteks van Christelike opvoeding. Laasgenoemde weer op basis van 'n Skrifmatige benadering tot menslike integrasie.

Ten einde die algemene antropologiese kontoere van die Neo-Humanistiese opvoeding te beskryf, is die gedagtes van vier denkers geanaliseer wat humanistiese opvoeding gestimuleer en beïnvloed het: Holt, Goodman, Rogers en Maslow. Holt en Goodman is Romantiese humaniste, en Rogers en Maslow is humanistiese psigoloë. Hulle algemene antropologie kan soos volg gekarakteriseer word:

(1) Die mens is 'n biologies-psigologiese organisme wat 'n positiewe neiging het tot groei en met onbeperkte potensiaal. Die mens is outonoom en vry van enige eksterne norme.

* This *opsomming* (summary) was translated into Afrikaans by Elmien Viljoen.

(2) Die ware self is die biologies(-psigiese) innerlike aard. Dit integreer alle menslike funksies en behoeftes van die organisme.

(3) Die mens is bedoel om 'n geïntegreerde of holistiese eenheid te wees. Die biologies(-psigiese) aspek kry egter voorrang. Die a-logiese aspekte van menswees is absolute voorvereistes vir alle aktiwiteite van menswees. Menslike aspekte word gereeld teoreties verdeel in die logiese en die a-logiese.

Vervolgens is vier opvoedkundiges se teorieë en modelle geanaliseer om 'n volledige beeld van menslike integrasie in opvoeding te verkry. Hulle is Combs se Affektiewe opvoeding, Weinstein se "Self-Science" opvoeding, Brown se "Confluent" opvoeding, en Valett se Humanistiese opvoeding. Die opvoedkundige bydraes van die vier teoretici ten opsigte van menslike integrasie, kan soos volg gekarakteriseer word:

(1) Die mens is 'n hoogs ontwikkelde biologies-psigiese organisme wat genoegsame potensiaal het vir selfaktualisering.

(2) Die menslike self word gekenmerk deur die affektiewe aspekte van menswees. Die self(-konsep of self-funksies) en die affektiewe aspekte kan nie van mekaar geskei word nie.

(3) Die menslike struktuur is saamgestel uit twee domeine: die kognitiewe en die affektiewe. Die affektiewe domein is die belangrikste integreringsbeginsel in persoonlikheidsontwikkeling en opvoeding, omrede dit die leidende en integrerende deel uitmaak van menswees.

(4) Neo-Humanistiese opvoeding is 'n poging tot menslike integrasie. Die doel daarvan is om emosionele komponente in te sluit in konvensionele leer, en om positief affektiewe kurrikula of programme te ontwikkel. Humanisties-opvoedkundige doelstellings kan bereik word deur affektief-opvoedkundige prosedures en tegnieke. As eindproduk is Neo-Humanistiese opvoeding affektiewe opvoeding.

In die Reformatoriese antropologie is daar vier beginsels van menslike integrasie geïdentifiseer: (1) godsdiens, (2) beeld van God, (3) hart (die

self) en (4) 'n lewende siel. 'n Reformatories-antropologiese beginselperspektief op pogings van menslike integrasie deur Neo-Humanistiese opvoeding, sluit die volgende in:

- (1) Die evolusionistiese voorveronderstelling van menslike oorsprong misken geheel en al die ware God as die Skepper van die mens in gesprekke oor menslike bestaan.
- (2) Neo-Humanisme huldig 'n optimistiese siening van die mens as 'n selfgenoegsame wese. Die mens het 'n positiewe geneigdheid tot self-aktualisering en voldoende potensiaal tot self-vervulling.
- (3) Die mens is 'n biologies-psigologiese organisme wat deurentyd streef na die bevrediging van sy innerlike behoeftes.
- (4) Die mens behoort vry te wees van alle negatiewe sosiale invloede.
- (5) Die mens is 'n outonome wese. Die absolute norme wat hy behoort te volg, is sy innerlike wette en behoeftes.
- (6) Self-aktualisering is die einddoel van die menslike organisme. Dit is ook 'n belangrike integreringsbeginsel.
- (7) 'n Individu is uniek vanweë sy eie genetiese geskiedenis en verskillende ervarings. Die mens is 'n hoër dier met hoër behoeftes.
- (8) Die mens se verhouding met God word gekarakteriseer deur antroposentrisme.
- (9) Die sosiale funksie van die mens word gesien as onwillig of negatief. Neo-Humanisme is grootliks individualisties of subjektivisties.
- (10) Die mens is 'n produk van die wêreld. Die wêreld is slegs die baarmoeder vir die mens, waarin hy gebore is en waarin hy elke dag lewe.
- (11) Die motiveerder, bestuurder of integreerder van menslike lewe en aktiwiteite, is die biologies-psigiese aard van menswees. Die self (hart) is verskuil agter, of geïdentifiseer met, die biologies-affektiewe funksies van menswees.
- (12) Die self-konsep as konseptuele gestalt, word óf positief óf negatief hanteer. In 'n positiewe sin funksioneer die self-konsep tot voordeel van

menslike integrasie. Die integreringsbeginsel is nie die self (hart) nie, maar die self-konsep wat die affektiewe funksie van die mens is.

(13) Neo-Humanisme verondersel altyd 'n dualistiese interpretasie van die mens: die kognitiewe (logiese) en affektiewe (a-logiese) domeine.

(14) Die biologiese of affektiewe aspek van die mens motiveer en rig menslike persepsie, leer, gedrag en lewe. Dit maak menslike leer en aktiwiteite betekenisvol en relevant. Dit wil voorkom asof Neo-Humanistiese opvoeders die affektiewe as dié belangrikste integreringsbeginsel in opvoeding beskou.

(15) Alle ander aspekte van die mens word gereduseer tot die biologiese of die affektiewe aspek.

(16) Die verhouding tussen die kognitiewe en die affektiewe aspekte is ondeelbaar simbioties. Die kognitiewe word egter nie tot enige mate van betekenisvolheid in die skool verreken nie.

(17) Bykans alle aspekte van menswees word hanteer in terme van óf 'n oorskatting óf 'n redusering. Hoe dit ookal sy, nie op basis van 'n eie wet nie, soos wat die geval wel is in die Reformatoriese antropologie.

(18) Interne ontwikkeling en hiërargiese verhoudings ten opsigte van alle menslike aspekte word erken. In vergelyking met die Reformatoriese perspektief of die mens, word die voorkeur in rigting gewoonlik omgekeer.

(19) Neo-Humanistiese opvoeding word saamgestel uit verskillende vorme van affektiewe benaderings tot opvoeding. Normaalweg manifesteer dit nie as holistiese opvoeding nie, maar as affektiewe opvoeding waarin die begin en einde geraak word.

Wat menslike integrasie betref, het Neo-Humanisme meer sukses behaal as klassieke humanistiese opvoeding. Eersgenoemde poog om, deur die logies en die a-logiese aspekte van menswees met mekaar te versoen, die gebreke van die logies-gesentreerde klassieke humanistiese opvoeding te oorkom. As gevolg van 'n dualistiese opvatting van die mens, wil dit egter voorkom asof die Neo-Humanistiese opvoeding nie daarin kan slaag om die verlangde balans in integrasie te

verkry nie. Derhalwe word die a-logiese aspekte oorbeklemtoon teenoor 'n vorige oorbeklemtoning van die logiese. Verder, vanuit die integreringsbeginsels van die Reformatoriese antropologie, is die pogings en konsepte van menslike integrasie van die Neo-Humanisme geëvalueer as 'n verwringde en ongebalanseerde disintegrasie, of 'n onvoldoende integrasie van menslike persoonlikheid en opvoeding. Die bevindings van die navorsing lei tot die gevolgtrekking dat Neo-Humanistiese opvoeding nie daarin slaag om ware menslike integrasie van persoonlikheid en opvoeding te beskryf nie.

Hierdie projek lê bloot dat ware menslike integrasie nie moontlik is sonder die hulp van 'n gebalanseerde antropologie nie. Die Reformatoriese perspektief op die mens waarborg 'n meer gebalanseerde blik op menslike integrasie, veral omdat alle vorme van immanente teenstrydighede soos dualistiese sienings van menslike medele funksies en dualismes rakende die rol van basiese motiewe, vermy kan word. Verder opereer die Reformatoriese perspektief met belangrike fundamentele beginsels wat die resultaat van 'n holistiese en geïntegreerde siening van die mens tot gevolg het.

SUMMARY

Neo-Humanistic education (or "humanistic education" in Neo-Humanist terms) is an irrationalistic educational movement which developed in the USA during the 1960s and 1970s on the basis of Progressivism, Existentialism, Humanistic Psychology, Romantic criticism and some religious movements. Neo-Humanistic Education attempts to effect human integration as the most important goal in the context of education.

This research focuses on human integration as a fundamental anthropological problem in Neo-Humanistic education, and aims at a description of the nature of efforts to effect human integration in Neo-Humanistic education; attempting to analyse the fundamental (principal) shortcomings of this approach, and comparing human integration in Neo-Humanistic education with human integration in Christian education on the basis of a Scriptural approach to human integration.

In order to outline a general anthropology in Neo-Humanistic education, four thinkers who stimulated and influenced humanistic education were analysed: Holt, Goodman, Rogers and Maslow. Holt and Goodman are Romantic humanists, and Rogers and Maslow are humanistic psychologists. Their general anthropology is characterized as follows:

- (1) Man is a biological-psychological organism, which has a positive tendency toward growth and unlimited potential. Man is autonomous, free from any external norms.
- (2) The real self is the biological(-psychical) inner nature. It integrates all human functions and needs of the organism.
- (3) Man is intended to become an integrated or holistic unity. However, the biological(-psychical) aspects are prepotent. The a-logical aspects of man are absolute preconditions for all activities of man. Human aspects are often dichotomized into the logical and the a-logical.

Another four educationists' theories and models were analysed to present the whole picture of human integration in the context of education. These are Combs' Affective Education, Weinstein's Self-Science Education, Brown's Confluent Education and Valett's Humanistic Education. The educational efforts for human integration of the four theorists were characterized as follows:

- (1) Man is a highly developed biological-psychical organism, who has sufficient potential toward self-actualization.
- (2) The human self is identified with the affective aspects of man. The self(-concept or self-functions) and the affective aspects are not distinguished from each other.
- (3) Human structure is composed of two domains: the cognitive and the affective. The affective domain is the most important integrating principle in personality development and education, since it plays the leading and integrating part in being human.
- (4) Neo-Humanistic education is an educational attempt at human integration. Its efforts aim to incorporate emotional components into conventional learning and to develop affective curricula or programmes positively. Humanistic educational objectives can be achieved by affective educational procedures and techniques. As a result, Neo-Humanistic education is an affective form of education.

In a Reformational anthropology, four principles of human integration are identified: (1) religion, (2) image of God, (3) heart (the self) and (4) a living soul. From the perspective of Reformational anthropological principles, efforts at human integration by Neo-Humanistic Education amount to the following:

- (1) The Evolutionistic presupposition of human origin completely excludes the true God as the Creator of man in discussions of human existence.
- (2) Neo-Humanism has an optimistic view of man as being a self-sufficient being. Man has a positive tendency toward self-actualization and sufficient potential for self-fulfillment.

- (3) Man is a biological-psychological organism that is always seeking for satisfaction of his inner needs.
- (4) Man should be free from all the negative social influences.
- (5) Man is an autonomous being. The absolute norms that he should follow are his inner laws and needs.
- (6) Self-actualization is the ultimate goal of the human organism. It is also an important integrating principle.
- (7) An individual is unique on account of his own genetic history and diverse experiences. Man is a higher animal with higher needs.
- (8) Man's relationship with God is characterized by anthropocentrism.
- (9) The social function of man is often seen as reluctant or negative. Neo-Humanism is basically individualistic or subjectivistic.
- (10) Man is a product of the world. The world is only a womb for man, in which he was born and lives every day.
- (11) The motivator, director or integrator of human life and activities is the biological-psychical nature of man. The self (heart) is hidden behind or identified with the biological-affective functions of man.
- (12) The self-concept as a conceptual Gestalt, is dealt with either positively or negatively. In a positive sense, the self-concept functions for the sake of human integration. However, the integrating principle is not the self (heart) but the self-concept which is the affective function of man.
- (13) Neo-Humanism always presupposes a dualistic interpretation of man: the cognitive (logical) and affective (a-logical) domains.
- (14) The biological or affective aspect of man motivates and leads human perception, learning, behaviour and life. It makes human learning and activities meaningful and relevant. Neo-Humanistic educators seem to suggest the affective as the most important integrating principle in education.
- (15) All the other aspects of man are reduced to the biological or affective aspect.
- (16) The relationship between the cognitive and affective aspects is indestructibly symbiotic. However, the cognitive is not dealt with to any

degree of significance, even in school education.

(17) Almost every aspect of man is dealt with in terms of overestimation or reduction, and not by its own law nucleus as is done in Reformational anthropology.

(18) Internal developmental and hierarchical relationships among all the aspects of man are recognized. However, the direction of prepotency in the hierarchy of the aspects was often reversed in comparison with a Reformational view of man.

(19) Neo-Humanistic Education is composed of various kinds of affective approaches to education. It is often manifested not as a holistic form of education but as an affective form of education in which its starting point and destination are affect.

Regarding human integration, Neo-Humanistic Education has achieved more success than classical humanistic education. The former makes an effort at overcoming defects of the logical aspect-centred classical humanistic education, and tries to integrate the logical with a-logical aspects of man. However, Neo-Humanistic education does not succeed in achieving the desired balanced integration on account of its dualistic concept of man. It also overemphasizes the a-logical aspects as a reaction to the previous overemphasis of the logical. Furthermore, from the perspective of the integrating principles of a Reformational anthropology, the concepts of and efforts at human integration of Neo-Humanism were evaluated as being a distorted and unbalanced disintegration or an inadequate integration of human personality and education. Therefore, the findings of this research lead to the conclusion that Neo-Humanistic education does not succeed in describing and achieving true human integration of the personality and education.

This research project has revealed that achieving true human integration cannot be effected without the aid of a truly balanced anthropology. Neo-Humanistic education is a case in point. Despite its

shortcomings, a Reformational view of man in education seems to be able to guarantee a more balanced view of human integration, if only because it avoids all immanent contradictions such as dualistic views of human modal functions and a dualism regarding the role of basic motives, but also because it recognizes a number of fundamental principles which determine the outcome of efforts at a holistic and integrated view of man.

Acknowledgments

I am indebted to many people in my nearly four years of study at the PU for CHE (Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education). I wish to thank them all for their love, guidance and help.

I would like to express a special word of appreciation to my promoter, Prof. Dr. J. L. van der Walt. He was willing to bear the labour pains to beget a doctor-son in his School. He often encouraged me, the weak-hearted Korean disciple, and frequently inspired me to produce more sophisticated work. He also arranged opportunities for further instruction to broaden and deepen my insights into Philosophy of Education. Owing to him, I also enjoyed a happy fellowship with a variety of scholars and could gain many valuable insights into my study from their various perspectives. Prof. Dr. P. C. van der Westuizen, Prof. Dr. J. L. de K. Monteith, Dr. C. T. Viljoen, Dr. J. Steyn, all of the PU for CHE, and Prof. Dr. G. Zecha of Salzburg University in Austria, read my research proposal, and gave critical comments and careful advice which I could usefully employ in this thesis.

Scholarships from PU for CHE for tuition fees and accommodation during the first two years of my study enabled me to come to South Africa from South Korea. My deepest thanks are also extended to the Sumoonro Church in South Korea for her supplicatory prayers and support toward the living expenses of my family in Potchefstroom. I deeply appreciate the support of Rev. Choon-Kyung Lee, Elder Kwang-Kil Kim and the supporting committee and organization of the Church. I fully realize that they supported me with true Christian love and faithful devotion to the Lord. My family members and relatives also supported me. Among them, I want to give special thanks to my uncle Jong-Ok Lee and aunt Kyung-Ran Park.

My interest in a Reformational approach to philosophical anthropology was first stimulated by some Korean professors: Prof. Dr. Sung-Soo Kim, Prof. Dr. Yong-Won Kang, Emeritus Prof. Dr. Yong-Sub Kim, the late Prof. Dr. Kitai

Hahn, Dr. Bo-Min Lee and the Dutch theologian Prof. Dr. N. H. Gootjes. They helped me to see the possibilities of Reformed faith and perspective. At just the correct time, I had the wonderful privilege to study as a doctoral candidate at the PU for CHE. At the PU for CHE, I experienced the fulness of the Reformational heritage and learnt from many scholars who have contributed to Christian higher education. I am indebted to them, especially to the Christian philosophers and educationists with whom I had the pleasure of interaction. I love PU for CHE as an alumnus.

I wish to express a sincere thank to Prof. Dr. A. L. Combrink for the final language editing, and also my appreciation to "Tannie" Anna Geyser for her help in editing the first draft of this thesis.

Finally, I must apologize most sincerely to my family: my wife Pearl and my children EunKang and Esther. I was not a good husband and father, because for the past four years I could not help them to settle comfortably in a foreign country. I deeply appreciate their long-suffering patience, love, encouragement, adaptation and self-sacrifice. In Christ we all had to put up with every inconvenience in order to yield a harvest in a limited period.

God, my heavenly Father, gave me all I needed!

Potchefstroom

November, 1996

Song-Guk Joh

CONTENTS

	OPSOMMING - - - - -	i
	SUMMARY - - - - -	vi
	<i>Acknowledgments</i> - - - - -	xi
1	ORIENTATION AND METHODOLOGY - - - - -	1
1.1	Introduction - - - - -	1
1.2	Background and context of the research problem - - - - -	1
1.2.1	Introductory remarks - - - - -	1
1.2.2	Historical background of Neo-Humanistic education - - - - -	3
1.2.3	Philosophical background of Neo-Humanistic education - - - - -	7
1.2.3.1	General - - - - -	7
1.2.3.2	Progressivism and Neo-Humanistic education - - - -	7
1.2.3.3	Existentialism and Neo-Humanistic education - - - -	8
1.2.3.4	Humanistic psychology and Neo-Humanistic education - - - - -	9
1.2.3.5	Romantic criticism and Neo-Humanistic education - - - - -	10
1.2.3.6	Neo-Marxism and Neo-Humanistic education - - -	11
1.2.3.7	Religious movements and Neo-Humanistic education - - - - -	13
1.2.4	Definition of Neo-Humanistic Education - - - - -	13
1.3	Statement of the research problem - - - - -	16
1.4	Topicality of the research problem - - - - -	17
1.5	Aims of the study - - - - -	21
1.6	Methodology - - - - -	22
1.7	Scope and delimitation of the study - - - - -	24
1.8	Research programme and structure of this thesis - - - - -	26

1.9	Conclusion - - - - -	27
2	THE CONCEPT OF BEING HUMAN IN NEO- HUMANISTIC EDUCATION - - - - -	28
2.1	Introduction - - - - -	28
2.2	John Holt: free man of value and dignity - -	29
2.2.1	General - - - - -	29
2.2.2	Human nature: good nature and inexhaustible potential - - - - -	30
2.2.3	Fear - - - - -	33
2.2.4	Freedom - - - - -	35
2.2.5	Whole development and the priority of a-logical aspects - - - - -	38
2.2.6	Anthropological remarks - - - - -	42
2.3	Paul Goodman: self-regulating free citizen -	43
2.3.1	General - - - - -	43
2.3.2	Holistic organism - - - - -	44
2.3.3	Self-regulation - - - - -	48
2.3.4	Social animal - - - - -	50
2.3.5	Anthropological remarks - - - - -	54
2.4	Carl R. Rogers: fully-functioning person - -	56
2.4.1	General - - - - -	56
2.4.2	Organism - - - - -	57
2.4.3	Process of becoming, and self-concept - - - - -	60
2.4.4	Fully-functioning person - - - - -	64
2.4.5	Anthropological remarks - - - - -	68
2.5	Abraham H. Maslow: self-actualizing people	70
2.5.1	General - - - - -	70
2.5.2	Biological nature - - - - -	71
2.5.3	Hierarchy of human needs - - - - -	75
2.5.4	Self-actualization - - - - -	77
2.5.5	Anthropological remarks - - - - -	82

2.6	Conclusion - - - - -	84
3	EFFORTS TO EFFECT HUMAN INTEGRATION IN NEO-HUMANISTIC EDUCATION - - - - -	87
3.1	Introduction - - - - -	87
3.2	Authur W. Combs: Affective Education - - - -	88
3.2.1	General - - - - -	88
3.2.2	Perceptual psychology - - - - -	88
3.2.3	Self-actualizing persons: integrated persons - - - -	91
3.2.3.1	A biological-psychological organism - - - - -	91
3.2.3.2	Self-actualizing persons: integrated persons - - - -	93
3.2.4	Affective Education for human integration - - - -	95
3.2.4.1	The holistic character of humanistic (affective) education - - - - -	95
3.2.4.2	The function of the affective aspects: personal meaning - - - - -	97
3.2.4.3	Affective character in learning - - - - -	98
3.2.4.4	Affective Education - - - - -	100
3.2.5	Remarks on human integration - - - - -	102
3.3	Gerald Weinstein: Self-Science Education -	104
3.3.1	General - - - - -	104
3.3.2	A curriculum of affect - - - - -	105
3.3.3	Self-science education - - - - -	109
3.3.4	Trumpet for human integration in education - - -	111
3.3.5	Remarks on human integration - - - - -	113
3.4	George I. Brown: Confluent Education - - - -	115
3.4.1	General - - - - -	115
3.4.2	Gestalt therapy - - - - -	117
3.4.3	Human integration - - - - -	119
3.4.4	Confluent Education for human integration - - - -	123
3.4.5	Remarks on human integration - - - - -	127
3.5	Robert E. Valett: Humanistic Education - - -	129
3.5.1	General - - - - -	129

3.5.2	Self-actualization - - - - -	130
3.5.3	A total person - - - - -	134
3.5.4	Humanistic education developing the total person - - - - -	135
3.5.5	Remarks on human integration - - - - -	138
3.6	Conclusion - - - - -	140
4	TRUE HUMAN INTEGRATION ACCORDING TO A REFORMATIONAL VIEW OF MAN - - - - -	144
4.1	Introduction - - - - -	144
4.2	A Reformational view of man: Image of God - - - - -	147
4.2.1	General - - - - -	147
4.2.2	Image of God (from the perspective of the creation, fall and redemption of man - - - - -	149
4.2.2.1	The uniqueness of man: the image of God - - - - -	149
4.2.2.2	The meaning of the image of God (from the perspective of the creation of man) - - - - -	151
4.2.2.3	The meaning of the image of God (from the perspective of the fall and redemption of man) -	155
4.2.3	Image of God in three relationships - - - - -	159
4.2.3.1	General - - - - -	159
4.2.3.2	A religious being: man's relationship with God --	159
4.2.3.3	A being-in-relation with neighbours: man's relationship with fellowman/woman - - - - -	162
4.2.3.4	A being fulfilling the calling of God: man's relationship with the world - - - - -	166
4.2.4	A holistic being - - - - -	169
4.2.4.1	General: traditional dualistic concept of man ---	169
4.2.4.2	Human wholeness: a Biblical concept - - - - -	171
4.2.4.3	Human wholeness in multi-dimensional structure - - - - -	174
4.2.4.4	Enkaptic wholeness (coherence) of individuality structure - - - - -	178

4.3	Principles of true human integration - - - -	180
4.3.1	General - - - - -	180
4.3.2	Religion - - - - -	180
4.3.3	Image of God - - - - -	183
4.3.4	Heart - - - - -	185
4.3.5	A living soul (or body): a holistic being - - - - -	188
4.4	Conclusion - - - - -	189
5	CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF THE EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE HUMAN INTEGRATION IN NEO- HUMANISTIC EDUCATION - - - - -	191
5.1	Introduction - - - - -	191
5.2	Critical discussion of the notion of human integration - - - - -	191
5.2.1	Religion - - - - -	191
5.2.1.1	Brief summary: "religion" as integrating principle - - - - -	191
5.2.1.2	Some characteristics of Neo-Humanism - - - - -	191
5.2.1.3	Additional critical discussion - - - - -	195
5.2.2	Image of God - - - - -	198
5.2.2.1	Brief summary: "image of God" as integrating principle - - - - -	198
5.2.2.2	Some characteristics of Neo-Humanism - - - - -	198
5.2.2.3	Additional critical discussion - - - - -	200
5.2.3	Heart (the self) - - - - -	201
5.2.3.1	Brief summary: "heart" as integrating principle -	201
5.2.3.2	Some characteristics of Neo-Humanism - - - - -	201
5.2.3.3	Additional critical discussion - - - - -	202
5.2.4	A living soul (or a body) - - - - -	203
5.2.4.1	Brief summary: "a living soul" as integrating principle - - - - -	203
5.2.4.2	Some characteristics of Neo-Humanism - - - - -	204
5.2.4.3	Additional critical discussion - - - - -	208

5.2.5	Some immanent criticism of Neo-Humanism - - -	211
5.2.5.1	General - - - - -	211
5.2.5.2	Some immanent criticism - - - - -	211
5.3	Conclusion - - - - -	212
6	FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
	- - - - -	214
6.1	Introduction - - - - -	214
6.2	Findings - - - - -	214
6.3	Conclusions - - - - -	217
6.4	Recommendations - - - - -	218
6.4.1	Recommendations pertaining to true human integration- - - - -	218
6.4.2	Recommendations with regard to further researches - - - - -	219
6.5	General conclusion - - - - -	219
	BIBLIOGRAPHY - - - - -	221

1 ORIENTATION AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 Introduction

In an attempt to introduce this study attention will be given in this chapter to the background and context of the problem. the statement of the problem, the topicality of the research problem, the aims of the study, the methodology, the scope and delimitation and the structure of the study.

1.2 Background and context of the research problem

1.2.1 Introductory remarks

In the history of education, various approaches to education have been followed on the basis of different interpretations and conceptions of human wholeness or totality. In various cases only one aspect of the human being has been overemphasized one-sidedly by educators and educational theorists, despite concomitant attempts to achieve human wholeness. Various aspects of the human being and many categories of such aspects can be mentioned to illuminate this problem. Two sets of aspects of the human being seem to have been differentiated and sometimes overemphasized principally, that is, the rational, cognitive or logical-analytical aspect as opposed to the non-rational, affective or a-logical aspects of the human being (Dooyeweerd, 1980:6; Steyn, 1989:2-4).

In some theories of education one of these sets becomes overemphasized, resulting in overreaction in competing theories in the form of excessive emphasis on the other set of human functions mentioned above. For example, when the rational or logical aspect of the human being is overemphasized

or absolutized in a theory, its contradiction or opposite (i.e. the a-logical aspects) seems to become excessively and one-sidedly emphasized in competing theories, in order to ensure equilibrium in the theorist's view of the human being-in-education.

Neo-Humanistic education can be regarded as an irrationalistic movement which became prominent in the United States in the 1960s (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:25), and which has attempted to portray the wholeness of man by emphasizing the irrational, affective, a-logical aspects of the human being, in reaction to the general trend of schooling which had at the time directed virtually all its attention at improving the capacity of the rational, cognitive, logical aspects of man. In this, its reaction was similar to what other irrationalistic trends that incline towards the freedom pole of the humanistic religious ground motive do (Van der Walt, 1985:39-40). The historical origins of Neo-Humanistic education can be traced to ancient educational philosophies with respect to its sharing common characteristics with other irrationalistic educational philosophies, like the emphasis upon the importance of self-knowledge or the awareness of the need to educate the whole person. Patterson (1973:32-44), a Neo-Humanistic educationist, for example, attempted to search for early examples of Neo-Humanistic education in almost all historical periods, from Aristotle to some recent humanistic schools, in order to find historical support for Neo-Humanistic education. Other theorists of education have also harked back to similar characteristics in antecedents of humanistic education in history in their efforts to explain the background of the Neo-Humanistic education, contending that humanistic education is neither a new, nor a static phenomenon, but its elements have existed for a long time (Nash, 1975:8; Lucas, 1984:284-361).

Neo-Humanistic education is broadly founded in humanistic philosophy, but its own historical and philosophical background or context in this century has given this educational phenomenon a new name: Neo-Humanistic Education or Humanistic Education. According to Steyn (1990:232), this approach can, in fact, be regarded as a more developed and balanced view of being human than some other irrationalistic educational philosophies, especially when it is compared from the viewpoint of anthropological equilibrium.

1.2.2 Historical background of Neo-Humanistic education

During the 1960s, partly because of the Sputnik shock in 1957, American education made every effort to raise the standard of intellectual achievement of students, especially in mathematics and science, criticizing the past education in the USA which had long been influenced by Progressivism. Various curriculum innovations, which were supported by federal funds and some philanthropic organizations, were made on the basis of the learning theory of Jerome Bruner, who emphasized the structure of disciplines and the use of inquiry (Gutek, 1991:309).

Coincidental with the rise to prominence of this intellectual efficiency movement in education came a growing interest in Behaviorism and its practical applications to teaching, which were being propagated by, *inter alia*, B.F. Skinner (Lucas, 1984:316). Educational administrators and curriculum specialists introduced organizational and methodological innovations in school architecture and design, curriculum organization, scheduling, staffing, and the use of television and other instructional technologies to increase the efficiency of intellectual education.

American education experienced a drastic change through these new curricula and methodological innovations, all of which naturally placed excessive emphasis on the rational, cognitive or logical aspect of pupils, in contrast to the period of Progressivism which had put more stress upon the irrational, affective or a-logical aspects of man. This leads one to the preliminary conclusion that the unbalanced deflection of the concept of being human called forward the opposite propensity in thought for the purpose of gaining equilibrium, and that historical situations often contribute to cause reactive movements, serving as catalysts (Nash, 1975:8,19).

Educational phenomena and pedagogic theory and practice in general are indissolubly connected with and embedded in specific cultural development (Schoeman, 1980:66). In this sense, it is possible to describe the historical characteristics which facilitated the development of the Neo-Humanistic education movement of the 1960s and the early 1970s.

The 1960s was a turbulent period. The 1960s has often been referred to as "the aquarian age" of human liberation and fulfillment for all (Lucas, 1984:325), the "troubled decade" (Guttek, 1991:297), the period of social protest and discontent, and the period of cultural revolution. During this period many young people from a variety of races and social levels demanded radical, social, political and educational changes in the United States.

Three major social and political factors can be discerned in connection with the historical background of Neo-Humanistic education.

Firstly, strong demands for complete civil rights gushed to the surface of American society, initiated by black Americans and minority groups. From the mid-1950s black Americans who

were impatient with the slow process of legal desegregation embarked on a more activist course. In the early 1960s they gained legal success through the full-scale demonstrations led by Martin Luther King, Jr. In the mid- and late 1960s, the really severe conditions of urban blight, unemployment and poverty caused a series of riots and civil disorders which gripped the large cities of the United States. School desegregation, increased employment opportunities, and full political participation were the main goals of Blacks throughout the 1960s. Hispanic consciousness and the women's liberation movement struggled for the same ideals (Guttek, 1991:297-301; Nash, 1975:17; Lucas, 1984:323-324).

Secondly, radically organized student activists protested against the American political-social-economic structure and the involvement of the country in the war in Vietnam. The mid- and late 1960s and the early 1970s were the era of such protest activities. Antiwar protests and demonstrations which occurred throughout the nation reached a peak in 1968-1969. Student activism was a new ideology that combined elements of humanism, Neo-Marxism, anarchism and social democracy. This activism was split into two contending and clearly separated factions in 1970: the radical anarchistic cadre and the neo-Marxist cadre. However, student activism began to lose its appeal for students and other people because of the use of violence in the early 1970s, and it lost momentum due to the economic changes occurring in the mid-1970s and the early 1980s (Guttek, 1991:301-307; Lucas, 1984:324).

Thirdly, the counterculture, which was a broad, diffuse movement struggling against the traditional cultural mores and values, influenced so many young people, especially white upper-middle-class youth during the 1960s, that it brought changes to the life-style and values of many young people. The counterculture bitterly criticized the traditional family,

social, and religious values, and endeavoured to build a more personalistic culture of utopian peace and harmony. Rock music, long hair, sandals and blue jeans, and communal living were the conspicuous characteristics of the movement. Many adherents of the counterculture rejected the work ethic which placed a premium on material wealth as a sign of progress and values, and discarded education which was not existentially relevant to their personal interests (Lucas, 1984:324-325; Gutek, 1991:307-308).

These above-mentioned social phenomena and trends stood against the big mass-society, impersonal bureaucracy and industrialism which threatened human value and freedom, and contributed to the rise of a new humanistic idea characterized by individualism, a free-humane-integrated personality, equal-interpersonal relations and a humane society (Van der Walt, 1985:39; 1987:25).

In this context, the books of radical and romantic critics of school education were published in surging waves. Neo-Humanistic educators criticized the fact that "schools were overly centralized, bureaucratic, formalized, routine, mindless and stifling of children's freedom and teacher's creativity" (Gutek, 1991:311). Their agitation for school reform "reflected a profound and abiding antipathy toward technocracy and all its underlying cultural assumptions" (Lucas, 1984:325). As positive efforts for humanistic education, Neo-Humanistic educators established many open, permissive and humane schools, and formed more holistic curricula (or programmes) that attempted to achieve a more integrated personality through emphasis of the affective aspects of man.

However, sudden economic changes, such as the high inflation rates of the mid-1970s and the recession of the 1980s, caused this critical and romantic movement to decline rapidly and to

accommodate the new demands. As Paul Nash (1975:19) has pointed out, during this period of scarcity and contraction, there was a turning towards specialization, vocationalism and professionalism. Increasingly the activism in the 1960s became irrelevant by the late 1970s and the early 1980s (Gutek, 1991:307), and a new call for basic learning and essential skills gradually emerged again (Lucas, 1984:354). However, irrationalistic trends still remain as forms of the New Age Movement and Postmodernism in 1980s and 1990s (Steyn, 1993:183, 193; Van Niekerk, 1996:4).

1.2.3 Philosophical background of Neo-Humanistic education

1.2.3.1 General

Neo-Humanistic education rests on an irrationalistic philosophy which inclines towards the freedom pole of the humanistic religious ground motive and comes chronologically after the Pragmatism and Existentialism of this century (Van der Walt, 1985:18, 39). Neo-Humanistic education has quite a few characteristics in common with other irrationalistic philosophies in this century. As a matter of fact, it has developed in connection with philosophic trends such as Progressivism, Existentialism, Humanistic Psychology, Romanticism, Neo-Marxism, and Oriental religious movements. The relationship between the Neo-Humanistic education and these philosophies will be presented concisely in this chapter in order to identify the character of Neo-Humanistic education.

1.2.3.2 Progressivism and Neo-Humanistic education

Although organized Progressivism had come to an end in the mid-fifties, its principles have lived on even to this day. The

history of American education in this century is often described as a strife between Progressivism (Liberalism) and Essentialism (Conservatism) (Newman, 1994:198-199). Because of common denominators like child-centredness and the non-authoritative role of the teacher, Neo-Humanistic education is sometimes regarded as a kind of Progressivism (Newman, 1994:198).

"Old progressives never die", according to Mosher (1976 :163). Ralph Mosher, for example, rediscovered the principles of Progressivism elaborating itself even at the end of the 1960s and in the early 1970s, and tried to relate Progressivism to developmental psychology by propounding education for human development of the whole child (Mosher, 1976:161-181). Consequently it is certain that he tried to put Neo-Humanistic education in the context of Progressivism.

Neo-Humanists adopted most of the principles of Progressivism, such as child-centredness, the non-authoritative role of the teacher, the focus on the active and involved pupil, the co-operative and democratic aspects of education, and the holistic conception of child and education, and so on (Knight, 1989:92; Power, 1982:162; Mosher, 1976:165,172).

1.2.3.3 Existentialism and Neo-Humanistic education

It is not easy to identify the actual influence of Existentialism on both the American school education and Neo-Humanistic education (Morris & Pai, 1976:392). Existentialism is sometimes regarded as only a related partner, instead of as a foundational basis (Power, 1982:161).

Humanistic psychology, which has exercised an important effect upon Neo-Humanistic education, was referred to as

existential psychology especially in the initial phase, and many Neo-Humanistic educators believed that their educational ideals were rooted in Existentialism (Morris & Pai, 1976:356-357, 396). The reason of their close connectedness is that Existentialism occurred just a "little earlier" than Neo-Humanism in history and that the two philosophies shared many fundamental ideas as irrationalistic trends in modern humanism. Therefore Existentialism is often regarded as a philosophical foundational idea (Morris & Pai, 1976:353-356), and as a stimulus (Knight, 1989:92) for the Neo-Humanistic educational movement.

As a result of the influence of Existentialism, Neo-Humanism has many characteristics in common with Existentialism. Neo-Humanists, who placed stress on the uniqueness of the individual and the search for personal meaning in human existence, had an overwhelming preference for the concrete, the subjective and the personal rather than the abstract, the objective and the social dimensions of human knowing, valuing, and action. They also thought that man was able to mould himself according to his own free choice rather than being determined by external conditions, and that he was responsible for what he was and what he did (Morris & Pai, 1976:354-355; Knight, 1989:92).

1.2.3.4 Humanistic psychology and Neo-Humanistic education

Humanistic psychology, which has been also named "third force psychology", following Psychoanalysis and Behaviorism, is also very closely linked with Neo-Humanistic education. Humanistic psychology is often introduced incorrectly as an educational theory (Mason, 1972:213), or as a psychological theory applied in education (Roberts, 1975), or in itself as a form of Neo-Humanistic education (Youngue, 1977).

Humanistic psychology, which is one of the important foundational ideas in the Neo-Humanistic education movement, has directly contributed to the development of Neo-Humanistic education (O'Banion, 1978:22,24). A few representative Humanistic psychologists took part directly in the Neo-Humanistic education movement as well as made a significant impact on the movement. People such as Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow and Arthur Combs were important guiding lights or leaders of the Neo-Humanistic education movement (Knight, 1989:92; Morris & Pai, 1976:356-364; Nash, 1980:7-8). Glasser (1969) applied his psychological theory to school education, and even Frankl contributed to this movement (Cronjé, 1989:28).

Humanistic psychologists presented ideal images of man in education, and proposed many methods and skills which were applied in the counselling situation, as means to accomplish the humanistic ideals in the classroom. They also encouraged educators to integrate these new educational programmes such as group sensitive activities with the regular curriculum in school (Read & Simon, 1975; Swisher, Vicary & Nadenichek, 1983:12-13).

1.2.3.5 Romantic criticism and Neo-Humanistic education

Since Rousseau's educational ideas in the late eighteenth century, Romanticism has been a major trend in the history of modern education. The Romanticism which was propagated by Rousseau and his successors was an attempt to restore the non-rational, affectional side of being human to a place of recognition and respect after what was perceived as the excessively rational and scientific temper of the eighteenth century (Nash, 1975:13). Lucas (1984:292) summarized the characteristic ideas of Romanticism in education as follows: the

notion of learning readiness, faith in the basic goodness of the child's nature, trust in its untrammelled expression and development, the idea of growth and discovery in the absence of inhibiting constraints, opposition to uncritical or purely verbal learning, stress on freedom, and the importance of intuition, feeling, and individuality.

Since Neill's Summerhill School became widely known in the 1960s, many writers have criticized contemporary schools, and many proponents of the romantic ideal established and managed so-called humanistic schools. Typical writers of this group, who inherited the romantic tradition during the 1960s and the early 1970s, are John Holt, Paul Goodman, Edgar Fridenberg, Herbert Kohl, Jonathan Kozol, George Dennison, Charles E. Silberman, Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner, George Leonard and others (Power, 1982:159; Knight, 1989:92; Morris & Pai, 1976:385).

These writers criticized chiefly the repressive, mindless, and inhumane conditions of modern schools from a negative point of view. They contended that modern schools had oppressed the humane growth of the student because they were preoccupied with order and punishment in their pursuit of intellectual achievement (Morris & Pai, 1976:351). Romantic critics thus made a large impact on the reading public and developed a grassroots sympathy for dabbling in Neo-Humanistic education (Knight, 1989:92).

1.2.3.6 Neo-Marxism and Neo-Humanistic education

Neo-Marxism is also involved in Neo-Humanistic education. Although Neo-Marxism is sometimes classified as a separate trend, independent of Neo-Humanistic education (Steyn, 1990:230,232) and its relationship with Neo-Humanistic

education is doubted, it has in the past also been dealt with in the category of Neo-Humanistic education in a broad sense, because Neo-Humanism definitely seems to contain Marxist or Neo-Marxist elements (Van der Walt, 1985:39-40; Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:28).

Neo-Marxist elements surfaced in Neo-Humanistic education in the late 1960s, as Van der Walt (1985:41-46) pointed out in analysing J.A. Battle's articles written in 1968. Generally speaking, however, Neo-Marxist analysis was actively applied to the relationship between school and socio-political structures in the 1970s. Left radical-critical books which were written in the mid- and southern American situation by Illich and Freire appeared during this period. Neo-Marxism has also been influencing educational theories in America since around the mid-1970s, for example in the philosophies of Apple, Giroux, Aronowitz, McLaren and others, even though it is reaching only a small audience inside theoretical studies of education (Newman, 1994:199). Neo-Marxist educators have also penetrated the Neo-Humanistic movement, criticizing Neo-Humanism for being relatively apolitical and ineffectual in confronting the problems identified in the 1960s and the early 1970s. Neo-Marxist educators required action on a political and economic level as well as on the personal and psychological level (Apple, 1976:315-316). Neo-Marxist educators have contributed to a better understanding of the relationship between knowledge (school education) and power (political power) (Newman, 1994:199).

Neo-Humanistic education is also associated worldwide with a radical-political movement against uniform and nationally controlled education, especially in the Third World (Van der Walt, 1985:40; Cronjé, 1989:6; Broudy, 1980:18). Revolutionary educational movements in the third world, for example People's Education in South Africa (Cronjé, 1989:25)

and the Chongyojo movement in South Korea were brought about by Marxism or Neo-Marxism.

1.2.3.7 Religious movements and Neo-Humanistic education

Certain religious movements can also be seen to be allied to Neo-Humanism. In these movements, Zen-Buddhism, eastern philosophies, magic, occultism and the use of conscience-raising drugs have been mentioned (Broudy, 1980:18; Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:28). Schaeffer had already pointed out the influence of oriental religions in modern thought in 1972, and predicted that these religious influences upon the Western thought would be getting clearer (Steyn, 1993:183-184).

The New Age Movement, which places great stress on the spiritual dimensions linked to non-rational aspects of man, has been developing since the 1980s, inter alia from oriental religions and mysticism. According to Steyn (1993:184), major ideas of the New Age Movement were applied to theories of school education and curriculum in the 1980s, and the educational application was named "Transpersonal Education" by Ferguson. This can be regarded as a subsequent form of the Neo-Humanistic educational movement (Steyn, 1993:193).

1.2.4 Definition of Neo-Humanistic education

Humanism, as a philosophy, has a history as long as that of man himself. It has been argued for as a form of *paideia* in the ancient world of Greece and Rome, and it has become even more respected as the idealistic idea of man-centeredness since the Renaissance, even though it has been seriously criticized and rejected by most Christians who regard it as a form of idolatry of the human self.

Humanism is a perplexing term which should be considered in various historical and philosophical contexts because it has included a variety of content from ancient times to the present. Its characteristics are, *inter alia*, emphasis on the power and value of the human personality, the unassailability and the holiness of the individual, and the importance of self-directed personal development (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:25).

In modern times humanism has revealed a distinct dualistic and dialectical tension in its religious ground motive of science (nature) and personality (freedom) (Dooyeweerd, 1984. vol.1:190; Brummer, 1961:98-100). In this century, the former motive of humanism in education has been typically demonstrated in the great stress placed on intellectual and academic excellence in Essentialism, Behaviorism and Positivism. It has attempted to attain to academically basic truths, particular professional skills and techniques, and to assimilate students in cultural traditions. Because the moral and good life is believed to be the essential components of the knowledge of the educated man, education should be based on academic rationality, objectivity, and amorality as the basic conditions for knowledge (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:26).

Neo-Humanistic education came into being as a form of reaction against this overemphasized science (nature) motive of humanism in education. For this reason it has taken on a negative or counter-cultural character. It has criticized the mass society, impersonal bureaucracies, large corporations and industrialism, and stands against technology, social controls, the primacy of things and objects (Broudy, 1980:18). Neo-humanists have doubts about the objective, neutral, and positive view of science and knowledge of the "old" (classical, traditional) humanism in this century (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:26).

"Neo-Humanistic education" is a vague term, because the Neo-Humanistic education movement encompasses several approaches in an umbrella fashion and many people use the term without defining or circumscribing it (Kirschenbaum, 1975:327; Hamachek, 1975: Preface 11). Broadly speaking, the Neo-Humanistic education movement reveals five important tenets, according to Van der Walt (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:24):

- 1 a broad and diffuse view of man that emphasizes human freedom, value, personal autonomy, and individualism;
- 2 a rejection of theories which reduce man to a single or a limited number of factors of mentality (e.g. Behaviorism and all other forms of reductionism);
- 3 emphasis on the subjective and inner aspects of man, in reaction to the scientific and technological objectification of man;
- 4 emphasis on emotion, desire and feeling of man, in reaction to the over-emphasis of the rational and cognitive potential of man,
- 5 a preference for free, alternative, open, informal schools, educational theories and administrative regulations.

Neo-Humanistic education proposes absolute individualism, the integrity of man, and a humane society as its goals (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:25). Furthermore, Neo-Humanistic education positively attempts to bring some balance to the past overemphasis of rational and cognitive processes by advocating the opposites, i.e. the non-rational, affective processes in man and education (O'Banion, 1978:27).

In view of the ideas propounded in this outline, Neo-Humanistic education can be defined as an irrationalistic educational movement which has stressed the non-rational, a-logical and affective aspects of man in reaction to the overemphasized rational, logical, cognitive aspect of man in the

traditional humanistic approaches, and which has attempted to bring some balance between them in order to bring about the holistic development of man and education on the basis of its irrationalistic position (Van der Walt, 1985:39-41; Steyn, 1990:222).

1.3 Statement of the research problem

Neo-Humanistic education, as a form of reaction to the overemphasis and one-sidedness of intellectual education, underlines the importance of the recognition of the a-logical (including the affective and emotional) aspects of the human being in the education process also (Steyn, 1989:3). In this way Neo-Humanistic educationists strive to integrate the a-logical aspects of being human with the logical-analytical aspect in education. However, they do this on the basis of a-logical centredness (cf. Valett, 1977), while at the same time criticizing the overemphasis of the logical-analytical aspect of the human being in prevailing positivism, and in technological theories of education.

The major aim of Neo-Humanistic education is the development of the whole person of the human being (Valett, 1977:58). Therefore many Neo-Humanistic educational theorists have criticized traditional educational ideas and practices for the fact that they seem to concentrate too heavily on the development of the intellect at the expense of the development of affective aspects, and therefore lack psychological relevance for children both in the curriculum and in the classroom atmosphere (Patterson, 1973:1-19; Valett, 1977:10,11; Youngue, 1977:1).

The matter of human integration is therefore a fundamental anthropological problem in Neo-Humanistic education (cf.

Valett, 1977:36-38). "Whole person", "holistic development", "confluent education", and "self-actualization", which are all characteristic terms in Neo-humanistic education, show their (i.e. the Neo-Humanistic educationists') attempts at effecting human integration both explicitly and implicitly.

However, these conceptions of integration can in principle not lead to the true integration of the human being on account of the very nature of humanism. Neo-Humanistic ideas fall short of the true human integration in the light of Scriptural principles, for instance the unity in religious direction, unity in the image of God, modal unity and so on (Fowler, 1981:1-10; 1991:3-16; Spykman, 1985:32-47; Van der Walt et al., 1985; Taljaard, 1976:150-187). Some Christian philosophers and educational theorists have already pointed out principles which form the basis of true human integration in education (Spykman, 1985:32-47; Van der Walt, Dekker, Van der Walt, 1985). It is necessary to apply this fundamental understanding of true human integration to the Neo-Humanistic education in a transcendental-critical manner.

Therefore the problem of this study can be stated in terms of the following questions:

1.3.1 What is the nature of the efforts to effect human integration in Neo-Humanistic education?

1.3.2 What is true human integration according to the Scriptural-educational view and how can it be accomplished?

1.3.3 What are the fundamental (principal) shortcomings of this approach?

1.4 Topicality of the research problem

Although Neo-Humanism in psychology has been conspicuously developed in psychological studies since the

1950s (O'Banion, 1978:22), the Neo-Humanistic discussion in education only began in the middle of the 1960s and culminated in the period from 1970 to 1975. The year 1972 showed the largest number of publications in and on Neo-Humanistic education in the USA (Youngue, 1977:6).

The humanistic educational movement seemed almost to cease in the mid-1980s in the USA, but its initial form changed earlier than that, and its popular appeal decreased rapidly from the late 1970s onwards. As the call for the cognitive, that is, basic learning and essential skills recurred in the late 1970s and the early 1980s (Lucas, 1984:354), so the education of the 1970s, roughly demarcated, was thought of as the antithesis of education in the 1960s (Nash, 1980:5).

However, Neo-Humanistic education has been one of the important educational trends in the Western world, especially in the USA and Western Europe (Van der Walt, 1985:40), and discussions about it have continued (cf. Fatzer, 1987; Swisher, Vicary & Nadenichek, 1983). Its influence has been dispersed into many countries of the Third World as a philosophy mingled with Neo-Marxism even during the 1980s. Above all, Neo-Marxist Neo-Humanism, having developed from the mid-1970s until the present, is regarded as an irrationalistic trend (i.e. Progressivism) pushed to the limit, opposing one-sided essentialistic schooling (Newman, 1994:200).

Newman (1994:200) pointed out the occurrence of a new humanistic (progressive) revival in the American education in the 1990s. He contended that in the changing social and political climate of the 1990s, Progressivism in a Neo-Humanistic form might once again have a turn. He pointed out that President Clinton had taken an eclectic approach to the politics of education, mixing Progressivism (liberalism) and Essentialism (conservatism). Newman (1994:198-199, 203)

summarized the course of American education of this century as the strife between Progressivism and Essentialism. This means that Neo-Humanism in education, which has been suffocated since the mid-1970s, "is making a modest comeback" in the 1990s (Newman, 1994:200).

The New Age Movement, a new trend which also reveals irrationalistic features, appeared in the world of education in the 1980s, also in the form of Transpersonal Education. The New Age educational movement can be regarded as a later more profound development of the Neo-Humanistic education (Steyn, 1993:193).

The above-mentioned examples of recent developments surrounding the Neo-Humanistic education show that Neo-Humanistic education had not totally faded away after its golden age of the 1960s and the early 1970s; its components remain in the fabric of education and rise to the surface whenever traditional education fails or greatly overemphasizes the intellectual aspect of the human being.

Books, articles and reports on the Neo-Humanistic education were collected and classified by Gray in 1976. She found a great amount of material on Neo-Humanistic education and classified it into rubrics like: rationale and rhetoric, broad and underlying theory, theory and practice, effects of curriculum on students, teacher-training programmes, surveys of student and teacher attitudes, relevant psychological research into attitudes and beliefs, descriptions of classroom activities, descriptions of programs and curricula, instructional technology and programmed learning and media, teacher training, and finally evaluation and measurement.

When these materials and other publications are analysed, it is found that many of the studies on Neo-Humanistic education

intend to produce positive results for Neo-Humanistic education on the basis of psychological research or school activities (cf. Patterson, 1973:128-139; Aspy, 1977; Anderson, 1981; Swisher, Vicary & Nadenichek, 1983), and they intend to apply the tenets of Neo-Humanistic education to various subjects and activities (cf. Bybee & Welch, 1972; Brown, 1973; Anderson, 1975; Weller, 1977).

Although a number of attempts for the general estimation and advocacy of the Neo-Humanistic education have been made by psychologists, sociologists and avant-garde teachers, and some educational theorists, few of them have dealt with its philosophical-anthropological problems. Because of its use of terms such as affective learning, levels of consciousness, sensitivity, feeling, confluence, awareness and interpersonal relationship, it appears as if Neo-Humanistic education can not be subjected to philosophical analysis (Fenstermacher, 1972:73).

Studies of Neo-Humanistic education from a Christian perspective are especially rare. However, two valuable studies have already been undertaken on Neo-Humanistic education from the reformational Christian perspective.

Steyn (1989) studied the a-logical aspects of the human being in some Neo-Humanistic thinkers from the perspective of the reformational Christian philosophy of education. In her dissertation she dealt with and evaluated the ideas of Vandenberg, Combs, and Friedman, among other Neo-Humanistic educationists. She concluded that Neo-Humanistic educationists did not seem to succeed in overcoming a dualistic anthropology and that they seemed to view the logical-analytical aspect of being human as a matter of minor importance.

Cronjé (1989) studied the Neo-Humanistic movement and its relevance to the school structure in the USA. In his thesis he dealt with and evaluated the Neo-Humanistic educational movement, and the actualization of the self as the purpose of humanistic schools in the USA, and contrived to propose the true context for the logical-analytically qualified school for self-actualization. He concluded that Neo-Humanistic educationists could not succeed in achieving the self-actualization which was their educational purpose as a result of their overemphasis both on the affective mode of being human and on the possibilities offered by the school structure. He propounded the theory that true self-actualization can be achieved in the societal-didactic foundations of the school structure which relates to task-motivation.

It was therefore timely to study the concept of human integration in education which is a basic aim and major end of Neo-Humanistic education, to compare it with the Christian reformational view and in this process to discuss and evaluate the former critically. Such a study was deemed to be one of the most fundamental investigations on Neo-Humanistic education, since it was also expected to reveal the religious basic motive of Neo-Humanistic education.

1.5 Aims of the study

This research aimed at:

- 1.5.1 a description of the nature of efforts to effect human integration in Neo-Humanistic education;
- 1.5.2 a comparison of human integration in Neo-Humanistic education with human integration in Christian education, on the basis of a Scriptural approach to human integration, and
- 1.5.3 an attempt to analyse the fundamental (principal) shortcomings of this approach.

1.6 Methodology

This study was performed from a Scriptural-reformational, fundamental-educational point of view. The following methods were applied.

1.6.1 Phenomenon analysis

Phenomenon analysis is not a method derived from Phenomenology, but is the ontological analysis of the educational phenomenon (Van der Walt, 1980:76; 1982b:33). The ontological question which had to be answered in this study was focused on the phenomenon of being human and on the phenomenon of human integration in Neo-Humanistic education and in Christian education.

1.6.2 The structural-empirical method

The structural-empirical method or the transcendental-empirical method is a method in which educational theorists grasp the structure of the plan of God for the educational phenomenon through empirical observations and experiences (Schoeman, 1978:801-802; 1980:37-38; Van der Walt, 1982b:33-34; 1992:89-117; Venter, 1983). This method was used for analysing and discussing the structure of the human being.

1.6.3 Literature study

Literature study entails general literary researches which criticize and examine literature. Books, dictionaries, articles, dissertations, and studies of bibliographies concerned with a specific theme were consulted (Van der Walt, 1982b:34-36; cf. De Wet, Monteith, Steyn & Venter, 1981:39-74). This study was based on, *inter alia*, primary and secondary sources on Neo-Humanistic education and Christian education.

1.6.4 The problem-historical method

This method is indispensable for understanding the historical background or context of a research problem (Van der Walt, 1982b:39-40; cf. Van der Walt, 1987:5-29). In order to discuss the present-day fundamental aspects of the research problem as outlined above, human integration was dealt with in a problem-historical context.

1.6.5 Intersubjective control

This method entails that a researcher submits to other scholars' conclusions that he has found through his study, so that the conclusions can be checked or tested (Van der Walt, 1982b:38-38). In this study discussions with and suggestions from the researcher's promoter and other advisors were taken into consideration. These other advisors include the members of an advisory research committee of the Faculty of Education of the PU for CHE, and Professor Gerhard Zecha of the University of Salzburg (Austria).

1.6.6 Transcendental criticism

This method was used in order to analyse the religious ground motive of Neo-Humanistic education (by means of transcendental criticism), to evaluate its views and to propose the true idea of human integration from a Scriptural point of view (the phase of transcendent criticism), to point out inner incoherences and conflicts (immanent criticism), and to evaluate the possibility of applications of Neo-Humanistic education and its possible contribution to true educational development (exheretical criticism) (cf. Strauss, 1978:1-10; Van der Walt, 1982b:41-43; Van der Walt, 1980:65-67; Dooyeweerd, 1984 vol.1:37-38, 88; Duvenage, 1985:36).

1.6.7 Fundamental reflection on basic principles

Fundamental reflection on basic principles is a method by means of which educational philosophers come to certain

convictions during their reconsideration and evaluation of a specific problem (Van der Walt, 1982b:37-38). This method was applied, for example, in order to find the true principal foundation of the true integration of the human being.

1.7 Scope and delimitation of the study

1.7.1 Delimitation in terms of academic discipline

This is a study in the philosophy of education. It has, therefore, concentrated on fundamental theoretical questions regarding ontology, epistemology, religious ground motive and mainly anthropology. However, it has also dealt with sociological as well as psychological descriptions of the human being .

Neo-Humanistic education has in a sense been diluted, adjusted or broadened by the more theoretically developed Neo-Marxism, Post-Modernism and the New Age Movement since the mid-1970s (Newman, 1994:199-200; Steyn, 1993:193). This research was, however, confined to Neo-Humanistic education as a historical phenomenon during the 1960s and the early 1970s.

1.7.2 Delimitation in terms of definition of some key concepts

1.7.2.1 Human integration

"Human integration" in this thesis was used to refer to the organization of the constituent elements of being human (or personality) into a coordinated, harmonious whole (Stein, 1984:692). Human integration includes all aspects in connection with the human being, since man is a being who religiously consists of oneness in the heart from all his

functions or aspects in time (Schoeman, 1980:6; Brummer, 1961:107, 192, 194).

1.7.2.2 Fundamental

"Fundamental" in this thesis has the same meaning as "principial", "transcendental" and "ontic" (Schoeman, 1980:4,17). "Fundamental" refers to what is at the foundation of reality as the necessary prerequisite of temporal existence (Spier, 1979:58).

1.7.2.3 Anthropological problem

"Anthropological problem" in this thesis was used to refer to the problem in philosophical and educational anthropology. This term refers to the problem of man as a complex entity which is characterised by its indivisible and integral unity in education (Schoeman, 1980:85,87; Dooyeweerd, 1984 vol.1:44, 542; Spier, 1979:257).

1.7.2.4 Neo-Humanism

"Neo-Humanism" was used instead of "New humanism", because the prefix "neo-" properly denotes a new or modern form of a philosophy or designates those who advocate or use it, such as Neo-Marxism or Neo-Darwinism, while "new" can refer to a philosophy which has not existed before but is now made or brought into existence for the first time (Murray, Bradley, Craigie & Onions, 1978 vol.VII.:88, 113).

1.7.2.5 Some dualistic or contrasted terms

Some dualistic or contrasted concepts about man in philosophical and psychological trends have been discovered. Some trends have ascribed human behaviour to human reason or the logical function of man, others have ascribed it to other aspects of man such as emotion and will, in order to counteract the former's overemphasized view of reason. The terms "rational", "logical", and "cognitive" (especially in psychology)

have been used for the former, and "irrational", "a-logical" (or non-logical), "affective" (especially in psychology) for the latter (Dooyeweerd, 1984 vol.1:18, 153, 466-467; Schoeman, 1980:1; Vallet, 1977:12, 21-24). These two sets of terms are, however, not respectively correlative. In this thesis they have been used in terms of the broad outline above unless a specific meaning for specific terms seemed to be required or suggested.

1.8 Research programme and structure of this thesis

This research report consists of the following chapters:

1.8.1 Orientation and methodology

This chapter introduces the background and context of the problem, the statement of the problem, the topicality of the research problem, the aims of the study, the methodology, the scope and delimitation, and the structure of the research.

1.8.2 The concept of being human in Neo-Humanistic education

This chapter presents the general anthropology of Neo-Humanistic education. This is presented in terms of an analysis and critique of some representative views of Neo-Humanists, such as Holt, Goodman, Rogers and Maslow.

1.8.3 Efforts to effect human integration in Neo-Humanistic education

This chapter identifies the nature of the efforts on the part of Neo-Humanists for human integration. Famous theories of some Neo-Humanists such as Combs, Weinstein, Brown and Valett on human integration are analysed and then criticized for this purpose.

1.8.4 True human integration according to a reformational view of man

This chapter presents the concept of being human and the principles of human integration from a reformational Christian perspective. The anthropological theories of Christian philosophers and educational theorists who have been advocating the reformational philosophical tradition, are employed for this purpose.

1.8.5 Critical discussion of the efforts to achieve human integration in Neo-Humanistic education

Critical discussions between Neo-Humanists and reformational Christian thinkers on the efforts to achieve human integration are presented in this chapter. The researcher critically evaluates the efforts of Neo-Humanists in this process on the basis of his reformational view.

1.8.6 Findings, conclusions and recommendations

This chapter summarises the findings, presents the conclusions on the basis of these findings, and suggests some recommendations, *inter alia*, for future research.

1.9 Conclusion

Some introductory remarks to this study were made in this chapter. The next chapter will deal with the concept of being human in Neo-Humanistic educational philosophy through an analysis and critique of a few representative Neo-Humanists' ideas.

2 THE CONCEPT OF BEING HUMAN IN NEO-HUMANISTIC EDUCATION

2.1 Introduction

Neo-Humanistic education was brought about as a reactionary movement against the over-emphasized intellectualistic trend of modern education as is mentioned in the previous chapter (1.2). In this chapter, the study of the general concept of being human in Neo-Humanistic education, is executed through analysing some anthropological theories of Neo-Humanists.

The emphases in Neo-Humanistic education are twofold: one is more related to teaching subject matter in a more humanistic way, and the other is more related to educating the non-intellectual or affective aspects of the student (Patterson, 1973: Preface 10). Sometimes Neo-humanists are, for this reason, classified into two groups according to their nature: destructive critical, and constructive advocates (Hunt & Sullivan, 1974:224). Thirdly, Romantic critics in Neo-humanism focus their critical concerns more on schooling and society, while humanistic psychologists in education concentrate on the total development of each individual (Mason, 1972:219, 243). These classes, however, are in principle not different from one another. The first group in each classification refers to a group with Romantic critical features, and the second refers to another group with Humanistic psychological characteristics.

In order to outline a general anthropology in Neo-Humanistic education, it is necessary that some major writers representing the above-mentioned two categories should be selected as examples. On the other hand, it is necessary to analyse the concepts of being human of some Neo-humanistic thinkers, who, from the earliest stage of the movement, have stimulated and influenced humanistic educators and educationists.

To consider these two trends, the works of Holt, Goodman, Rogers and Maslow have been chosen for analysis. Holt and Goodman are Romantic humanists who destructively criticize traditional education and society, and Rogers and Maslow are humanists who offer positive and constructive suggestions on applying humanistic psychological approaches to education.

2.2 John Holt: free man of value and dignity

2.2.1 General

John Holt, who is acknowledged to be "the living symbol and chief spokesman", "a single spokesman", "the most widely known", "the central figure" or "the best known spokesman" of the Romantic school of criticism in the Neo-Humanistic education (Hootman, 1976:1, 12, 13, 89), wrote some books and articles on the basis of his experience and observations when he had been a teacher. His major writings are *How Children Fail* (1964), *How Children Learn* (1968), *The Underachieving School* (1969), *What Do I Do Monday?* (1971), *Freedom and Beyond* (1972) and *Instead of Education* (1976). According to Hootman (1976:1,2), the publication of *How Children Fail* marks 1964 as the beginning ("the first drop of rain") of Neo-Humanistic education, and 1972, the publication date of *Freedom and Beyond* is used to mark the end of the Romantic school criticism in Neo-Humanistic education.

Judging by the themes of his writings, John Holt seems to criticize mainly the dehumanizing malfunction of modern schools, then propounds some effective cases based on his own experience and observation, and later proceeds to his major concern about freedom and the nature of being human, and finally broadens the area of his interest from school to society.

The methodology of his writings has developed from concrete descriptions of school problems and alternative cases, to more philosophical discussions on education, freedom, human nature and society, as his philosophical understanding progressed.

Holt (1971:267) proclaimed himself to be a humanist. His attention as a humanist was almost entirely on man in education. In his analysis and criticism of modern schools, he blamed teachers, teaching methods and educational systems for having done harm to children, as well as for having disturbed their sound development. Accordingly, Holt's (1976:208) proposals are focused on the demand for a different view of being human and of the nature and needs of children, to teachers, administrators and parents rather than on a demand for a series of effective teaching methods or technological renovations of school activities and facilities. Holt believes that all educational failures of teachers are caused by their lack of true understanding of children and they fail to establish proper humanistic relationships between themselves and children (Hootman, 1976: 22).

2.2.2 Human nature: good nature and inexhaustible potential

Holt (1971:267) adheres to behaviouristic humanism, according to his own admission. His behaviourism, however, is not a kind of psychological Behaviourism, because he abhors the mechanical understanding of man in psychological Behaviorism and has often criticized it for standardizing children as it happens in an academic assembly line (Holt, 1969a:105; 1971:280). Instead, his behaviourism is related to atheistic Evolutionism (Holt, 1971:24). His understanding of religion reminds us of the interpretation of William James' psychology, in which religion belongs to those who are

captured in fatalism and paranoia (Holt, 1971:36). In a word, Holt stands for atheistic humanism in terms of religious belief.

John Holt (1976:112-117) directly presents his view of human nature in a chapter of *Instead of Education: ways to help people do things better*, though many of his books imply a certain view of human nature. He agrees partly that human nature has a bad bend in accordance with the so-called "traditional and pessimistic view of man" (Holt, 1976:113). However, he puts more stress on the good capacity and propensity of man, defending his optimistic view of man against the charge of the conservative and the "Christian", that his view of man is too sentimental and does not take account that human beings, all-too-frequently, have the capacity of doing wrong (Holt, 1976:112).

Holt (1976:114) contends that the biological nature of man, which he sees as the deepest nature of man, not only has a capacity for evil, but also a huge capacity for harmless pleasure, enjoyment of life without hurting others, and he also argues that the emotion of man, unless disturbed by fear or some principles of a sick society and of religion, can be moved into and expressed in a good direction.

Holt emphasizes the positive aspects and potential of human nature in relation to learning, since his anthropology is an educational one. He has faith in the ultimately healthy impulses of children, as was pointed out by Nash (1965:378). In his description of the nature of man, Holt states that man by nature thinks and learns as "a learning animal", just as birds fly and fish swim (Holt, 1968:189). He considers that by nature children want to grow, step forward and move out into the world, because they have natural impulses to grow (Holt, 1971:277). According to Holt (1972:2), children are naturally smart, energetic, curious, eager to learn, and good at learning.

Children are especially full of curiosity as a result of their natural bent of mind (Holt, 1968:90; 1969a:157), and their curiosity even grows by what it feeds on (Holt, 1968:168).

According to Holt (1969b:3,5), the learning desire of man to understand the world in which he* lives and to gain freedom and competence, is without exception so innate and unquenchable that teachers cannot help, and can only harm the education of children unless the teachers have faith in the innate eagerness of the children.

Holt holds that man, mysteriously, has huge natural potential to learn from birth. He recognizes that man's latent intellectual capacity is so great that he uses only about ten percent of that potential during his whole life (Holt, 1969a:5), and that it is much more powerful than that which has been expected by us (Holt, 1972:67), so that man cannot completely grasp its mystery through scientific examinations (Holt, 1968:173-175, 188). The power to learn and to be creative, which runs well especially during childhood, often astonishes parents and teachers (Holt, 1968:25, 17). This power even grows if the conditions are good (Holt, 1968:66).

According to Holt (1968:71, 99, 101), children have self-curing power in their minds and spirits, and patience, persistence, as well as an ability to cope with uncertainty (Holt, 1972:24,67). Correction in education is not necessary, because children have the ability to become aware of their own mistakes, and to correctit for themselves. Holt (1971:40) believes that all good things in education come from the children and are in them.

* Use of male pronouns in this thesis also includes reference to females, unless the context dictates otherwise.

Holt (1972:103) defines man as "a social, a cultural animal". Man is by nature so malleable by his social-cultural environment that he is easily shaped in accordance with its influence (Holt, 1976:114). Since the behaviour of man depends very much on the culture in which he grows up, the questions about fundamental human nature without his own culture, are meaningless, and can not be answered. So Holt (1976:114) holds that "there is and can be no such thing as a human being without a culture".

This very fact that man is a social-cultural animal becomes simultaneously the condition limiting the good nature and huge capacity of man. Every bad influence does not come from the inner human nature or self, but from a social-cultural environment as Rousseau, the father of Romanticism, had already contended. Holt (1976:116) believes that people do many bad things. However, he excuses them for doing this because they have been taught and made to do these things in society. A sick society treats man so badly and unfairly, and destroys so deeply the sense of his own dignity and worth, that he cannot think what to do with himself (Holt, 1976:116). Therefore every attempt to find out how much goodness or kindness there may be in human nature, depends entirely on the answer to the question how much goodness and kindness there is in the society. Childhood, the days when man is not affected so much by society, is regarded as the ideal period, because good nature may demonstrate itself unconstrainedly during that time. This very view of man makes Holt criticize his society radically, especially modern schools, the educational constitutions in the society.

2.2.3 Fear

What makes men (children) who possess good nature and great potential fail? Holt (1969a: Foreword 15-16) answers

by contending that they usually fail because they are afraid, bored and confused. The main anthropological interest of Holt among these three factors is focused on fear. Fear in children is caused when they worry that they may fail, disappoint or displease their parents and teachers.

Holt (1969a:38-40) points out that children feel trapped and under great tension because they are afraid of failing, afraid of being called stupid, and afraid of feeling stupid themselves. He warns that fear weakens, stunts or paralyzes the intelligence and capability of children. At the worst, it destroys and dampens their curiosity and confidence, and distorts the child's whole way of looking at, thinking about, and dealing with life (Holt, 1969a:49, 160, 167; 1968:9, 100). Fear makes children almost incapable of constructive thinking and working, so Holt (1969a:49, 69) states that "the scared learner is always a poor learner". Scared children keep on making mistakes, and their works become worse and worse, not better (Holt, 1969a:134, 152).

Since a fearful person, child or adult, is in retreat, driven back or shrinking back to an unknown world or experience, he forgets very easily. Since the fearful person wants to feel safe, he wants to fall back in many ways on the protective strategy of deliberate failure, and he is not even tempted to try a new and creative task which contains uncertain elements (Holt, 1971:34-35). Moreover, since a fearful child is locked into his babyhood, he cannot grow up in a healthy way. There can never be reality of encounter, truthfulness, honesty in him, because he cannot help yielding to the threat of a superior force (Holt, 1976:25).

The fearful person comes to use various strategies in order to defend himself and to avoid trouble, embarrassment, punishment, disapproval or loss of status. After some time the

strategies become habits with him (Holt, 1969a:45, 48, 141, 158). These strategies are the means by which he is being shaped while trying to get correct answers through every attempt, instead of thinking about the meaning of whatever he is working on. Holt (1969a:3, 25, 46, 140) calls the child who uses these strategies a "producer" in contrast with a "thinker". According to Holt, children are experts at finding these strategies when they feel afraid. These strategies, such as a mumble in language classes (Holt, 1969a:13) and a blind guess (Holt, 1969a:15, 33), are created to avoid punishment and disapproval, and to please the grownups at all costs. These strategies, however, hamper children's true thinking (Holt, 1969a:17, 46), and destroy both their character and intelligence, since these strategies are in the long run self-limiting and self-defeating (Holt, 1968: Preface 8; 1971:54). In this context, Holt (1971:53, 58) gave a title, "The killing of the self", to a chapter in *What do I do Monday?*, diagnosing that fear in schooling destroys and kills the curiosity, confidence, trust, hope, self-respect, and intelligence of children.

Holt (1969a:63) compares the children who have been captured by the feeling of failure and incompetence in schools to psychoneurotic patients who have long been troubled by heavy stress. Agreeing with the Scottish psychiatrist Ronald Laing, Holt (1971:39, 48, 54) discusses the similarity between fearful responses of children in school and psychopathological diseases such as schizophrenia and paranoia. Holt draws the conclusion that fear of failure completely destroys mental health and even the soul.

2.2.4 Freedom

Holt contends that men who have innately good nature and unlimited potential, are being deprived of it on account of the

bad influences which are caused by the society and the culture in which they live. So he demands freedom of all the negative and oppressing factors and conditions of the environment. More concretely speaking, the meaning of freedom is to be free from fear (Holt, 1969a:69). Only when men are free from fear and worry, they can find their own hidden talents of which they are unaware (Holt, 1969b:88).

Holt considers a school as the major social institution which causes this threat and oppression. In modern schools, according to his analysis, fear makes children more destructive. Fear experienced by soldiers in a war is far less destructive (Holt, 1969a:49). The schools are dull, ugly and inhumane places (Holt, 1969b:28) and they subject children to heavy and destructive psychological pressure (Holt, 1969b:37). To show its destructive influence, Holt compares the school to a jail (Holt, 1969a:156; 1969b:134, 145-163, 182; 1972:243; 1976:186), to a place which makes man a slave (Holt, 1969a:160; 1969b:135; 1972:48), or to the Army (Holt, 1969b:137; 1971:56). He believes that the Army, which people generally see as a typically threatening and oppressive place, is physically and psychologically far less destructive than modern schools, and that the Army seems about a hundred times more friendly, welcoming and pleasant than an oppressing school (Holt, 1969b:137; 1971:56). Indeed, modern schools, for Holt (1971:77), are causing stupid, defensive and self-defeating behaviour in children.

Holt suggests that the compulsory school attendance laws and the whole system of diplomas and credentials through schools, should be abolished (Holt, 1969b:28; 1972:137), and that the so-called conventional testing, which is a harmful instrument threatening children, should also be abolished (Holt, 1969b:53, 55; 1971:250, 264). He doubts the validity of standardized psychological tests, especially the IQ test (Holt, 1969a:98;

1968:69; 1969b:181), and he protests against the authoritarian, prescriptive and oppressive attitude of teachers as the role of taskmaster, policeman, judge and even the devil (Holt, 1969b:146, 152-153). He also opposes all uniform methods (Holt, 1969a:105; 1972:11, 154), technological methods (Holt, 1971:280-281), and a fixed, required curriculum, because he thinks that they destroy the individuality of man just like the production system on the assembly line. In a wider sense, he also criticizes organizational and bureaucratic systems of modern society (Holt, 1969b:131).

The positive aspect of freedom, according to Holt, causes the good nature and inexhaustible capacity of man to blossom as much as possible. Holt (1969b:34; 1971:65; 1972:28) advocates that children must be given much more freedom in a positive sense, excluding guidance or control in a negative sense, so that they may become true "free men". Holt (1972:17) recognizes some limits in freedom, however, as he explains that the meaning of freedom is "more choice" to reject or use as he pleases (Holt, 1971:94; 1972:20).

According to Holt (1969a:156), it is important and even essential for man to have freedom to live and to think about his life for his own sake. Children should have more freedom of choice in their lives and learning, allowing them to choose and decide what they want. In this context, Holt (1969a:175, 181; 1969b:129, 204) contends that a pupil must have greater freedom to decide about the content, method, and even the period of time needed for learning for himself, so that the pupil may move, talk, plan, use his time, direct and assess his own learning. He will then be the planner, director, and assessor of his own education and may be treated like a sensible adult (Holt, 1969b: Preface 9, 138). As a result, Holt wants to say that man becomes a true human being only through freedom, because man must become an autonomous being in the real

sense. Therefore, Holt (1971:37) argues that a learner (child or adult), his experiences, his interests, his concerns, his wonders, his hopes and fears, his likes and dislikes, the things he is good at, must always be at the center of his learning.

Holt (1968:15, 93; 1969b:103; 1972:180; 1976:71, 189) points out that a learner approaches learning with enthusiasm and willingness when it seems to satisfy him. The learning must be interesting and worth doing, then the learner learns much more rapidly and effectively in his own way, in his own good time and for his own reasons or purposes (Holt, 1968:107, 186; 1971:95). Furthermore, Holt (1968:146; 1976:156) contends that man can foster a sense of his own being and worth, based on a positive self-concept. When these humanistic purposes and ways are carried out on the basis of his belief, a man who has the strong feeling of identity and esteem becomes a truly remarkable person (Holt, 1969b:201).

2.2.5 Whole development and the priority of a-logical aspects

Holt has a holistic concept of life, learning and being human. He contends that the reality of life is characterized by a totality consisting of all aspects rather than by something that can be divided up by dotted lines into a lot of little areas (Holt, 1971:102). Though the reality is sometimes referred to in terms of its aspects, as if it might be divided, it is simply different ways in which man looks at parts of the wholeness of reality and of being human and of experience, and asks certain kinds of questions about them. The truth is that the aspects are all one and that they act together (Holt, 1976:5, 6).

Holt (1971:95, 11) puts stress upon the wholeness of learning in which a student completely participates. He defines learning as a kind of growing, a moving and expanding of the

person into the world around him, not confined by the intellectual aspect. Sometimes Holt (1976:3, 10) prefers "doing" and a "do-er" to "education" and "learning". He considers that the latter only applies generally to the intellectual aspect of man, while the former can apply to the totality of life. For him, "doing" means the wholeness including body, muscles, hands and instruments available as well as the intellectual function. "Doing" implies all the so-called dualistic parts, both the physical and the intellectual, because it means the whole activity including all that man is saying, hearing, writing, reading, thinking and even dreaming. And being a "do-er" means that the student is at the centre of his own actions, so all the actions belong to him and are a part of him (Holt, 1976:5). In this sense Holt (1976:87) doubts whether a teacher can work in a "purely" intellectual field.

Holt does not only confine intelligence to the intellectual capacity, but tries to widen its scope. He regards intelligence as a style of life (totality), a way of behaving particularly in new, strange and perplexing situations (Holt, 1969a:165). Furthermore, he points out that the root of intelligence lies in a certain feeling about life and one's own self-image with respect to life. He argues that the true test of intelligence should not be how much we know how to do, but how we behave when we do not know what to do. In this sense he defines the true intelligent person as the man who opens himself up to a new situation, tries to take in with mind and senses everything he can about it and grapples with it boldly, imaginatively, and resourcefully (Holt, 1969a:165).

Holt emphasizes the whole development of man. He proposes that the school should provide children with intellectual, artistic, creative, and athletic activities, because students should develop according to the great variety and richness of life, determined by their curiosity, abilities, talents and

interests (Holt, 1969a:180). Art can exercise the brain which is generally considered to be a part of the intellectual function (Holt, 1968:137), and the music-art-poetry class may be far more important in terms of the human development and the growth of human capacity (Holt, 1969b:193). Holt (1972:242-243) proposes that teachers should "help every human being grow and develop in every way to the fullest extent of his capacity - in, among other things, awareness, responsiveness, curiosity; courage, confidence, imagination, resourcefulness, patience, generosity, sympathy, skill, and understanding; in the ability to see a wide range of choices, to choose wisely among them, and to recognize and change choices that prove to be unwise; in a strong sense of his own freedom, dignity, and worth, and of those same qualities in others", in order to promote the growth of the children.

The mutual relationship between the intellectual and the affective is also emphasized in this understanding of the whole human being. Holt (1971:25, 32, 34) points out that men have not only thoughts but feelings about themselves, their world and the world outside their world, and that these two can not be radically divided but depend on and very strongly affect each other. So the feelings about the world are part of the knowledge about it, and the knowledge is part of the feelings. As a result, these two act upon each other.

Nevertheless, Holt (1971:25) considers that feelings, the a-logical aspects of man, determine the way and possibility of the growth of man. The a-logical aspects are the precondition for all the learning activities of man, and provide power to enable learning activities to proceed. On this basis, when students are not honest about their feelings, their activities cannot be interesting and the unpleasant feelings prevent their learning from proceeding. Instead, when students are and feel free to express their feelings to themselves and others, they are able

once again to begin learning (Holt, 1969a:173). Because students learn in spurts, the more interested they are in what they are learning, the faster these spurts are likely to be (Holt, 1968:107). Furthermore, Holt (1969a:159) contends that interesting and exciting feelings, a-logical phenomena, make children act intelligently and get into the habit of acting intelligently.

Holt (1968:118), in this context, diagnoses that failure in education is often brought about by teachers' ignorance or negligence of the feelings of children. He criticizes the teachers who think the child's feelings are unimportant, to be easily overridden by exhortation and encouragement, or even anger and threats. He points out that the failure of communication between a teacher and a student in the classroom is also caused by the teacher's unawareness of the child's feelings (a-logical aspects of human being) (Holt, 1969b:102). As a concrete example, Holt (1969b:92) suggests that when students are under emotional pressure, their memory and hunch, which enable the progress of learning, cannot function well.

Holt also reveals his trust in the a-logical aspects through estimating hunches very positively. He explains that children test, confirm, and strengthen not only their hunches about what the teacher says, but also the criteria by which they make these hunches, while the teacher only provides a kind of emotional support (Holt, 1976:77). If students are too confused and too anxious, they no longer dare trust any of their own hunches, so that they can not learn much (Holt, 1976:78). Holt (1968:98) regards hunches as a very important element of learning, because he is convinced that students learn through testing their own hunches which they do trust.

2.2.6 Anthropological remarks

The major features of Holt's anthropology can be summarized as follows.

2.2.6.1 Man-centredness: free man of value and dignity

Holt is an atheistic humanist, who believes in optimistic Evolutionism. According to his concept of being human, man has by nature good propensities and unlimited positive potential. Man should be freed from all the oppressive and threatening influences that obstruct his good disposition and capacity, and must be able to establish himself and his life according to his own spontaneous decision. The truly free (autonomous) man is described as one who has an irrefutable right to his life and all his activities.

2.2.6.2 Self: the biological-psychical nature

Holt does not develop a theory of the self as the motivator and director of human behaviour. However, it is evident that the biological-psychical nature toward self-satisfaction plays the leading role in human behaviours. Unless the biological-psychical nature is disturbed by external threatening oppression, it motivates human learning and development into a good direction. It should choose and decide everything according to his own way. It should also direct man's learning and activities freely to self-fulfilment.

2.2.6.3 The priority of the affective aspect in the holistic view of man

Holt entertains a holistic concept of reality and of being human. Man's learning is also holistic to such an extent that it has to be involved in all aspects of man. Man is a doing and not just a thinking being, and his activity is engaged in the whole world where he is located. Holt tries to avoid the over-emphasis or reductionism of the logical (intellectual) aspect of

man. He also intends to show the interrelationship between the intellectual aspect and the affective (cf. Holt, 1971:25, 32,34). However, Holt places strong emphasis upon the affective aspect rather than the logical. The affective aspect of man is the precondition and motivating element of the intellectual in learning and activities of man. The affective aspect contains many a-logical aspects with some functions of the self. According to Holt, the components of the affective aspect are, for example, biological satisfaction, fear, confidence, self-respect, will, feelings, senses, art, creativity, athletics, music, poetry, impulse and intuition. As a result, he divided human aspects in a dualistic way: the physical-biological-psychical aspect and the intellectual.

2.3 Paul Goodman: self-regulating free citizen

2.3.1 General

Paul Goodman is "one of the earliest writers" (Patterson, 1973:11), to whom even John Holt has some debt (Hootman, 1976:124, 144). He is a well-known critic of the school and social system in America during the 1960s. However, his great contributions as a philosophical founder of Neo-humanistic Education and Gestalt Therapy have often been neglected, as Fatzer (1987:39) points out. As a radical critic of the American school system, psychologist of Gestalt therapy and once professor of sociology, he has written prolifically on a wide range of topics. He wrote novels, poetry, plays and literary criticisms, but his major works relate to Gestalt therapy, and criticism of American society and education. His educational works are estimated to be "part of our best thought on education" (Vaughan, 1970:6).

His anthropology and educational philosophy have been of central concern in several of his books: *Gestalt therapy* (1973), *Growing up absurd* (1961), *Compulsory miseducation* (1975), *The community of scholars* (1962), *Communitas* (1960), *People or personnel* (1968), *New reformation: Note of a Neolithic conservative* (1968) and so forth. The first three books mentioned above are thoroughly analysed in this chapter, because these books best reveal his concept of being human in education. The second part of *Gestalt Therapy*, which he developed and worked over the material which Perls had written as a manuscript, reveals Goodman's basic view of man, and the other two books show his view of man in connection with society and school.

2.3.2 Holistic organism

Goodman fundamentally presupposes Evolutionism in his view of man. Such human characteristics of the body as erect posture, freedom of hands and growth of brain, are explained according to evolutionary development (Goodman, 1973:363-365). Acquisition of human mental abilities (speech) and problems (neuroses), is also explained in the same way (Goodman, 1973:361, 372). According to him, man's adjustments are mainly conservative and they have been built into him (the organism) during a long phylogenetic history (Goodman, 1973:456). Man acquires much of his behaviour from imitative learning as young animals in higher phyla do (Goodman, 1973:365).

Goodman (1973:274, 362), as an evolutionist and Gestalt psychologist, considers man as an organism, like an animal, which is mobile in a field and has a complicated internal structure. Though "Man", "person", "self", "individual", "organism" and "animal" are sometimes distinguished from one

another, these terms are often interchangeable (Goodman, 1973:367, 406, 465). When he discusses psychological matters in Gestalt therapy, he usually uses "organism". However, when he discusses educational and social matters in *Growing up absurd* and *Compulsory miseducation*, he prefers to use "animal" to "organism" more frequently (Goodman, 1961:185; 1975:40).

The biological analogy of organism (animal) is accepted without any hesitation by Goodman, as Boyer (1970:179-180) points out. As every organism grows by incorporating, digesting, and assimilating, man grows toward maturity contacting new matters in the same way (Goodman, 1961:3; 1973:395). Man in society is pictured in terms of a living organism in his environment. As an organism, man grows by "assimilating" from the environment (society) what he needs for his growth (Goodman, 1973:276), seeks to diminish tension and to reach "equilibrium" (Goodman, 1973:404), and tries to increase "excitement" (satisfaction) (Goodman, 1973:466). Besides this, the words that he uses, for example, "osmosis", "mobile", "locomotive", "sexual" and so on, allude to his direct biological inference of human nature.

His biological, or physiological predominance is also shown in his identification of the soul and the self. He states that 'the soul' is used to refer to the self-contained conservatism of organism (physiology is the system of conservative inherited adjustments) (Goodman, 1973:456). The soul is physiological, since it is present in the human powers which maintain and enhance the health and growth of the organism (conservatism) (Vaughan, 1970:17-18). "The self" refers to the organism's confrontation and assimilation of novelty in the environment (Goodman, 1973:456). So the self, in a certain sense, is nothing but a function of physiology and, in another sense, is an adjusting function (psychology is the special set of the

physiological adjustments that are also in relation to what is not physiological) (Goodman, 1973:456, 457). Therefore, the self functions both physiologically and psychologically.

The conspicuous characteristic of the Gestalt approach is the unitary concept of man in the total context of the actual situation (Goodman, 1973:285). Strict isolation into parts of the organism (mind, soul and body) and any concepts isolating functions of organism from its environment, are considered to be improper for the true understanding of man (Goodman, 1973:19, 287). Man is an "organism-as-a-whole" (Goodman, 1973:428) and his every experience is a "whole way-of-being-in-the-world" (Goodman, 1961:154). There is no such thing as "merely" biological functioning in any human problem (Goodman, 1973:359). A main characteristic of neurosis is to perceive a world of compartmented mind, body, and external world (Goodman, 1973:446). Man's nature is so malleable that he continuously unifies heterogeneous substances into a new whole by thorough assimilation in his environment (Goodman, 1973:14, 15, 359). The healthy man can merge into a new integrated whole each time (Goodman, 1973:369).

Every contacting act of an organism, in reality, consists of awareness, motor response, and feeling as a whole - a cooperation of the sensory, muscular and vegetative systems (Goodman, 1973:307). Every human experience and function is a unitary interaction in a "sociocultural-animal-physical" field (Goodman, 1973:274-275). Goodman calls the inseparably interacting relationship between organism and environment in any function, the "organism/environment field" (Goodman, 1973:275). He refuses some split dichotomistic conceptions in organic functioning, such as body/mind, self/external world, emotional/real, biological/cultural, personal/social, unconscious /conscious and so on (Goodman, 1973:287-290).

Applying the holistic view to his educational philosophy, a distorted education has no whole (complete) relationship to the child's own intellectual, social, and animal interests (Goodman, 1975:52, 124). On the contrary, the perfect education is characterized by the education of the whole man without fragmentation or regimentation (Goodman, 1961:81). So he states that "not to teach the whole curriculum is to give up the whole man" (Goodman, 1961:83), because all the children's needs, feelings, powers and resources should be considered in education.

Human nature is basically good and of great potential. Man is considered to be an organism of great power and efficiency (Vaughan, 1970:20). Goodman's notion of nature is a little elusive (Barrow, 1978:93) and it is chiefly conceived as a process (Boyer, 1970:154). However, Goodman basically believes in the goodness of human nature, in the reasonableness of man and in human possibility, on the basis of the Romantic tradition (Berg, 1972:71; Boyer, 1972:164). The animal character of man is so good that it should be highly respected and be allowed to be expressed freely (Goodman, 1975:42). Even sexual expression should be approved in and out of season, also in school (Goodman, 1975:28).

Goodman believes that man has an inborn spontaneous interest in and impetus towards learning (Barrow, 1978:102). Good education, which is Progressive education to him, is the attempt to naturalize (to naturalize is the same as to humanize) (Goodman, 1975:39). That which maintains and enhances the health and growth of the organism is "natural", that is, ideal (Vaughan, 1970:18). Accordingly, the ideal education is the natural process of growing up. The ultimate aim of education, in a sense, is the development of the natural powers of man (Boyer, 1970:37; Vaughan, 1970:107).

2.3.3 Self-regulation

Goodman (1973:349) uses "organismic-self-regulation" in order to show both the biological basis and the autonomous character of the self. The self refers to the organism's confrontation with and assimilation of the novelty in the environment (Goodman, 1973:456). So the self is not only a function of physiology, but also an autonomous psychological adjusting function (Goodman, 1973:456, 457). In his view of man, psychological structures of man such as the ego, the id, and the personality, are the three structures (aspects) of the self (Goodman, 1973:433).

The self, as the integrator in the total organism/ environment interaction, exists at the boundary of an organism, contacting its environment, in other words, where there are the shifting boundaries of contact between an organism and its environment. So it is often called the system of contact, the system of response (Goodman, 1973:281). It integrates the perceptive-proprioceptive functions, motor-muscular functions and organic needs of the organism. "It is aware and orients, aggresses and manipulates, and feels emotionally the appropriateness of environment and organism" (Goodman, 1973:428).

The self is sometimes called the system of creative adjustment, because it essentially performs this function (Goodman, 1973:295, 425). It is also called the agent of growth, because it plays a crucial role in the growth of the organism (Goodman, 1973:282, 426). It causes the organism to grow through contacting its environment.

Goodman (1975:76-77, 79) resists Behaviouristic attempts to reduce the concept of man (animal) to a machine-operable. He believes that the self has the power to regulate itself as an

acting agent. Self-regulation or self-government is a basic feature and need of man. Learning as growth means to enhance and extend the self-regulating force which is inherent in human nature and provides for the continuous growth of the individual (Vaughan, 1970:129). He believes that if man can regulate himself entirely according to his own intuitions and impulses, he will be able to develop his realistic responsibility better: consideration for the other, responsibility for social consequences, and sincerity and courage with respect to own feeling (Goodman, 1975:101).

Independence (Goodman, 1975:57, 61), identity (Vaughan, 1970:60), initiative (Goodman, 1975:116), spontaneity (Goodman, 1973:430; 1975:116), freedom (Goodman, 1961:236), liberty (Goodman, 1961:7), activeness (Goodman, 1973:337; 1975:86), voluntariness (Goodman, 1975:56) and creativeness (Goodman, 1973:338), which are all virtues contained in self-regulation, are not only the characteristics of the human self, but also the demands of the self (human nature). These features are the criteria for the health of man (Goodman, 1973:356). Neurosis is considered to be a disturbance of the self-function, and lies midway between the disturbance of the spontaneous self and the disturbance of the id-function (id is a structure of the self) (Goodman, 1973:490). Therefore the above-mentioned features should be maintained and fostered in every stage of human development, both in school and in society (Goodman, 1975:116). The idea of education is to bring up the young to be new centres of these features (Vaughan, 1970:51).

Freedom, which is the most typical virtue among the above-mentioned features, is defined as the condition of initiating activity (Vaughan, 1970:25). It is almost the most needed condition in all human activities and environments, and the growth to freedom is the most important concern for Goodman

(Boyer, 1970:69, 167). Freedom is the direction of growth and results in models of achievement and personal excellence. It is the criterion of good and right behaviour (Vaughan, 1970:20). According to Vaughan's conclusion, freedom is the touchstone and goal of the educative process (Vaughan, 1970:139). It is indispensable in the education of the young, for it refers to the initiating activities of an experimental and exploratory nature in terms of what the child learns (Vaughan, 1970:111). It is also an important task that society as a whole should devote itself to cultivate freedom (Goodman, 1961:236).

The self has strong a-logical implications. According to Goodman (1973:430-431), properties of the self consist of spontaneous feelings (emotion), so that emotions are often considered the underlying self. They are considered to be the integrative awareness of a relationship between the organism and the environment, and unique deliveries of the state of the organism/environment field (Goodman, 1973:464-466). Emotions are not the confused or rudimentary impulses, but sharply differentiated functional structures. The emotions are means of cognition, far from being obstacles to thought. Goodman (1973:431) states that the feeling (emotion) integrally involves perception, in order to emphasize the predominance of emotions over cognition. In this context, he contends that all education should take the emotional aspect into consideration (Goodman, 1975:37; Fatzer, 1987:46-47), while criticizing the fact that the modern schooling is too impersonal, standardized and academic (Barrow, 1978:114).

2.3.4 Social animal

Goodman (1961:119-132) often calls man "a social animal". According to the above-mentioned analysis (2.3.2.), man is an organism-as-a-whole, and his every experience is a whole way

of being-in-the-world. Goodman (1973:275) calls the inseparably interacting relationship between organism and environment in any function, the "organism/environment field". The environment of man naturally extends from a physical condition to a social situation. Personality, a structure of the self, is the system of attitudes assumed in interpersonal relationships, and it is formed by the creative social contact of man, so that it has essentially social factors (Goodman, 1973:386, 437, 481). His social functions constitute a society, a bond among persons (Goodman, 1973:366).

An organism grows up through the contact of environment. Man's growing up is a process of socializing (culturizing) (Goodman, 1961:3, 8). While growing up as a man, human nature assimilates a culture, just as other animals grow in strength and acquire habits in their environment completing their nature (Goodman, 1961:3). Human nature is so malleable that man often becomes that which suits a particular type of society in a particular historical stage (Goodman, 1961:4).

As Vaughan (1970:20) points out, the malleableness of man often becomes man's vulnerability in so-called unnatural social arrangements, institutions, and conventions, because he can become their victim. Goodman (1975:29) considers modern city life to be harmful to human growth. He calls modern Western society an "Organized System" (mechanical system) (Goodman, 1961: Preface 9). Its features are overcentralization, regulation of all the behaviours of man, and indirectedness (Goodman, 1961: Preface 12; 1961:133). Man feels boredom, irrelevance, ineptitude, powerlessness in that society, and human nature is thwarted and insulted (Goodman, 1961:9, 73, 80; 1975:14). Finally, men become "Organization Men" in the society (Goodman, 1975:42, 76).

Goodman (1961: Preface 10, 12; 1961:71, 76, 134, 157, 246; 1973:401; 1975:29, 100; Boyer, 1970:61) blames the organized and unnatural system for taking away the real environment for human growth, dehumanizing, depersonalizing, causing terrible damage to children, and destroying self-confidence and initiative. He also criticizes it for being disastrous to the growth of excellence and manliness, thwarting aptitude and creating stupidity, making man a featureless animal, molding young dependents and conformists, wasting human resources, and producing elites that have imposed on themselves a morale fit for slaves.

The organized society generates its own troubles such as the unlivable communities, the collapse of public ethics or the problems of youth (Goodman, 1961:15). It creates many outsiders, such as the Beat Generation, drop-outs, middle-class delinquents. It also causes an alarming rate of urban mental illness (Goodman, 1961:170; 1975:14, 49, 68). Man is tormented, alienated from his job, robbed of a basic right, and damaged in growing up in an organized society (Goodman, 1961:29, 145; 1975:95; Berg, 1972:51). Since the society thwarts, corrupts, shackles, dampens, discourages, dims human nature, sense and capacity; "growing up (is) absurd" like the title of his book, and man cannot be a real human (Goodman, 1961:12, 133).

The school system has the same problems. The school system as a whole, with its increasingly set curriculum, stricter grading, incredible amounts of testing, is considered to be a vast machine (Goodman, 1975:76). Schools decreasingly do not represent any human values, but simply adjustment to a mechanical system (society) (Goodman, 1975:23). Goodman (1975:43, 76, 108) states that the compulsory school system is a lockstep, and that the universal high-schooling is a disaster. He also critically states that Behavioristic education prevents

true learning, and programmed instruction rigidifies the present departmentalization and tends to nullify man's lively virtues (Goodman, 1975:76-78).

Schools and regimental structures sap, dampen, dull, and deprive the young of their nature and capacities, so that they have a miserable effect on man (Goodman, 1975:108, 123). Independence, initiative, scrupulous honesty, earnestness, usefulness and respect are flouted by the school (Goodman, 1975:24). The education of modern schools fosters conformity instead of independent thought and expression.

Goodman plans an ideal society, which supports human nature and growth. It is a small, local, holistic, participatory democratic, decentralized and free human community which is built on the basis of positive and constructive "anarchism" (Vaughan, 1970:3-5), like the Greek polis and the kibbutz in Israel (Goodman, 1961:80-81, 231; Vaughan, 1970:30; Boyer, 1970:164; Holderied, 1975:221). It is grounded on freedom (community and freedom are key words in Goodman's social theory) and the social manifestations of a common human nature so that the self-regulating and creative forces of human nature may become the dominant influences in human association (Vaughan, 1970:8, 45, 53). It is a face-to-face community, which is characterized by the meaningful, personal, intimate and caring contacts and strong bonds among the members involved (Goodman, 1961:110; 1975:113; Vaughan, 1970:26; Berg, 1972:59). Its basis is the interrelated principles of mutual-aid, voluntary association and fraternity (Vaughan, 1970:22).

Since education is a natural community function, the community as a whole is an educative environment for the growth and development of the whole man (Goodman, 1961:80-81; 1975:20, 106). The community is the "studium

generale" consisting of students, masters, and professionals from all walks of life (Boyer, 1970:159), and it has all the necessary educational elements for the child, adolescent, and young man: (1) a social and environmental background which fosters initiative, (2) free contact and encounter among the individuals of the community, and (3) the attention and guidance of concerned adults (Vaughan, 1970:71).

Through the education of the face-to-face community, the young emerge as "free citizens" who are competent to take on the tasks of continually securing their rights and responsibilities, and integrating a dynamic presence into the community (Vaughan, 1970:108-109). They also become "society-makers", who are constantly creating new societies by discovering and inventing new human powers (Goodman, 1975:22; Boyer, 1970:43). They grow up by identifying with the community (society) and culture, taking it over, renewing it, and transforming it (Boyer, 1970:38).

2.3.5 Anthropological remarks

The major features of Goodman's anthropology can be summarized as follows.

2.3.5.1 Free man (or free citizen)

On the basis of Evolutionism, Goodman believes that man is basically a biological organism like a higher animal. As an organism, man seeks to diminish tension and to reach equilibrium, and tries to increase satisfaction of his needs. The needs of the organism are basically good and of great potential. So they should be highly respected and be allowed to be expressed freely. Education is the attempt to naturalize man according to his inborn spontaneous interest and impetus. Man should be free and open to spontaneous satisfaction of the

needs of the organism in a positive sense, and free from every control of society as an organized system in a negative sense. Free human society is a positive and constructive anarchistic community.

2.3.5.2 Self-regulation

The self, as "the system of contact" or "system of response" (Goodman, 1973:281), refers to confrontation of the organism with and assimilation of the environment. It exists at the boundary of an organism contacting its environment. It integrates the perceptive-proprioceptive, motor-muscular functions and organic needs of the organism for the creative adjustment to the environment. The self, as the acting agent, regulates itself for human growth according to the natural intuitions and impulses of the organism. The self-regulation contains these characteristics: independence, identity, initiative, spontaneity, freedom, activeness, voluntariness and creativeness. Consequently, a free man is characterized by positive and initiative self-regulation. The affective function of man is considered to be essential for all the activities of the self. Emotions are often regarded as the underlying self.

2.3.5.3 Biological holistic organism

Man is internally an organism-as-a-whole without being divided into parts. Outwardly, man cannot be understood without his environment, because his every experience is a whole way-of-being-in-the-world. Goodman's conception of human reality is a functional unitary whole. However, the biological and affective aspects are absolutized. Goodman (1973:456, 457) regards the affective as the special function of the biological adjustments that are in relation to what is not biological. The affective aspect of man is a precondition for all the intellectual activities of school. It is a means of cognition, and involves perception integrally. The predominance of the affective aspect over the logical is an

important characteristic of Goodman's philosophy of education. The social aspect is also conspicuous in the organism's relationship with the environment. The wholeness of man, according to Goodman, consists of four aspects: the biological, affective, social and logical (intellectual).

2.4 Carl R. Rogers: fully-functioning person

2.4.1 General

Carl R. Rogers is an outstanding founder of Humanistic psychology, and he is perhaps best known for his innovative work in the area of psychotherapy, known as "client-centred therapy". His impact has also been great in vast areas beyond the boundaries of psychology (Van Belle, 1980:15). He has had a great influence especially on education in direct and indirect ways. He himself often admits that he extrapolated his philosophy of humanistic education from his experience and research in counselling (psychotherapy) (Rogers, 1961:297; Patterson, 1977a:328).

Rogers is one of the most important pioneers of Neo-Humanistic education (Read & Simon, 1975: Preface 13). According to Patterson (1977a:324, 327, 328), the term "humanistic education" is widely used to refer to a concept (philosophy) of education which was essentially developed by Rogers, and his works provide the systematic psychological foundation upon which humanistic education must be based. Read, Simon and Patterson regard him as the most important founder of the Neo-Humanistic education.

His major writings are *Counseling and Psychotherapy* (1941), *Client-Centered Therapy* (1951), *On Becoming a Person* (1961), *Freedom to Learn* (1969), apart from a great

number of articles. Freedom to learn has been an important source of analysis and inspiration to Neo-Humanists (Hootman, 1976:153, 154). This book was revised and retitled Freedom to learn for the 80's (1983).

To Rogers (1969:125), a person is more important than courses, curricula, coverage and teaching instruments in education. He often emphasizes the value of a person-centred attitude in the learning process (Rogers, 1983:4). His theory of psychotherapy and education can be well understood on the basis of his anthropological intent (Van Belle, 1980:3-5).

2.4.2 Organism

Rogers' view of man is based on evolutionistic presuppositions. Historically speaking, he underwrites the American tradition in which Evolutionism has exerted a strong influence, as Van Belle (1980:109) points out. Evolutionism permeates his whole view of man. He applies it to both the status of the human race compared with other animals, and the growth of the human organism. He views the human race as a more intelligent participant in its own evolution - its physical, psychological and social evolution (Rogers, 1961:369). The growing directional trend of organisms is compared to the process of evolution: from the organism early or low on the evolutionary scale, to the organism which develops later and will be regarded as higher (Rogers, 1951:488-489). As a result, the ideal creative person is considered to be a fit vanguard of human evolution who is most likely to adapt and survive under changing environmental conditions (Rogers, 1961:194).

Man is an organism, experiencing and perceiving his world (reality) (Rogers, 1951:483). The organism refers to what man is as a whole (Rogers, 1961:104-105). Rogers pays more

attention to the growing function of the organism, instead of depicting its structure or substance. The organism sometimes indicates "much more than physiological processes" (Van Belle, 1980:70), "the inner core of man's personality" (Rogers, 1961:92), because it is considered a physiological-psychological existence (Rogers, 1951:487; Van Belle, 1980:94). However, the organism is more biological. Rogers describes man as a "biological organism which develops into a personality" (Van Belle, 1980:110). Man is called a human animal with an animal nature (Rogers, 1961:91, 105). The maintenance, enhancement and actualization of the organism are the central aims of human life (Rogers, 1951:493, 514; Van Belle, 1980:73). The organism, above all, strives for the satisfaction of a certain number of organic (physiological) needs (Rogers, 1951:508, 511). In his theory of psychotherapy and education, the sensory and visceral experiences of the organism also precede the experiences of self (Rogers, 1961:80; 1969:163).

Rogers views man as a dynamic integral unity (Van Belle, 1980:71, 155). The organism is at all times a total organized system (Rogers, 1951:487). As a total functioning unit (Rogers, 1961:90), it responds to its experiences (the phenomenal field) in an organized, total fashion (Rogers, 1951:486). At the same time, it has a tendency toward total, organized, goal-directed responses which is one of the most basic characteristics of organic life (Rogers, 1951:486-487). He thus holds that man is most successful when he is functioning in a total manner as an integrated, whole, unified individual (Rogers, 1969: 273).

He believes that the total organismic sensing of a situation is more trustworthy than intellect only (Rogers, 1961:22), because the organism is like a giant computer into which all the relevant data are fed. It computes the most economical course of action as a result (Rogers, 1961:355; Van Belle,

1980:57). So the ideal person is one who can live fully the experiences of his total organism, because he is better able to permit his total organism to consider, weigh and balance each stimulus, need, demand, and its relative weight and intensity (Rogers, 1961:118).

Rogers (1961:163; 1969:109, 114) has full trust or confidence in the human organism. A central article of Rogers' faith is that human nature is inherently good and trustworthy, and the human organism moves in a positive, forward and constructive direction (Rogers, 1961:194; Van Belle, 1980:15, 73; Patterson, 1977a:329). He contends that the innermost core of man's nature, that is, the deepest layers of his personality, the base of his animal nature, is positive: basically self-regulatory, socialized, forward-moving, rational and realistic (Rogers, 1961:91, 194, 195). So his belief is that man must be given "unconditional positive regard" (Rogers, 1961:283), and the integrity, worth and significance of man must be deeply respected (Rogers, 1951:35, 427). Even a client or a student must be fully accepted for what he is (Rogers, 1961:74, 287; 1969:281).

He profoundly believes in the capacity (potentialities, strength or wisdom) of the human organism (Rogers, 1951:23; 1969:114, 217). As Wijngaarden (Van Belle, 1980:115) points out, Rogers' humanistic credo is that the human organism, which is a substantial entity, has the capacity for "self-help". The human organism has a capacity for self-insight (Van Belle, 1980:39), for self-directed, constructive change (Rogers, 1951:24; Van Belle, 1980:41). Man can reorganize himself at the conscious and deeper levels of his personality, coping with life more constructively, intelligently, socially and satisfactorily (Rogers, 1961:36, 195). Rogers (1961:105) believes that the human organism is able to achieve, through the remarkable integrative capacity of its central nervous system, a balanced,

realistic, self-enhancing, other-enhancing behaviour as a result of all the elements of awareness. It is a suitable instrument for discovering the most satisfying behaviour in each immediate situation (Rogers, 1961:118, 190).

In the educational context, man has "a natural potentiality for learning" (Rogers, 1969:157), so that he is curious, eager to solve problems, wishes to learn. He seeks to discover, wants to know, endeavours to master, desires to create, moves toward self-discipline under conducive circumstances (Rogers, 1969:114, 131).

2.4.3 Process of becoming, and self-concept

The human organism has a natural tendency toward growth, enhancement, maturity and actualization (Rogers, 1951:487, 489-490; 1961:290; 1969:115). It is a strong, positive forward-moving directional force (Rogers, 1961:27). It is often called "a growth tendency", "actualizing tendency", "a drive toward self-actualization", or "a forward-moving directional tendency" (Rogers, 1961:35; Patterson, 1977a:286).

It is the urge of an organism which causes it to expand, extend, become autonomous, develop and mature through activating its full capacity, both in the direction of greater differentiation of organs and of function, and in the direction of self-actualization: greater independence, self-responsibility, self-government, self-regulation, autonomy and socialization (Rogers, 1961:35, 488). This tendency is completely constructive and reliable in nature. It is the inevitable basis for human education and psychotherapy, because the motivation for learning, personality change and creativity spring from the self-actualizing tendency (Rogers, 1961:285, 289, 350-351).

On the basis of the actualizing tendency, Rogers views man as an actualizing organismic process. He puts his whole emphasis upon process, not upon the end state of being (Rogers, 1961:399). Since human life, at its best, is considered a flowing, changing process in which nothing is fixed, man is also in the process of becoming (Rogers, 1961:27). So he sees man as a stream of becoming, not as a finished product. "It means that a person is a fluid process, not a fixed and static entity; a flowing river of change, not a block of solid material; a continually changing constellation of potentialities, not a fixed quantity of traits" (Rogers, 1961:122). The personality (and the self) is continually in flux, and the only stable elements are the physiological capacities and limitations of the organism (Rogers, 1961:285).

This process is directional. The goal of the process (man) is to become more and more himself (Rogers, 1961:108). He is coming to be what he is (becoming a person) (Rogers, 1961:113, 124). In this process of becoming, he is very much closer to his organic being. He is much closer to being in the flow of his feeling (Rogers, 1961:143). More specifically speaking, he is in an ongoing process of differentiation and integration at increasingly complex levels (Van Belle, 1980:93). He is a process of achieving worth and dignity through the development of his potentialities, and he is a self-actualizing process, moving on to more challenging and enriching experiences (Rogers, 1961:395).

Since this is a positive, constructive, realistic, and trustworthy process, the process itself, not a state of being, is a good life (Rogers, 1961:178). So man is becoming "a constantly changing flow of process" (Rogers, 1961:155), "an integrated process of changingness" (Rogers, 1961:158), and "a participant in and an observer of the ongoing process of organismic experience"

(Rogers, 1961:189), rather than a fixed static being (Rogers, 1961:131, 132).

In this context, Rogers discusses the negative function of the self, and the relationship between the self-concept and experiences of the organism. The self is defined as "the organized consistent conceptual gestalt" (Patterson, 1977a:287), and the self-concept or self-structure is defined as "an organized configuration of perceptions of the self" (Rogers, 1951:136). These terms are "composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects; goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive or negative valence" (Rogers, 1951:136-137). In short, he views the self as a "map" of one's experiential territory (Rogers, 1951:144), or as a "perceptual field" (Rogers, 1951:486), including one's values, beliefs, and basic attitudes about himself, others and the environment.

The self-concept is a central, regulative, channeling anchorage point in man (Van Belle, 1980:103). Rogers views the self(-concept) more and more as an obstacle on the road to man's becoming, because a determining self-concept is a static self-concept, and the structure (or concept) of the self does not permit the intrusion of a perception at variance with it (Rogers, 1951:505). The self-concept often becomes dominant and all-determining over the process of the organism, and arrests its natural flow. So he mentions the self in a negative sense of distortion and denial, and in a pathological sense.

The self-concept can bury deeply the actualizing tendency of the organism under layer after layer of encrusted psychological defense (Rogers, 1961:31). Rogers (1951:507, 510) argues that many psychological maladjustments are caused by the

organized concept of the self denying the experiences of the organism. When the situation exists, there is a basic or potential psychological tension. Therefore, psychotherapy has the task helping to move the process of becoming, which occurs naturally within the individual client, from the self as a fixed, rigid construct (a state of maladjustment) toward the self as a fluid gestalt process, the organism (psychological adjustment).

The therapeutic process involves a shift from incongruence between self-structure and experiences of the organism, to congruence between them (Rogers, 1951:526-527; 1961:157). "Congruence" is used to refer to the accurate matching of actual experience with the perceived self (Rogers, 1961:282). Therefore, the goal of psychotherapy is that the organized self-concept of the client attains much greater congruence with the physiological (sensory and visceral) experiences of the organism. In other words, "the total experience of the organism is directly incorporated into the self; or more accurately, the self tends to be discovered in the total experience of the organism" (Rogers, 1951:532).

For this purpose, the previous self-concept, which was incongruent with experiences of the organism, must be disorganized, and then it must be reorganized to a new enlarged self, which can accept all the conflicting and defending experiences of the organism. The self that maintains and enhances itself against the organismic process is a stumbling block for the congruence with experiences of the organism, in Rogers' view (Van Belle, 1980:127). The self has to become incorporated in and identified with the experiential organism in the process of becoming (Van Belle, 1980:50). Man then feels that he is his "real" self, his organic self (Rogers, 1951:532).

Therefore, Van Belle's argument is persuasive. He points out that Rogers is not a self-theorist but rather a growth theorist or monistic geneticist (Van Belle, 1980:94, 156). Because he thinks that Rogers' major interest is the organismic actualization process rather than the self, and that Rogers himself never refers to his view of personality as a "self theory", even though he does refer extensively to the self-concept, to perception and to the phenomenal field (Van Belle, 1980:111, 112; 1977:80). In this context, Smit's conclusion that Rogers' personality is an "ego-less self", is only partially right (Van Belle, 1977:79-80; 1980:110).

Some Neo-humanists (e.g. Patterson, Combs) describe Rogers' view of personality as a (phenomenological or perceptual) self theory (Van Belle, 1980:109-112; Patterson, 1977b:200-205), but Rogers describes man as a biological organism. However, it is also important to note the fact that some Neo-humanists interpret his view of man as a self theory. It is evident that they project their own anthropological perspective into their interpretation on his theory of man.

2.4.4 Fully-functioning person

Rogers (1961:183) describes the person who would emerge if psychotherapy were maximally successful, as a "fully functioning person". Even though he mentions that this kind of person does not exist, the fully-functioning person is the theoretical goal, the conclusion of personal growth (or good life) in therapy and in education (Rogers, 1961:183; 1969:295).

The fully-functioning person is characterized as "the ultimate in actualization of the human organism" (Van Belle, 1980:56). He is characterized by optimal psychological adjustment, optimal psychological maturity and complete congruence

(Patterson, 1977a: 294). However, it is not a static condition, coming from the solution of psychological problems, or psychological adjustment or satisfaction (a state of virtue, or contentment, or nirvana, or happiness), but a directional process, moving toward a much more fully-functioning organism (Rogers, 1961:186).

Rogers mentions three general characteristics of "the fully-functioning person". These characteristics are, in fact, unitary, but for clarity of presentation they are broken down into three (Rogers, 1969:282). The first characteristic is an increasing openness to experiences of the organism. There are no barriers, no inhibitions to prevent the full experience of whatever is organismically present (Rogers, 1969:284), so that every stimulus may be freely relayed through the nervous system without being distorted by any defensive mechanism (Rogers, 1961:187-188). Free from threat and defensiveness, the fully-functioning person is becoming more able to accept and live the experiences of his total organism (Rogers, 1969:188, 284). He is especially more open to all his feelings, and he himself, as a self-evaluator, sifts evidence from all sources (Rogers, 1961:191-192).

The second characteristic is an increasing existential mode of living. It involves an increasing tendency to live each moment fully: each moment is always new, so the next moment cannot be predicted in advance. Such a living of the moment means an absence of rigidity translated or twisted to fit preconceived self-structure. It means maximum adaptability, a discovery of structure in experience, and a flowing, changing organization of self and personality (Rogers, 1961:189). The person cannot predict specifically what he will do, because only the behaviour of the maladjusted person is so rigidly patterned that it is precisely predictable (Rogers, 1969:292). Here and now, the fully functioning person becomes a participant in and an

observer of the ongoing process of an organismic experience (Rogers, 1961:189).

The third characteristic is an increasing trust in his organism as a means of arriving at the most satisfying behaviour in each existential situation. The fully functioning person increasingly considers his total organismic reaction to a new situation, as a competent and trustworthy guide to behaviour which is truly satisfying. So he permits his total organism (a giant computer) to process all available data, and to discover the most proper course of action which would come closest to satisfying all his needs in the situation (Rogers, 1961:189-190).

The fully-functioning person experiences the most complete and absolute freedom within himself. He represents freedom from threat and pressure, freedom from internal (or potential) strain and anxiety (Rogers, 1951:532). He is a nonconformist (or independent person), who is not easily controlled by his environment. He makes his own choices and plays his significant part voluntarily and freely (Rogers, 1969:269-270). He, as a "learning man" (Rogers, 1975:5), explores and learns through his spontaneous choice and will (Rogers, 1969:259, 269). He also has a sense of responsibility, so that he takes responsibility for the self and his situation (Rogers, 1969:271). Therefore he is an autonomous person (Rogers, 1961:38, 170).

The fully-functioning person is "a creative person" (Rogers, 1969:290), from whom the fruit of his creativity and creative living emerges, because his sensitive openness and existential living keep on fostering creativeness through allowing awareness of relationships not observed by others (Patterson, 1977a:295). Since he is almost certainly not a conformist, he is not necessarily adjusted to his culture: blind adjustment will suffocate his creativity. Instead he may live constructively, in

a more satisfying way and in his own unique way (Rogers, 1961: 193-194; 1969:175).

The fully-functioning person is a more integrated, whole and unified individual. From the surface level to the level of depth he is unified within himself. He has become "all of one piece" (Rogers, 1962:29). The whole person includes the physical, intellectual, emotional, and interpersonal aspects. Educationally speaking, the attainment of the major goal of education is the fully-functioning person (the whole person). Significant learning focuses on a combination of the intellectual (cognitive) aspect and the affective (emotional) attitudes (feelings or gut-level) (Rogers, 1975b:39, 48; 1969:4-5, 162, 165). However, Rogers pays more attention to the emotional aspect than the cognitive one in therapy and education (Rogers, 1961:90, 327; 1969:289; Patterson, 1977:328). He trusts a-logical (non-intellectual) aspects much more than intellectual ones (Rogers, 1961:22). So he regards his total organismic sensing (e.g. hunches) of a situation as more trustworthy than his intellectual perception (Rogers, 1961:22). His preference for a-logical aspects becomes more evident when we remember his negative interpretation about the self(-concept) as a perceptual field, and his over-positive confidence in the biological organism. The fully-functioning person to Rogers is not the self but the organismic actualization process, to which the self ought to yield, as pointed out by Van Belle (1980:112).

In brief, according to Rogers, the fully-functioning person is "the individual who has experienced optimal psychological growth - a person functioning freely in all the fullness of his organismic potentialities; a person who is dependable in being realistic, self-enhancing, socialized, and appropriate in his behavior; a creative person, whose specific formings of behavior are not easily predictable; a person who is everchanging, ever developing, always discovering himself and

the newness in himself in each succeeding moment of time" (Rogers, 1969:295).

2.4.5 Anthropological remarks

The major features of Rogers' anthropology can be summarized as follows.

2.4.5.1 Autonomous person: fully-functioning organism

Rogers views man as a biological organism on the basis of Evolutionism. The human organism is inherently good and trustworthy, because it has a positive directional tendency toward self-actualization and sufficient capacities (self-sufficiency) for satisfactory self-help, self-insight, self-learning and self-change. In the actualizing process of the organism being led by the growth tendency, man is becoming a biologically and psychologically fully-functioning organism. A fully-functioning organism refers to an autonomous person, who experiences complete freedom from threat and strain caused by negative values, beliefs and attitudes of the self(-concept). The person makes his own choices through his spontaneous will, and plays his significant part voluntarily and freely in the process of self-realization. He is not a conformist, but a creative person.

2.4.5.2 An actualizing organismic process rather than the self(-concept)

Man always exists in the process of becoming, in the direction of self-realization (or fully-functioning organism). The biological experience of the organism and its becoming process precede the self(-concept). The self is regarded as the organized consistent conceptual gestalt. The perceptual field of the self (self-concept) includes one's values, beliefs and basic attitudes about oneself, others and the world. When the self(-

concept) is incongruent with experiences of the organism, it disturbs the actualizing process of the organism and causes psychological maladjustments. In this case, the self(-concept) should be reorganized so that it may attain better congruence with experiences of the organism. In the process of becoming, the self must become incorporated in the experiential organism. Therefore, the "real" self is the biological organism in its actualizing process, which leads man to self-actualization.

2.4.5.3 A dynamic integral unity (wholeness)

The human organism is a dynamic integral unity, a whole functioning unit, or a total organized system. It functions in a total manner as an integrated, whole, unified individual. The wholeness of man basically denotes a biological-psychological unity of the organism. Man is characterized more by the biological aspect of the organism. Rogers regards man as a human animal with an animal nature. The preference of the biological aspect becomes more evident in the negative interpretation about the self(-concept). The self-concept includes the physical, ethical and social functions. Rogers enumerates the physical, intellectual, emotional, and interpersonal aspects in the wholeness of man. However, he often pays more attention to the biological-affective aspects and intellectual aspect in education. Though he emphasizes an integration between the intellectual (logical) aspect and the (biological-)affective attitudes for significant learning, he confronts each one in a dualistic way, and pays more attention to the affective aspect in therapy and education. Rogers trusts the biological-affective aspects much more than the intellectual aspect, because he regards the former as the total organismic sensing of a situation. Therefore, the biological and affective aspects are overemphasized in the wholeness of man. Especially the biological is absolutized.

2.5 Abraham H. Maslow: self-actualizing people

2.5.1 General

Abraham H. Maslow was "one of the foremost spokespersons of the humanistic psychologies" or "instrumental in the emergence of two major new forces in psychology: the humanistic (the Third psychology) and the transpersonal (the Fourth psychology)" (Frager, 1987: Preface 33, 34; Cox, 1987:251). He and his colleagues founded the Association for Humanistic Psychology in 1962, and his ideas became a major influence on the Esalen Institute, the first growth centre, established in the same year. His ideas have been applied in the areas of psychology, education, business and management, health care and social studies (Cox, 1987:245). Cox (1987:264) praises Maslow's psychology which has continuously branched into many dimensions of American life and culture.

He was the principal spokesman for self-actualization, which was the most highly regarded personal value among Neo-Humanists (Nash, 1980:8). He was also considered to be the first person to create a comprehensive psychology stretching from the basement (Freud) to the attic (higher nature of man) (Frager, 1987: Preface 35-36). His theory of man was primarily derived from studies of normal, psychologically healthy persons: self-actualizing people.

The Neo-Humanistic educational movement is largely part of the application of Maslow's humanistic psychology to education, as John F. Powers points out in his study of Maslow (Bosak, 1977:367). The humanistic values which Maslow argued have been the banner of many Neo-Humanistic educators (Cox, 1987:253-254). His motivation theory, holistic view of man and self-actualization have been the major foundation and goal of Neo-Humanistic education.

He wrote six books and over 140 journal articles (Cox, 1987:246). Among them, *Toward Psychology of Being* (1962a), *Motivation and Personality* (the third edition, 1987), and *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature* (1971) will mainly be analysed for the identification of his view of man.

2.5.2 Biological nature

Maslow (1968a: Preface 3; 1968b:685) often mentions that Humanistic psychology represents and creates a new concept (image) of man with a real change in direction, in comparison with behaviouristic and Freudian psychologies. He believes that human nature has been sold short by the latter psychologies (Maslow, 1968b:687).

His so-called new concept of man is based on the belief that human nature is basically good. He firmly rejects the belief that human inner nature is ultimately and basically depraved and evil. He believes that it is intrinsically good, trustworthy and desirable, or on the other hand neutral and pre-moral, even though he is a little cautious about affirming its pure goodness (Maslow, 1987: Preface 18; 1987:52, 82-85; 1968a:3-4).

Bad behaviours such as destructiveness and hostility do not come from the inner nature, but they are accepted as reactive or defensive attitudes against threat and disappointment (Maslow, 1987:82-91). He argues that so-called evil behaviours can also come from ignorance and childish misinterpretations and beliefs (Maslow, 1968a:195). He, accordingly, takes it for granted that psychologically healthy

people uniformly choose and yearn for what is good and right for themselves and others (Maslow, 1968a:159, 168-169).

Human inner nature knows very well what is good for it and what it really needs (Maslow, 1962:39; 1987:60). Guiding values and rules to live by, can be found from the inner nature (Maslow, 1968a:182). Man has, within his nature, greater potential than realized for curing himself of maladjustments and for solving problems and conflicts (Maslow, 1987:103; 1968a:38). Maslow (1968a:165) holds indirectly that man has power, within his inner nature, to save himself, by criticizing the only way of salvation through extra-human forces. The inner nature of man is also the source of creativeness, art, love, humor and play, and even certain kinds of truth and knowledge about himself and the world (Maslow, 1968a:182-183).

The sources of growth and humanness are essentially within the inner nature (Maslow, 1968a:211). The inner nature has a positive growth or self-actualization tendency that drives the human organism from within to fuller development. It is an active will to psychological health, an urge (impulse) to grow, pressure to self-actualization, a quest for identity and autonomy or yearning for excellence (Maslow, 1987: Preface 20; 1968a:155).

A peculiar characteristic that Maslow emphasizes is the recognition of so-called higher levels of human nature. He criticizes behaviouristic and Freudian psychologies for being inadequate in their treatment of the higher nature of man (Maslow, 1968b:686-687; 1987: Preface 17). The higher levels of the inner nature consist of higher needs and mystical, aesthetic, rhapsodic, spiritual (religious, transcendent), philosophical and value aspects of man, that are found in self-actualizing people or in peak-experiences (Maslow, 1971:325,

349). He sometimes calls them, "godlike" possibilities (qualities) within human nature (Maslow, 1971:35, 275; 1968a:92, 174).

The inner nature of man, however, is not usually strong, overpowering and obvious like the instincts of lower animals. It is weak, delicate, subtle, hidden and equivocal. It often leaves room for doubt, uncertainty, and conflict. So it is easily overcome and suppressed by habit, cultural pressure, learning, and preferences of other people (Maslow, 1968a:4; 1987:117). Nonetheless, it rarely disappears, but persists unconsciously, even though denied and repressed (Maslow, 1968a:4, 192). Maslow calls the weak inner nature "instinct-remnants" (Maslow, 1962:38; 1987:117).

The inner nature is often called the essence (Maslow, 1968b:687) and core (Maslow, 1968a:4) of man, the (human) organism (Maslow, 1971:380), intrinsic (deeper or real) self (Maslow, 1968b:691), humans' inherent design (Maslow, 1987:117), the unconscious (Maslow, 1971:89; 1968a:192), primary processes (Maslow, 1971:89), human instincts (Maslow, 1987:60), the depths of human beings (Maslow, 1971:114), and animal nature (Maslow, 1968b:687). He includes in the inner nature instinctoid needs, preferences, impulses, capacities, talents, anatomical equipment, physiological balances, prenatal and natal injuries, and traumata to the neonatus (Maslow, 1962:35).

The inner nature is characterized by its biological nature individually (biological idiosyncratic), and collectively (species-wide) by evolutionistic nature as a species. Maslow (1971:11, 349) believes Evolutionism in both phyletic and ontogenic development. He tries to discuss similarities and difference between man and animals at the phyletic aspect, and he also attempts to describe the hierarchical development of needs

and self-actualizing processes at the ontogenic dimension (Maslow, 1987:10, 57, 61; 1971:332, 351).

Human nature anchors in the biological aspect according to the evolutionistic presupposition, though it consists of its anatomy, physiology, basic needs, yearnings, and psychological capacities (Maslow, 1987:117). Man has a biologically based inner nature, and it is called a biological essence (Maslow, 1968b:688). The higher nature of man is part of his biological nature. The higher needs (and metaneeds) are precisely as biological (instinctoid) as the need for food (Maslow, 1987:59). The higher values of being (spiritual, religious, philosophical, axiological values) are also aspects of human biology (Maslow, 1971:324, 326-327). Mystic transcendent peak experiences (Maslow, 1971:333-334), and intrinsic conscience and feelings of guilt are ultimately rooted biologically (Maslow, 1971:338). Self-actualization is also the biologically based nature of man and it conforms to biological destiny (Maslow, 1968a: preface 6). As a result, the search (looking within) for the inner nature is called "subjective (introspective, humanistic) biology" (Maslow, 1971:186-187, 330; 1968a:185).

He calls his psychological approach the "holistic-dynamic" psychology (Maslow, 1962:34), or "holistic approach" (Maslow, 1987:211). Holism is applied to the cosmos, society (culture), person and all areas of psychology (Maslow, 1987: preface 19). The fact that the individual is an integrated, organized whole belongs to his first proposition (Maslow, 1987:3). Cognitive, affective and conative aspects of psychic life are interrelated, overlapping and synergic, rather than separated (dichotomized) and antagonistic (Maslow, 1987:25, 42, 173; 1971:210). Instinctoid needs and rationality are "synergic" (Maslow, 1987:51), and the higher value-life is hierarchically integrated on the same biological continuum with the lower animal (biological) nature (Maslow, 1971:324). Since the

organism behaves ordinarily as an integrated whole, each act tends to be an expression of the whole integrated personality (Maslow, 1987:11, 233), and any single stimulus influences the whole organism (Maslow, 1971:76).

2.5.3 Hierarchy of human needs

Maslow (1987:15-23; 1968a:199-200) enumerates five basic needs.

(1) The physiological needs: the most fundamental (prepotent) drives of life (essential elements and minerals, such as water, salt, protein, calcium, oxygen, and so on).

(2) The safety needs: security, stability, dependency, protection, freedom from fear, anxiety and chaos, need for structure, law and limits, strength in the protector, and so on.

(3) The belongingness and love needs: belongingness (as in a family, a community, a clan, a gang, friendship), affection, love.

(4) The esteem needs: (a) strength, achievement, adequacy, mastery and competence, confidence to face the world, independence and freedom (b) reputation or prestige, status, fame and glory, dominance, recognition, attention, importance, dignity and appreciation.

(5) The self-actualization needs: fullest development of one's talents and capacities, and actualization (fulfilment) of the self.

In addition to the above-mentioned basic needs, he mentions two basic cognitive needs: (a) the needs to know and to understand (b) and aesthetic needs (Maslow, 1987:23-26; 1968a:63-66). He also suggests "metaneeds" to describe the higher motivations of self-actualizing people: excellence, truth, beauty, lawfulness, simplicity and the like (Maslow, 1987:66, 82; 1971:330).

All the needs of human nature are included in the same repertory, and they are organized into a fairly definite hierarchy on the basis of the principle of relative prepotency. Lower needs are usually more prepotent than higher needs. Thus the physiological needs, for example, are stronger than the safety needs, and the safety needs are much stronger than the need for self-actualization (Maslow, 1987:56-57). These needs are arranged in an integrated hierarchy, so that higher needs rest upon lower needs, and they develop only on the basis of the lower needs (Maslow, 1968a:172-173). All the needs are so interrelated (sometimes overlapped) that it is almost impossible to separate any needs from any other clearly and sharply (Maslow, 1987:8, 25).

Higher needs, however, are later evolutionary (ontogenic) developments, so that the satisfaction of higher needs is closer to self-actualization, and it represents a general healthful trend, a trend away from psychopathology. Pursuit and gratification of higher needs produce more desirable subjective results (e.g. more profound happiness, serenity, and richness of the inner life) and desirable social consequences (Maslow, 1987:57-58).

Man is "a wanting animal" (Maslow, 1987:7), who throughout his whole life desires something. If he is satisfied with a need, another suddenly comes to the fore to take its place, because "a want (need) that is satisfied is no longer a want (need)" (Maslow, 1987:18). Relative gratification submerges the needs and allows the next higher set of needs in the hierarchy to emerge, dominate, and organize the personality (Maslow, 1987:32). New higher needs emerge, when more fundamental needs are satisfied, even though there are actually some exceptions caused chiefly by ideals, high social standards and high values (Maslow, 1987:27). The hierarchical order may, therefore, be considered to be simply steps along the path to

general self-actualization, by means of gratification (Maslow, 1968a:153). The process of growth (becoming), accordingly, is seen as a process of progressive gratification of basic needs toward the self-actualization (being) (Maslow, 1962:40; 1968a:26).

On the one hand, the gratification of basic needs is positively correlated with psychological health, and on the other hand, its frustration causes psychological illnesses and deficiency diseases (Maslow, 1987:38-39). A threat of thwarting the basic needs and metaneeds (including self-actualization) of the organism is psychopathogenic (and metapathogenic) (Maslow, 1987:78, 81; 1971:193). Maslow diagnoses that (psychological) illnesses are caused by frustrations (of the basic needs, of idiosyncratic potentials, of expression of the self, and of the tendency of the person to grow in his own style), especially in the early years of life (Maslow, 1962:37; 1968a:193-194). He interprets neurosis as the absence (deficiency) of certain gratifications (Maslow, 1971:379; 1968a:37, 163). At the same time, gratification has therapeutic value. Steady gratification can, therefore, cure and forestall deficiency illnesses, and a gratified person does not demonstrate a syndrome of these illnesses (Maslow, 1968a:153).

2.5.4 Self-actualization

Maslow dedicated himself to the study of so-called self-actualizing people, since he had been deeply inspired by Ruth Benedict and Max Wertheimer (Maslow, 1971:41-42). Self-actualizing people are those who have come to a high level of maturity, health and self-fulfillment (the highest reaches of human nature) (Maslow, 1968a:71-72).

In principle most people are capable of self-actualization, and they actually yearn for it; however, it rarely happens in practice (Maslow, 1968a:158, 160). He presumes that less than 1% of the adult population are self-actualizing people, and he concludes that self-actualization is perhaps not possible for young people in contemporary society (Maslow, 1968a:204; 1987:126). Self-actualization is an ultimate goal for young people in humanistic education (Maslow, 1971:168-169, 181).

He recognizes that it is not possible to define self-actualization clearly (Maslow, 1968a:24). Therefore he often attempts to present detailed descriptions of the qualities and attributes common among self-actualizing people. Their characteristics are perception of reality, acceptance, spontaneity, problem-centering, solitude, autonomy, fresh appreciation, peak experiences, human kinship, humility and respect, interpersonal relationships, ethics, means subordinated to ends, humor, creativity, resistance to enculturation, imperfection, values, and resolution of dichotomies (Maslow, 1987:128).

Self-actualization consists of roughly five important characteristics: full development of inner nature, psychological health, integration (wholeness), creativity (and autonomy), and transcendence.

(1) "Self-actualization is intrinsic growth of what is already in the organism, or more accurately of what is the organism itself" (Maslow, 1987:66). The first characteristic of self-actualization, accordingly, is full acceptance, free expression and full development of the inner nature (Maslow, 1968a:5,197). Self-actualizing people unconditionally accept their good inner nature and its positive self-actualizing tendency (Maslow, 1968a:26). They are able to dip into the inner nature, to use and value its primary processes without fear (Maslow, 1962:45). They pay more attention to the inner

impulse voices (signals) of their own nature (Maslow, 1971:46-47, 184). The determinants which govern them are primarily the inner laws of nature (Maslow, 1968a:35). They permit their own intrinsic nature to determine themselves. As a result, self-actualization, in a positive sense, can be described as the full development of all the talents, capacities and potentialities of the inner nature.

(2) Self-actualizing people are in a state of good psychological health. Most psychopathologies are considered to be caused by denial, frustration or the twisting of inner human nature (Maslow, 1987:115). Self-actualizing people, however, have already been suitably gratified in their basic needs, because self-actualization, according to his motivation theory, cannot be reached until all the prior basic needs have been satisfied (Maslow, 1971:190; 1987:22). They are free from the deficiency problems from the past (Maslow, 1968a:115), and moreover, the satisfaction of their basic needs has a good effect on their health and acts as "therapeutic medicines" (Maslow, 1987:97).

Since man can, after sufficient gratification of certain basic needs, become, to some extent, independent of strong prerequisites of the needs, self-actualizing people are more capable of withstanding temporary loss of the basic needs (Maslow, 1987:31). Even though they may experience conflict, anxiety, frustration, sadness, hurt and feeling of guilt, their behaviours are determined less by them (Maslow, 1962:45; 1987:180-181). They may, sometimes, feel hostility, hatred or aggression, however, such a feeling is expressed in healthy ways such as righteous indignation and anger against injustice (Maslow, 1987:88). As a result, "self-actualization implies minimal presence of psychopathic problems (neurosis, psychosis), and of loss or diminution of the basic human and personal capacities" (Maslow, 1968a:197).

(3) Self-actualizing people reveal their well-integrated (whole) personalities. Self-actualization means "a fusion (unity, integration) of ego, id, super-ego and ego-ideal, of conscious, preconscious and unconscious, of primary and secondary processes, a synthesizing of pleasure principle with reality principle ... a true integration of the person at all levels" (Maslow, 1968a:96).

In self-actualizing people, many dichotomies within themselves (e.g. head vs. heart, wish vs. fact, and reason (rational) vs. instinct (irrational) are resolved into unities, just as cognitive vs. conation becomes cognition structured with conation (Maslow, 1968a:139; 1971:210). Many oppositions in their lives (such as work vs. play, vocation vs. avocation, duty vs. pleasure, individual vs. social, and selfishness vs. unselfishness) are also fused into higher unities (Maslow, 1962:43). Many philosophical polarizations (such as biology vs. culture, innate vs. learned, the subjective vs. the objective, and the idiosyncratic vs. the universal) are resolved (or transcended) (Maslow, 1987:55). Self-actualizing people, as a matter of fact, are "all integrators, able to put separate and even opposites together into unity" (Maslow, 1987:162). The more integrated and unified they are at all levels of their inner nature, the more synergic (cooperative) their modalities are without conflict (Maslow, 1962:44; 1968a:35).

(4) Creativity is a universal characteristic of all self-actualizing people (Maslow, 1987:142). Maslow (1971:57) sometimes considers self-actualization to be the same thing as creativity. He is interested in creativity as the self-actualizing personality, rather than special talented creativity (Maslow, 1987:160). Creativity is that which proceeds from the inner nature (Maslow, 1968a:144; 1971:82). Self-actualizing people are creative men who permit themselves to dip into the inner nature (Maslow, 1971:69). For this, one logical perception only

is insufficient, because it often blocks man from fully sensing the primary process of the inner nature. So they approach their inner nature, the source of creativity, with all the alogical perceptions (Maslow, 1971:69-70, 94).

The past, the future, traditions, inhibitions and regulations often prevent creativity from coming to the fore from the inner nature (Maslow, 1971:62-66). He assumes that most people lose it as they become more cultured. Therefore, "pure spontaneity (second naivete)" is a prerequisite for creativity, because it enables the inner capacities to flow forth automatically from within (Maslow, 1968a:197; 1971:70; 1987:160). Self-actualizing people are very spontaneous. They resist being acculturized and rubricized (Maslow, 1968a:126, 181), instead they maintain a high degree of individuality, uniqueness, privacy and autonomy. Consequently, they are autonomous people (Maslow, 1968a:26, 34), who follow the inherent design of their own inner nature.

(5) Transcendence is another characteristic of self-actualization. Transcendence is defined as "the very highest and most inclusive or holistic levels of human consciousness, behaving and relating, as ends rather than as means, to oneself, to significant others, to human beings in general, to other species, to nature, and to the cosmos" (Maslow, 1971:279).

Self-actualizing people show, in a negative sense, the transcendence of ego, their own body, time, space, culture, death, pain, the basic needs, the Freudian superego, their own weaknesses, dichotomies, D (deficiency)-realm, negativity, fear, human imperfections, their own credo (system of values and beliefs). In a positive sense, they reveal the transcendence as mystical experiences, identification-love for others (homonymy), identification with B (Being: the perfect state of self-actualization)-value, the attainment of Taoistic objectivity,

becoming godlike (beyond the merely human), living in the realm of B-cognition, perceiving the whole cosmos as a unity (Maslow, 1971: 269-279).

Besides, the transcendence of self-actualization is often characterized by metamotivation (Maslow, 1971:299-340) and Taoistic perception, receptivity, and attitude (Maslow, 1971:52, 68). Maslow (1971:35, 73) especially refers to the transcendence of self-actualizing people as mystic and aesthetic "peak experiences". Such experiences are regarded as transient moments of the climax of self-actualization (Maslow, 1971:48). These experiences create a feeling of ecstasy and certain convictions, and they transform (or strengthen) people and their perception of the world (Maslow, 1987:137, 163).

2.5.5 Anthropological remarks

The major features of Maslow's anthropology can be summarized as follows.

2.5.5.1 Self-actualizing people: autonomous men

On the basis of Evolutionism, man is regarded as a biological being (a wanting animal) that always seeks gratification of his basic needs. Human nature is basically good and trustworthy. It has a positive self-actualizing tendency for growth, and power to cure and save itself. The inner nature of man is the source of creativity, love, truth and knowledge about man and the world. Man has the godlike qualities in the higher levels of human nature. Consequently, self-actualization indicates free expression and full development of the inner nature of man. A self-actualizing person does not accept the negative traditions, inhibitions and regulations incongruent with the impulses of his inner nature. He is autonomous, creative and

spontaneous in accordance with the tendency of his inner nature. He obeys only the inner laws of his nature. He attains godlike transcendent perception and experiences (e.g. Taoistic objectivity, identification with B-value, and peak experiences). As a result, man is a self-sufficient and autonomous being in his inner nature. Self-actualization (full gratification of the basic needs) is the goal of his life and maturity.

2.5.5.2 Biological inner nature: the intrinsic self

The essence or core of man is his biological nature. The biological nature leads man toward development and self-actualization, and knows what is good for man and what he really needs. The biological nature cures, solves and saves man from his psychological maladjustments and conflicts. The nature also motivates and rules human behaviour and experiences through basic needs and its gratification. Man conforms to the biological destiny of his inner nature. His autonomy belongs to the biological inner nature, because inner laws of human nature govern his whole life.

2.5.5.3 Man as an integrated, organized whole

Man is regarded as an integrated, organized whole. All the levels of human nature are integrated and synergic in psychologically healthy people. Self-actualizing people reveal their well-integrated personality. In self-actualization, various kinds of dichotomy or polarity in the human nature, life and perspectives are resolved into unities. In this sense, self-actualizing people are called integrators. The more integrated they are at all levels of their inner nature, the more synergic (cooperative) their modalities are without conflict.

Human wholeness consists of many aspects: the biological, cognitive, affective, conative, social, aesthetic, axiological, philosophical, spiritual (religious) aspects. The cognitive,

affective and conative aspects are regarded as the psychic functions. The aesthetic, axiological, philosophical, spiritual (religious) aspects belong to the higher levels of human nature. The social aspect of man in many cases is considered to be negative. These aspects of man are integrated hierarchically in accordance with the theory of motivation. They are often overlapping and synergic. So each aspect is an expression of the whole integrated personality. However, human nature is anchored in the biological aspect of man. Even the higher nature of man is regarded as part of his biological essence. It is hierarchically integrated on the same biological continuum with the lower biological nature. Self-actualization is the development of the biologically based nature of man, so that it conforms to its biological destiny. Consequently, lower aspects of the hierarchy are more prepotent than higher ones. The logical aspect is less important than the biological, affective aspects.

2.6 Conclusion

The concepts of being human of four important exponents of Neo-Humanism have been analysed. On the basis of this analysis, the general features of Neo-Humanist anthropology can be summarized as follows:

2.6.1 The origin and development of man are explicated in terms of Evolutionism. Man is a biological-psychological organism. He has by nature a good and positive tendency toward growth. He also has unlimited positive potential. Self-actualization is the ultimate end of man's life and development. Man should be free from every negative social influence. He is healthy when he, as an autonomous being, obeys the laws and motivation of his inner nature, free from any external norms. Consequently, self-sufficiency, autonomy,

self-actualization are the most fundamental characteristics of the Neo-Humanistic anthropology (2.2.6.1, 2.3.5.1, 2.4.5.1, 2.5.5.1).

2.6.2 Goodman regards the self as "the integrating system of the contact between organism and environment" or "the integrating and acting agent" (2.3.5.2). Rogers considers it as "the perceptual field". However, he mainly discusses the negative function of the self(-concept) in the actualizing process of the organism. A positive role of self(-concept) is dependent on being in harmony with the experiences of the human biological organism (2.4.5.2). In conclusion, the real self is the biological inner nature (the biological-psychical in Holt and Goodman). The biological inner nature is the essence or core of man. It motivates, directs and governs human behaviors, development and actualization. It integrates all human functions and needs of the organism. It is often identified with the biological(-psychical) functions of man (2.2.6.2, 2.3.5.2, 2.4.5.2, 2.5.5.3)

2.6.3 Man is intended to become an integrated or holistic unity. The ideal person (free man, self-regulating free citizen, full-functioning person and self-actualizing person) reveals a well-integrated personality. Every activity of man is involved in all the functions of human organism. Holism is also applied to all the areas of the world. Though the numbers of aspects of the wholeness of man are different in Neo-humanists, integrating attempts of various aspects (e.g. the logical and affective aspects) are often made (e.g. 2.2.6.3, 2.3.5.3). However, the biological aspect of man is the most important and prepotent. It sometimes includes the psychical and other a-logical aspects. In many cases, the social aspect is considered to be a negative one for children. Neo-humanists often dichotomise human aspects into the logical and a-logical (biological-affective). The biological-affective aspects of man

are absolute preconditions for all logical activities of man (2.2.6.3, 2.3.5.3, 2.4.5.3, 2.5.5.3).

Through an analysis of four Neo-Humanists, concepts of being human in the Neo-Humanistic education have, in a broad sense, been identified. These four theorists are pioneers and motivators who founded and stimulated the movement of Neo-Humanism in education. So their anthropological ideas are the most essential foundation of the Neo-Humanistic view of human integration. However, these are not sufficient to present the whole picture of human integration of the Neo-Humanistic education, because a few Neo-Humanistic educationists (e.g. Combs, Weinstein, Brown and Valett) who were influenced directly or indirectly by the previous motivators (Holt, Goodman, Rogers and Maslow), have developed educational theories and models for human integration in the context of education. They form their theories of human integration on the basis of the Neo-Humanistic anthropology that has been analysed thus far in this chapter. Therefore, the next chapter will deal with some efforts to effect human integration through an analysis and critique of four representative Neo-Humanistic educationists' theories and models of human integration.

3 EFFORTS TO EFFECT HUMAN INTEGRATION IN NEO-HUMANISTIC EDUCATION

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, some educational efforts for human integration and their general nature in Neo-Humanistic Education will be introduced and examined. There have been a number of educational models and programmes experimented with for this purpose (Simpson, 1976:19-67; Valett, 1977:206-216). Some are school or classroom curricula, and the others are teacher training models and programmes.

I chose four representative educational theories and models in order to identify general characteristics of the efforts for human integration in Neo-Humanistic education: Combs (Affective Education), Weinstein (Self-Science Education), Brown (Confluent Education) and Valett (Humanistic Education). Combs, Weinstein and Brown are well-known Neo-Humanists. Nash (1980:8) regards these three theorists' programmes as "three major programs in humanistic education ... in the sixties". These three are also introduced and dealt with as the representative programmes by other Neo-Humanists. Simpson (1976: Preface 6) considers these three theorists as important representatives, and introduces the general nature and practices of their humanistic educational theories and models in Humanistic education: an Interpretation. Fatzer (1987:15-30, 251-270) also introduces these three as the most well-known models and programmes, though he includes Norman Newberg, David Aspy, Flora Roebuck, Al Alschuler, John Goodlad as well. Valett is chosen because his theory shows the human totality in Neo-Humanistic education well. He reveals tints of the influence of Jung and behavioural modification theory in special education.

However, this can be an example showing why educationists compare Neo-Humanistic education to an umbrella (Kirschenbaum, 1975:327).

3.2 Authur W. Combs: Affective Education

3.2.1 General

Authur W. Combs is a well-known Neo-Humanistic psychologist and educationist, who has been deeply involved with the Neo-Humanistic movement in education. He calls his own approach to psychology Perceptual(-experiential, phenomenological) psychology (Combs, 1989:8, 33). He laid its groundwork with Donald Snygg in 1949, and he has spent most of his professional life exploring its implications in education and counselling.

As a representative of the Neo-Humanistic educationists and chairperson of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1962 Yearbook Committee, he edited *Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming: A new focus for education* (1962), which is one of the most important humanistic educational writings. He also edited the report of the ASCD Working Group on Humanistic Education, *Humanistic education: Objective and Assessment* (1978). He contributed major articles to these books. He is famous for the Florida Training Program for humanistic teacher education, Florida Studies in the helping professions and the Childhood Education Program at the University of Florida.

3.2.2 Perceptual psychology

Perceptual psychology is a humanistic psychological approach emphasizing the inner human perception rather than human

behaviour. Combs (1989:8, 33) states that Perceptual psychology is "both a product of the Humanist Movement and a stimulus to its growth". The origin of Perceptual psychology is derived from Snygg's article, The need for a Phenomenological System of Psychology (Snygg, 1941). However, Perceptual psychology was made more concrete in Individual Behavior: a new frame of reference for psychology (Snygg & Combs, 1949).

Combs' theory has many characteristics in common with the psychological theory of Rogers (Combs, 1989:7, 128; Fatzer, 1987:255-256). Combs, however, pays more attention to the self-concept, than Rogers who puts more stress upon the becoming process of the organism rather than the self-concept. Combs develops his own self(-concept)-centred interpretation of psychology and education (2.4.3; Patterson, 1977b:203, 204; Bosak, 1977:438). He accepts Maslow's motivational theory *in toto*, together with the term "self-actualization" (2.5.3 and 2.5.4; Combs, 1970:287; 1979:101; 1989: 55).

The most basic concept of the Perceptual psychology is that human perceptions of self and the world determine man's behaviour. So human behaviour is regarded as merely symptoms (manifestations) of man's perceptions (Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:19; Combs, 1989:34). An adequate understanding of man, accordingly, requires understanding of the causes (perceptions) of his behaviour that lie in his inner life (Combs, 1981a:372).

The perception refers to personal meanings, phenomenal experiences, or self-concepts (Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:63; Combs, 1989:34). Human perceptions consist of feelings, attitudes, beliefs, understanding, values, likes and dislikes, hopes, fears, aspirations and goals. These are the primary

determinants of behaviour and the characteristics what "make us human" (Combs, 1981a:372; 1970:174).

A perceptual field within man is always composed of many perceptions. Combs (Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:207) defines the perceptive field as "the universe of experience open to the individual at the moment of his behavior". It includes all the personal meanings at varying levels of awareness and with more or less stability and importance in man's economy. However, behaviour is always a function of the total perceptual field at the moment of action, because the perceptions consist of a continuum from the lowest level to the highest in the field. Therefore, man's behaviour at any moment in time is regarded as the product of his perceptual field at that instant (Combs, 1989:35-36; Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:63).

Perceptions having reference to self are spoken of as the self-concept (phenomenal self). Combs (1989:48-49) states that it lies at the very centre of the perceptual field (existence). Some characteristics of the self-concept, according to his perceptual theory, can be summarized as follows: (1) The self-concept is not a self or ego as a postulated entity (or substance), but "an organization or gestalt of perceptions about the self" (Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:64), "a basic organization of personal meanings" (Combs, 1989:50) or "a system of beliefs about one's self and one's relationships to the world" (Combs, 1989:47). (2) Perceptions about self vary in centrality or importance to the individual. (3) The self-concept may be defined as less or more than the physical body. (4) The self-concept is both stable and fluid. (5) It is primarily learned from experience with the external world (Combs, 1962:53; 1989:53). (6) It determines behaviour. (7) Once established, it tends to corroborate itself. (8) What

people believe about themselves plays a dominant role in determining personal fulfillment (Combs, 1989:47-49).

There are seven elements which influence perception: the physical organism, time, opportunity, need, the self-concept, goals and values, and the organization of the field (Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:64-65). These elements, as essential factors for perception, are considered when a certain matter is interpreted on the basis of the perceptual psychology (e.g. intelligence, Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:207-225). The proper methodology of perceptual psychology is "reading behavior backward" in Combs' own term (Combs, 1975a:95), i.e. holistic-inferential techniques to discover personal meanings (Combs, 1978:21-22).

3.2.3 Self-actualizing persons: integrated persons

3.2.3.1 A biological-psychological organism

The anthropological view of Combs is based on Neo-Humanism, so that it demonstrates fundamentally the same suppositions as the general Neo-Humanists' view of man which was analysed in the previous chapter (2). His anthropological suppositions are summarily presented for the preparatory identification of self-actualizing persons.

For Combs, man, in a word, is an evolutionistic biological-psychological organism. Man is considered to be the last organism with the greatest potentiality in the course (chain) of evolution (Combs, 1979:106; 1989:24). He, as an organism (Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:146), has biological characteristics such as a drive toward health and fulfilment rooted in protoplasm (Combs, 1989:19, 21), and he searches for satisfaction of his basic needs for his own maintenance and

enhancement (Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:64). At the same time, man seeks psychological fulfilment of the phenomenal self (or self-concept). The psychological fulfilment, however, is more important than the physical fulfilment, because the phenomenal self is far more complex and important than the body. Combs (1989:20, 21) mentions that "the (psychological) self we wish to fulfill is not the physical self but our personal self... the self we experience is far more important to us than the body in which it travels".

Man is considered to be neither good nor evil by nature (Combs, 1989:19). However, Combs (1979:89-95; 1989:28-29) regards a negative interpretation of the human organism as a myth, and he contends that the human organism is completely trustworthy. He believes that "it can, it will, it must move toward (positive) health and fulfilment if the way seems open to do so" (Combs, 1989:21; Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:146-147). He holds that people start their own lives with the capacity to become good human beings, instead of being born bad or inhuman (Combs, 1970:174). He often states that "when men are free, they can find their own best ways" (Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:251; Combs, 1979:26, 92).

Besides, man has practically limitless potential, so that few people ever use more than a small percentage of their total possibilities (Combs, 1989:23-24; 1979:106). Man has, within himself, a drive (impulse) toward health, self-actualization (fulfilment), personal identity, freedom and autonomy (Combs, 1979:90, 92, 94, 233; 1981a: 372; 1989:19, 27). Man is unique and precious. Each person is thoroughly unique on account of his own genetic history and diverse experiences (Combs, 1989:25-26; 1979:174). Combs infers that the uniqueness of man confirms the immense value of each individual, because it means human beings are rare and precious. On the basis of

this supposition, Combs (1979:26, 64-65) believes in the dignity and integrity of individuals.

3.2.3.2 Self-actualizing persons: integrated persons

Combs uses various terms to identify ideal persons: "humane individuals" (Combs, 1975a:91), "healthy persons" (Combs, 1962:50; 1981b:447), "adequate persons" (Combs, 1962:50, 60), "self-actualizing persons" (Combs, 1962:50), "self-directed citizens" (Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:144), "good citizens" (Combs, 1975a:91), "effective, responsible citizens" (Combs, 1979:87), "intelligent citizens" (Combs, 1981b:447), "good teachers" (Combs, 1975d:256). Among these depicting adjectives, "healthy", "adequate" and "self-actualizing", are used most frequently, and "self-actualizing" is the most representative term (Combs, 1989:64).

The above-mentioned terms, in a sense, refer to the good integration of self-actualizing persons, because these terms, to Neo-Humanists, imply a well-integrated personality. Combs (1989:19) concretely uses the term "health" interchangeably with "wholeness". Since man searches insatiably for wholeness (integration) from the moment of conception unto the time of his death (Combs, 1989:19), man definitely shows a well-integrated personality in the state of self-actualization. Thus, Combs (1962:57) states that adequate (self-actualizing) persons are less likely to be at war with themselves.

Self-actualization is a level of fulfilment only achieved to some degree by people. Nobody ever achieves it completely (Combs, 1989:66). Some characteristics of self-actualizing persons are "autonomy, responsibility, willingness to pull one's fair share of the load, concern and tolerance for others, appreciation of human values, commitment to human welfare, commitment to

democratic principles, respect for the dignity and integrity of every human being, and the necessary skills and understandings to participate effectively in personal and group interaction" (Combs, 1972:20). When these characteristics are examined from a perceptual point of view, they can be classified into four distinguishable categories in the perceptual field of self-actualizing persons (Combs, 1962:50-51; 1989:66).

(1) Self-actualizing persons are characterized by an essentially positive view of self. They regard themselves as persons of dignity, integrity, worth and importance, so that they feel themselves likable, wanted, acceptable and able. They also feel a high degree of respect for their own individuality (uniqueness). Since they trust in their whole organism, they are completely free, creative, and autonomous (Combs, 1962:51-53; 1989:66-67; Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:242-248).

(2) They possess deep feelings of identification with others. They have a greatly expanded sense of self to include their fellows (even all mankind), without reference to creed, color or nationality. The identification refers to a feeling of unity (oneness), a feeling of sharing a common fate, and a feeling of striving for a common goal. Accordingly, they manifest a deep respect for the dignity and integrity of other people and a strong sense of justice, moral probity and responsibility (Combs, 1962:54-55; 1989:69).

(3) They possess perceptual fields maximally open and receptive to their experience. They have the ability to accept their awareness of any and all aspects of reality. A greater openness to experience provides them with more data, so that they are much more likely to penetrate to the heart of matters and to behave intelligently. The openness of self-actualizing persons extends to experiences of self as well as to all outside

events (Combs, 1962:56-59; 1989:67-69; Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:248-251).

(4) They are well-informed, because they have a rich and available perceptual field. Their perceptual fields are enriched by both informal experience (e.g. first-hand involvement in human relations or business) and formal experience (technical and professional education). Their perceptions are available when they are needed for actions, therefore, they make fullest use of their experience (Combs, 1962:59-62; 1989:69-70).

3.2.4 Affective Education for human integration

3.2.4.1 The holistic character of humanistic (affective) education

The perceptual approach, according to Combs (1975a:93-95), has a holistic character. It includes even some tenets of behavioural approaches. However, it extends beyond them to deal with more holistic matters not readily treated in the behavioural system. It attempts, in practice, to explain human behaviours holistically (or affectively). Combs (1982:495; 1979:159) calls the perceptual approach to education, "affective education" in a specific sense, or "humanistic education" in a broader sense (Combs, 1979:51). He uses these two terms interchangeably (Combs, 1981a:370).

Education must be holistic in nature, because man and his learning have a holistic (integrated) nature. The affective aspects of man are not something separate and apart from the cognitive one. Thus Combs (1979:161; 1975a:92) states that "there can be no such thing as an 'affective domain' that is separate and apart from cognitive experience: cognition and

emotion are inseparable". He regards it as an educational myth that the mind is separate from the body and it should be trained separately (Combs, 1979:239). Since every behaviour has affective aspects, "education must (also) be affective, or there may be no education at all" (Combs, 1979:160). He holds that the neglected affective factors should be necessarily incorporated in modern education emphasizing only the cognitive aspect and the learning of basics (Combs, 1975a:91; 1981b:448). This will enable students to learn more effectively (Combs, 1982:497).

Humanistic educational objectives that deal with the inner lives of students are holistic and affective in character (Combs, 1978:17-19; 1979:50-52). They have to do with matters of feelings, attitudes, beliefs, values, understanding, personal meaning, and perceptions of self and of others, which Combs regards as the qualities that make people human. They deal with the problems of self-actualization, good citizenship, responsibility, intellectual behaviour, independence, autonomy, positive views of self, identification with others, creativity, effective problem-solving, physical and mental health, and formulation of values and attitudes (Combs, 1975a:93; 1975b:124; 1978:17, 19, 21; 1979:51). All these objectives are, in the main, composed of the affective fulfilment of man.

Behavioural educational objectives, however, do not deal effectively with these holistic and general goals (Combs, 1975b:124; 1979:50), because they concentrate attention on specific goals of education only. Modern education concentrates on producing behaviours the educators know how to measure behaviouristically. The behaviouristic way stifles innovation and diverts attention from holistic (general) and overall goals of education. As a result of this, education becomes distorted (Combs, 1979:50; 1978:18). A behavioural approach to measurement is inadequate for assessing holistic

and affective objectives (Combs, 1978:22). Combs (1975a:98; 1978:21-27) puts forward a holistic-inferential approach to be able to assess the causes of behaviour: feelings, beliefs and perceptions of students.

3.2.4.2 The function of the affective aspects: personal meaning

What Combs calls "affective" has to do with "things that make man truly human": beliefs, attitudes, feelings, understanding, and concerns. Educational objectives are concerned with positive self-concepts, feelings of identification, responsibility, openness to experience, adaptability, creativity, and effective human relationships. These human qualities in education are outcomes of personal meanings (Combs, 1975a:93). Thus, the most important aim of Affective Education is to concentrate all educational efforts on helping students discover personal meaning. Educators, at every level of operation, are required to experiment with the assessment of personal meaning and to sharpen their own skills toward this end (Combs, 1975a:99).

According to the perceptual approach, the personal meanings (perceptions) are accompanied by emotion. Emotion is not the cause of behaviour, but a concomitant of every significant perception (personal meaning). Every human behaviour carries some sort of emotion (feeling), and the strength (level) of that emotion is dependent on the degree of the significance of perception (Combs, 1979:160). The greater, thus, the degree of personal relevance (meaning), the greater the degree of affect which is experienced (Combs, 1975a:92; 1981b:449; 1982:495). So Combs (1979:161; 1981a:370; 1981b:449; 1989:86) calls emotion (affect) "an indicator" of the degree of personal meaning (importance).

Since affect has to do with personal meaning, "... we are either going to have affective education or none at all" (Combs, 1975a:92). Affective aspects should be regarded as important facets of the learning process and must be included in educational planning and practices, because an educational system that ignores these aspects cannot achieve its noble objectives. Instead, it runs the risk of making itself ineffective. Any attempts to rule out the affective aspects of life from education are to make the education sterile (Combs, 1982:495; 1975a:92; 1979:162).

The teacher who is concerned about the personal meanings of students tries to keep his relationships with students warmer and more humane, and to seek and appreciate their affective aspects (Combs, 1975a:97). He creates the conditions which will facilitate involvement and changes in the behaviour and personality of his students (Combs, 1962:50; 1982:495). He knows very well that students are most motivated when problems are personally meaningful (Combs, 1981a:370).

In short, Combs emphasizes the primacy of the affective aspects in educational objectives and uses the affective aspects as integral factors in educational processes (Combs, 1981b:446).

3.2.4.3 Affective character in learning

According to Combs (Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977:65; Combs, 1989:85), learning has holistic aspects, so that it is a deeply personal (affective) as well as a cognitive experience. Learning is a human problem consisting of two parts: firstly a student acquires some new information or experience, secondly, he discovers the meaning of the information.

Aquisition of new information or experience is the first step in a learning process. The more significant aspects of learning, however, occur through the discovery of personal meaning. The most significant learning often has to do with the deepest discovery of the personal meaning of what people already know (Combs, 1989:84), because every bit of information affects their behaviours in the degree to which they have discovered the personal meaning of that information (Combs, 1975b:125; 1981b:448; 1982:495; 1989: 81).

Since learning is understood as the process of discovering personal meaning, it is also a very personal (affective) experience (Combs, 1981b:449). So Combs (1979:162) states, "unless education is affective, there will be no learning at all!". Therefore, schools should be more humane places, which encourage students to be involved and cooperate actively in the process of learning (Combs, 1977:145). They must devote far more time and energy to the personal meaning of the students in learning than to bare information (Combs, 1970:177; 1975c:193). Emotion should be considered significantly in the process of learning, because it provides a handy indicator of the personal meaning attached to the content studied by the students; no significant learning occurs without affect (Combs, 1981b:449; 1982:495). The assessment of educational outcomes should be focused on the degree of the personal meanings being produced by the process (Combs, 1975a:96).

Combs (1970:177-178) summarizes the affective demands of modern schools in the concepts of learning: (1) de-emphasizing information and objectivity, (2) valuing meaning, (3) developing sensitivity to students' meanings, (4) accepting students, (5) encouraging personal exploration, (6) testing, evaluating, and rewarding meaning, (7) teachers, too, must be evaluated and rewarded for humanism.

3.2.4.4 Affective Education

Combs (1982:496-497; 1981b:449) specifically explains the following five important affective factors in Affective Education. These affective factors can be depicted, with reference to his other writings, as follows:

(1) Self-concept

Self-concept affects all the aspects of behaviour and learning (Combs, 1982:496). It is a vital factor in success or failure in school. Since self-concept is learned by experience, especially from the ways that children are treated by significant people (Combs, 1975b:129), what happens to children in school may have long-term effects on their beliefs about themselves (Combs, 1979:179; 1981b:447). Students can learn best when positive self-concepts have been formed by successes in schools (Combs, 1977:243-244; 1979:123; 1981b:449). Failure is always debilitating and destructive to their self-concepts (Combs, 1979:123, 121-125). To produce and enhance a positive self-concept, it is necessary to provide success experiences, positive feedbacks from teachers and programs designed to eliminate failure (Combs, 1982:496; 1979: 125).

(2) Challenge or threat

Combs (1981b:449) holds that the discovery of personal meaning is deeply affected by the student's experiences of challenge or threat. Students, on the one hand, feel challenged when they are confronted with interesting problems and when they feel able to cope with them successfully (Combs, 1982:496). This feeling of challenge is conducive to learning and they willingly become involved in the learning process (Combs, 1989:88). On the other hand, threat is a negative experience producing the narrowness of tunnel vision and the immobility of self-defence (Combs, 1979:72; 1989:58-59). When students feel threatened, they are less able to handle

problems effectively, and they try to find ingenious ways of avoiding involvement, and it finally has disastrous consequences in any school situation (Combs, 1979:65-66, 72; 1989:88). To accomplish its goals, therefore, education must find ways of challenging students without threatening them (Combs, 1979:73; 1981b:449; 1982:496).

(3) Values

Values are generalized beliefs that provide the basic guidelines (criteria) by which students make their choice (Combs, 1981b:449; 1982:496-497). Combs (1982:496-497) also regards them as affective factors. Values can be achieved and developed through personal exploration, such as personal confrontation, experimentation and choice (Combs, 1979:81-82). Therefore, schools should consider positively the exploration of value as an important objective, and they should include it in the learning process (Combs, 1979:81-82; 1981b:449; 1982:496-497).

(4) Belonging and being cared for

Effective learning is deeply influenced by a student's feelings of belonging or being cared for. The experience of belonging is accompanied by feelings of excitement, interest, desire to be involved, and such like. Teachers must pay more attention to the conditions that induce these feelings in the classroom (Combs, 1981b:449; 1982:497).

(5) Personal needs

Basic needs are built-in motivation for students (Combs, 1979:169). Failure of need satisfaction produces narrowness and rigidity of perceptual organization, while its satisfaction frees students to seek the fulfillment of higher personal goals (Combs, 1962:61; 1981a: 371). "The most effective learning is related to personal needs" (Combs, 1979:178). Students learn best when they have a need to know, and they work hard for

things they need (Combs, 1972:289; 1981b:449; 1989:87). Therefore, schools must become more relevant to the needs and experiences of students (Combs, 1970:185), and they should provide more personalized curricula to meet the diverse needs of students (Combs, 1979:226).

Combs also emphasizes that other affective factors such as responsibility, autonomy, creativity and individuality, should be considered in a classroom. He strictly opposes a grading system, uniform class grouping, punishment and competition all of which may do harm to the positive self-concepts of students.

3.2.5 Remarks on human integration

Major characteristics of Combs' theory of human integration can be identified as follows:

3.2.5.1 Man is the most developed biological-psychological organism with great potential in the course of evolutionism. The organism has a drive toward biological-psychological fulfillment (self-actualization) and satisfaction of its basic needs. The psychological fulfillment is more important than the biological. The human organism is so trustworthy that it can find the best way toward self-actualization with its own capacity. Man is unique on account of his own genetic history and diverse experiences. The uniqueness confirms the dignity and integrity of individuals. The self-actualizing person trusts his whole organism, and has a positive view of self. He is autonomous, free, creative and responsible. He respects the dignity and integrity of humanity. Consequently, self-actualization is the goal of human integration.

3.2.5.2 Human perceptions of self and the world determine human behaviours. The perceptions refer to personal meaning, phenomenal experiences or self-concepts. The perceptions of self are not a self or ego as a substance, but an organization or gestalt of perceptions about the self and the world. They consist of feeling, attitudes, beliefs, understanding, values, likes and dislikes, hopes, fears, aspirations and goals which are regarded as the qualities that make man truly human. These qualities have something to do with the affective aspects, because the perceptions of self (personal meaning or self-concepts) are always accompanied by the affective aspects. Significant learning can occur in touch with personal meaning or self-concepts. Personal meaning is the integrating nucleus of man and his education. The goal of affective (integrating) education is the discovery (or exploration) of the personal meanings of students.

3.2.5.3 Man searches insatiably for integration from the moment of conception up to the time of his death, and shows a well-integrated personality at the state of self-actualization. The wholeness of man contains the biological, percipient, affective, cognitive (logical), social, moral and pistical aspects. Combs confronts the affective with the cognitive aspect dualistically. The affective aspects of man, according to Combs, include the percipient, affective, social, moral and pistic aspects on the basis of the biological aspect. Even self-functions or self-concepts are identified and intermingled with the affective category. The affective aspects, therefore, are overemphasized or absolutized. Though the cognitive aspect is not denied in his overt expressions, it has not at all been significantly dealt with in man and his education. The cognitive aspect is often contradictory to the affective aspects of man.

3.2.5.4 Combs' effort to effect human integration is the perceptual approach to education which is called Affective Education. Affective Education presupposes that man and his learning, by nature, are characterized by an integration between the affective and cognitive aspects. Since the two aspects cannot be separated from each other, the neglected affective aspects of man must be incorporated in modern education. So Affective Education uses the affective aspects of man as integral factors in educational objectives and processes. The most important integral factor is personal meaning, and its adhesive is emotion. Affective education is interested in self-concept, challenge/threat, values, personal intimacy and personal needs in an educational context.

3.3 Gerald Weinstein: Self-Science Education

3.3.1 General

Gerald Weinstein is one of the pioneers of Neo-humanistic education, who offers a "rich vein of ideas" (Read & Simon, 1975: Preface 13). He was the director of the Elementary School Teaching Project (1964-1968) supported by the Ford Foundation. The project disclosed that the educational failure of children from disadvantaged minority-groupings was caused by irrelevant school curricula, so-called cognitively oriented materials and lessons. He and his team concentrated their exploration on the realm of affect, and presented an alternative integrated curriculum based on the affective characteristics of all children as well as the socio-economically disadvantaged pupils (Meade, 1970: Foreword 10-11; Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:3-15).

Weinstein directed a programme of the Center for Humanistic Education, with the support of the Ford Foundation, at the

University of Massachusetts during 1970-1973. The centre offered the Self-science educational programme, "Education of the Self" or "Self-development", on the basis of Gestalt techniques (Weinstein, 1987a:161; Fatzer, 1987:26, 161, 262; Simpson, 1976:46-47). The programme is regarded as an important contribution to Neo-Humanistic education (Nash, 1980:8).

Weinstein has a continuous interest in the increments of self-knowledge along a developmental continuum, and scientifically examines, with Alfred Alschuler, the self-knowledge. Alfred Alschuler, who worked closely with Weinstein, gave an important idea for learning and teacher education: a typology for educational procedures (congruent, confluent, and contextual approaches) (Simpson, 1976: 48-49; Fatzer, 1987:27, 262). Weinstein's framework of values concerning the development of human potential and self-actualization, has been modified from a self-centred to a socially centered focus (Simpson, 1976:49).

3.3.2 A curriculum of affect

According to the educational philosophy of Weinstein (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:18), "Education ... should have a broad human focus, which is best served by educational objectives resting on a personal and interpersonal base and dealing with students' concerns". However, he diagnoses that modern education (even with its many curriculum reforms), fails to make contact with students and lacks relevance. It cannot make the educational content personal and meaningful, because of its failure to match the content to the students' learning styles, poor relationship to their experience, and ignorance of their feelings and concerns (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970: 21-22).

Among the above-mentioned four elements of failure, he points out, students' feelings and concerns, which constitute the affective domain, have been ignored especially in modern education. The affective domain, in fact, enables education to establish and maintain a significant contact between students and the educational content. The affective domain is regarded as "a point of departure for hooking" students to the cognitive materials (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:10). Thus, the education which ignores the affective domain tends to lack relevance seriously.

The affective domain is composed of two elements, emotion (feeling) and basic forces (concerns) which direct and control behaviour. Weinstein pays more attention to concerns than to emotion. Human concerns are defined as "the most persistent, pervasive threads of underlying uneasiness (that) the learners have about themselves and their relation to the world" (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:22, 37). Concerns always engage feelings, because concerns are the deepest level in the affective domain. Feelings, however, do not always involve concerns. Human concerns are so influential that they "determine the nature of an individual's life and ultimately the life of an entire people" (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:24). The salient elements of the concerns, such as a positive self-concept (self-identity), power (potency), connectedness, are the intrinsic drives that motivate behaviour (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:24).

He hypothesizes that educational relevance can be achieved in a harmonious linkage between the affective domain and the cognitive aspects of learning (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:23). He does not want to be blamed for asserting the primacy of the affective domain over cognition, or for erecting a wall between them. Sometimes he emphasizes their integral relationship, by contending that "cognitive learning is a natural way of becoming more capable of dealing with one's inner needs. The

more analytic the person, the more means he presumably has available for dealing with his feelings and concerns" (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:24). He also states that cognition and affect are not contradictory, but complementary (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:32).

Modern education, according to Weinstein, is characterized by the pervasive emphasis on cognition and its separation from affect. The affective aspects are prescribed or limited to serve the cognitive, so that the cognitive content influences the students' behaviors slightly or coincidentally (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:27-28, 31). The reason is that the affective domain contains more intrinsic forces for motivation, and it has a greater impact on behaviour and on realizing human potential. Speaking more concretely, it is the affective aspects that serve to vivify the cognitive curricula.

For educational relevance, therefore, Weinstein (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:31, 33) recommends "a curriculum of affect" or "a curriculum of concerns" as an ingredient to be blended with cognitive curricula modes. He gives a model for developing a curriculum of affect and outlines its procedure of integration between affect (concerns) and cognitive content (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:33-59). The process of the model is regarded as a series of steps for ordering, integrating, and interrelating aspects and inputs of teaching and learning. The steps often overlap (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:33). It proceeds in this sequence:

- (1) Identifying the learning group: a knowledge of the students' common interests and characteristics, such as developmental, economic, geographic, cultural and racial. It is a prerequisite for the first step (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:34-35).
- (2) Identifying shared concerns: the premise of this model is that the concerns of the learners should be major factors in

determining all the procedures of a curriculum. Three major concerns are those about self-image (self-identity), disconnectedness (connectedness) and control over one's life (potency) (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:35, 39).

(3) Diagnosing underlying factors: social and psychological forces of the pupils should be correctly diagnosed, because they may cause the concerns to manifest in a different manner. The behavioural outcome is described on the basis of the diagnosis (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:40-42, 44).

(4) The organizing ideas: organizing ideas must be selected on the basis of the concerns of the student rather than academic subject matter, so that they can help him to cope with his concerns (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:47).

(5) Content vehicles: in addition to the cognitive materials, three types of content - (a) experience related to persistent concerns, (b) the learner's feelings about his experiences related to his major concerns, and (c) his experiential content which he has learned from the social context - should be used at every step in the teaching process (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:51).

(6) Learning skills: (a) basic skills (reading, writing, oral communication and computation), (b) the skills involved in learning to learn (the ways of thinking, examining and behaving), (c) self and other awareness skills used in recognizing and describing oneself and others in terms of emotion. These three skills are associated with materials, ideas and information (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:52-54).

(7) Teaching procedures: two important principles for selection of teaching procedures are (a) close matching of the learning styles, and (b) production of the most effective affective results (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:56-58).

(8) Evaluation of the outcome: the evaluation must be a continuous process (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:58).

Weinstein (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:71-99) presents a few examples of lessons based on the affective curriculum (e.g. "one-way glasses"). They are educational programmes and curricula adapted from the materials of the human potential movement which aim at improving psychological growth (Weinstein, 1971:196). They focus on analysing and changing human perceptions of the student's deep concerns toward a positive self-image, connectedness and a sure sense of power.

3.3.3 Self-science education

Weinstein accepts a common concept of science as the method for his approach. According to his opinion, science is a systematic way of gaining knowledge, which involves activities such as careful observation, hypothesizing, further observation, experiments and evaluations. Its important characteristic is the activity of creating a hypothesis. A scientist hypothesizes about something, and seeks to affirm whether or not his hypothesis has a greater or lesser degree of congruence with reality (Weinstein, 1975:373-374).

Self-science, as a humanistic approach to the psychological aspects of education, is a systematic way of exploring one's self, which has little to do with behavioural science or traditional scientific thinking (Simpson, 1976:47-48). According to Weinstein (1975:374), man hypothesizes many things about himself and about others. Thus, one's self-concept is regarded as a cluster of hypotheses which he has about himself (Weinstein, 1975:374). Man often reckons that the hypotheses he has about himself and others are established truths, and does not make any attempt at examining how much of each of his beliefs is fact and how much fiction. As a result, his beliefs are not regarded as tentative hypotheses, while they, at the same time, influence his whole life.

Self-science education offers "programs for training learners in those skills, concepts, and attitudes that will expand their self-knowledge concerning their own unique style for being in this world" (Weinstein, 1975:374). In these programmes a learner, like a scientist, explores his own inner self and observes his own behaviour. Sometimes, he begins deductively with a generalization that he holds about himself and which he tests through systematic observations. More often he begins by gathering data inductively. He can gradually discern the general patterns that he can transfer to other situations (Simpson, 1976:47). "Education of the Self", for example, is a laboratory course aimed at self-exploration. Its content focuses on the "uniquely-experiencing self" (Weinstein, 1971:198), so that the course may deal primarily with internal knowledge of man and help a student to develop self-observation skills. During the whole course a student is encouraged to become "a natural scientist" focusing on himself (Weinstein, 1971:198). Weinstein (1975:374) believes that this programme can increase the intentness (or power) of the students to choose their own ways of being, by means of training them to perceive more accurately their relationship to themselves, others and the world, and to anticipate the phenomena of their personal experiences more accurately.

Self-science is basically an educational attempt, since it is not designed as a therapeutic process, but as a preventive and developmental one (Simpson, 1976:47; Weinstein, 1975:378). Its ultimate goal is to enable students to facilitate the expansion of each other's self-knowledge as well as their own (Weinstein, 1975:379). He believes that matters concerning the self are important enough to deserve their own time slot in the school programme (Simpson, 1976:48).

3.3.4 Trumpet for human integration in education

"Trumpet" is a metaphor which was chosen primarily for the shape of the process of human integration; one starts at the narrow end and comes out at the wider side. Self-awareness is expanded through this trumpet-shaped process (Weinstein, 1971:196). The model (Trumpet) was designed as "a strategy for selecting and sequencing affective activities that would lead to the expansion of an individual's response patterns" (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:162; Weinstein, 1971:196). It portrays how three basic concerns (self-identity, connectedness and potency) are integrated with thought and action. Weinstein (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:165) states that it "depicts the process of personal integration as having three phases in each of which a different function assumes the most important role - awareness of concerns, abstract thought, and conscious action". He intends to interweave the three concerns with awareness, abstract thought and conscious action for personal integration.

The Trumpet has been adapted and revised successively since its conception in 1967. The original form (1967) is composed of five steps. It starts from the individual's three basic concerns, and proceeds in this order: (1) inventory, (2) distinction, (3) abstraction, (4) experimentation, (5) choice of action (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970: 164). It was applied to a curriculum of affect (concerns) of the Philadelphia Cooperative School Program by Terry Borton (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:162-174).

The revised Trumpet (1971) for the Education of the Self is considered to be more typical (Simpson, 1976:89; Weinstein, 1971:196; 1975:375). It is a tool to provide the self-scientist with "a cognitive map whereby he can determine the flow, phasing, or sequencing of a series of affective learning

activities (or personal observations)" (Weinstein, 1971:198). It guides the direction of his personal exploration. It also systematizes his introspection by providing some typical questions that he may ask at each phase of his personal exploration (Weinstein, 1975:375-376).

The typical Trumpet march of the Education of the Self goes through the following eight steps (it starts from the three basic concerns, and proceeds in this sequence with some typical questions):

(1) Experience confrontations (I interact with a situation that generates data); the students confronts himself through an exercise or real experience, as he reacts to a particular phenomenon (Weinstein, 1971:198; 1987:162).

(2) Inventory responses (How did I respond? What was unique? What was common?); self-observation is divided into three areas (feelings or sensations, thought, and actions or behaviours). The answers to the questions of each area represent the student's unique as well as his common responses (Weinstein, 1971:199; 1987:162-163).

(3) Recognizing patterns (What is typical of me?); students develop their own pattern profiles as they verify and classify the data produced from the previous steps (Weinstein, 1971:200-201; 1987:163-164).

(4) Own patterns (What function does this pattern serve for me?); the aim of this phase is to help the student to acknowledge and accept all his patterns without disowning any aspects of himself (Weinstein, 1971:201; 1987:164).

(5) Consider consequences (What does happen, or could happen in my life because of this pattern?); the student examines the effectiveness of his own pattern, so that he may be motivated to expand his repertoire of patterns (Weinstein, 1971:201-202; 1987:165).

(6) Allow alternatives (Will I allow myself any additional patterns of response?); the student chooses any alternative

from his expanded repertoire of patterns, and experiments with it at this step (Weinstein, 1971:202-203; 1987:165-166).

(7) Make evaluations (What happened when I allowed myself a new behavior?); since there are some risks involved in experimenting with the student's response system, he must evaluate carefully his experimental responses at various levels in terms of the consequences (Weinstein, 1971:203; 1987:166).

(8) Choose (Now that I have a choice which behaviour do I want to use?); after careful evaluation of the experimental behaviours, the student makes his decision to keep all, part of, or none of his new responses. The act of choosing is the valued conclusion of the Trumpet (Weinstein, 1971:203; 1987:167).

The Trumpet is a complicated set of interactions in which personal, intellectual and emotional aspects of man are involved. It starts from human concerns, proceeds through some intellectual tasks about the responding patterns of concerns, and leads to an expanded self-awareness and change of behavior. However, it is essentially an instrument for affective learning, which is intended to be introduced into formal educational situations (so-called cognitively oriented curricula). The intellectual aspects of the Trumpet are the only means (or tasks) for affective outcomes. Weinstein believes that change of behaviour is acquired from an integrating process of the affective domain of man.

3.3.5 Remarks on human integration

Major characteristics of Weinstein's theory of human integration can be identified as follows:

3.3.5.1 Meaningful life and significant learning come from gratification of or contact with man's inner affective domain.

The absolute norm of man is the demands of human concerns. Positive self-image, close connectedness and full control over one's life (the satisfactory realization of man) can be achieved by the expansion of self-knowledge.

3.3.5.2 Human concerns are defined as "the most persistent, pervasive threads of underlying uneasiness (that) the learners have about themselves and their relation to the world" (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970:22, 37). The salient elements of the concerns are a positive self-concept (self-identity), power (potency) and connectedness. Self-concept, which is a cluster of hypotheses about oneself and others, especially influences man as a whole. The human concerns as intrinsic drives, motivate human behaviours and determine the human perception and the nature of life. The self refers to the concerns. The human concerns are the starting point and the principle of human integration.

3.3.5.3 Human totality is composed of two domains: the affective and the cognitive. The affective domain of man is composed of concerns and emotion. Concerns are the deepest level in the affective domain of man so that they always engage feelings. The affective domain includes affective (personal), social (interpersonal), pistical (belief) aspects and roles of the self (conscious action). Weinstein does not want to be blamed for asserting the primacy of the affective domain over cognition, or erecting a wall between them. He also states that cognition and affect are not contradictory, but complementary. However, the affective domain contains more intrinsic forces for motivation, and it has greater impact on behaviour and on realizing human potential. It is the affective aspects that serve to vivify the cognitive curricula. The affective domain maintains a significant contact between students and the educational content.

3.3.5.4 Weinstein's efforts to effect human integration are the Curriculum of Affect (concerns), Self-science Education and Trumpet. The Curriculum of Affect concentrates on the affective domain in education. For educational relevance, a harmonious linkage between the affective domain and cognitive aspects of learning is attempted. The curriculum of affect (concerns) is recommended as an ingredient to be blended with cognitive curricula modes. Self-science Education is a humanistic approach to the psychological aspects of education which makes a student explore his self(-concept) systematically. Its main goal is to enable the student to facilitate the expansion of his self-knowledge. The Trumpet is a strategic procedural model of human integration. It interweaves the three concerns of man with awareness, thought and action, in order to reach an expanded self-awareness and integrated personality. All three methods of integration are affective instruments which are devised for the purpose of an integrated and relevant curriculum.

3.4 George I. Brown: Confluent Education

3.4.1 General

George I. Brown is a Gestalt therapist, awareness trainer, leader of creativity-training workshops at the Esalen Institute, and professor of education at the University of California, Santa Barbara (Brown, 1971a:20). He originally studied with Fritz Perls, the founder of Gestalt therapy, and later worked with him as co-therapist. As a member of the editorial board of *The Gestalt Journal*, he has written a number of articles and books related to Gestalt therapy and its applications (Merry & Brown, 1990: Preface 13; Fatzer, 1987:24).

He invented what he calls "Confluent Education" - though Don Hamachek is also considered by Steyn to have given this name to his educational theory (Steyn, 1989:77; 1990:228) - after his first systematic attempt in 1967, in order to train teachers and develop affective curricula. This, on the basis of the principles of Gestalt therapy and Psychosynthesis, was concerned with developing ways to help individuals achieve a confluence of the cognitive and affective domains of their experiences (Nash, 1980:9; Simpson, 1976:50).

He explored the possibility of applying the approaches and techniques of humanistic psychology and the human potential movement to education in the Ford-Esalen Project with a grant of the Ford Foundation (1967) (Brown, 1971a:21). **Human Teaching for Human Learning: An Introduction to Confluent Education** (1971a) was the report to the Ford Foundation on the Ford-Esalen Project in Affective Education (Brown, 1971a: preface 15; Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975: 10). He developed an academic programme at the graduate level (master and Ph.D. courses in Confluent Education) at the UCSB (University of California, Santa Barbara) with another grant from the Ford Foundation from 1970 onwards (Brown, 1973:516; 1975b:188; Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:10). Another grant from the Ford Foundation enabled him to direct DRICE (Development and Research in Confluent Education). Major activities of DRICE were (1) in-service projects that provided training and practice in the development of curriculum, (2) teacher-training and field school testing projects, (3) research on the effects of humanistic education on teaching quality and classroom environment on the basis of the principles of Gestalt therapy (Brown, 1971b:194-195; 1973:516; 1975b:189; Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:10; Simpson, 1976:52-57; Fatzer, 1987:24). DRICE was succeeded by CEDARC (the Confluent Education Development and Research Center).

3.4.2 Gestalt therapy

George I. Brown is a Gestalt therapist and awareness trainer much influenced by Fritz Perls, the founder of the Gestalt Therapy. Brown (1970:95) is convinced that Gestalt principles have rich potential which contributes to education. He experimented with a number of Gestalt therapy techniques in his first exploration of the Confluent Education at Esalen Institute. He often asked Perls to supervise directly the actual Gestalt therapy sessions and educational applications of the project (Brown, 1971a:23, 24).

Brown makes an attempt at transmuting principles of Gestalt Therapy into educational contexts. He states: "As you read you will notice how principles of Gestalt can be applied to teaching and learning and how valuable these contributions can be" (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975: Preface 9). *Human Teaching for Human Learning* (1971) and *The Live Classroom* (1975) begin with sections on Gestalt theory and forty practical examples of Gestalt techniques, and then present some illustrative applications to the field of education. "Gestalt is central to work in confluent education" (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:15).

Gestalt refers to "a whole, a functional unit" (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975: preface 9), or "a dynamic (holistic) configuration of figure and background" (Simpson, 1976:51). The most important aim of Gestalt therapy is the recognition or reorganization of wholeness (irreducible unity) out of parts of human existence and experiences. Then it is accompanied by a sudden insight (the aha! experience) and therapeutic effects.

Gestalt therapy, as an existential approach, focuses on what is happening "Here and Now" with a client rather than on analysing or interpreting his history (Brown, Yeomans &

Grizzard, 1975:13). The only reality that exists and is capable of being experienced, is the reality of the instant (Brown, 1970:95). The therapist is directed toward helping an individual to be aware of his Here and Now (not why, but what) in feeling and sensory terms. For this reason, Gestalt therapy is often defined as awareness training. The presupposition of Gestalt therapy is that healthy growth of man can occur only when he is aware of, and lives each instant in its most real sense (Here and Now). Any involvement in the past or future may distort the awareness of the present (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:24-25).

Gestalt therapy provides many techniques to facilitate change and growth through helping the individual to experience "himself partaking of the universe" (integrated wholeness) (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:28; Brown, 1971b:192). Major impediments of real awareness are caused by a split of the individual self into two selves. One is the authoritarian, intellectual self that insists on perfection, ideals, all the "shoulds" (or "ought to's"), the other is the hedonistic, emotional self that makes every effort to avoid all the demands of the first self through various ways. These two selves are often in desperate conflict. If the two cannot be integrated into a whole person, the individual cannot be directed at experiencing reality and his creative potential is wasted and becomes worthless. A Gestalt therapist, therefore, helps the client become aware of the split of his selves and its nature. He helps the polarized selves of the client to bring about some integration into an individual person (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:32-33, 24-25).

There are four stages in the process of Gestalt therapy.

- (1) The preparation stage: a greater awareness of reality. Richer perceptual and affective experience should be allowed.
- (2) The incubation stage: "letting be", staying with one's own

life flow without straining to change direction, speed, or content, including immersion in painful experience. (3) The illumination stage: the new concept, idea, or invention emerges into consciousness. (4) The verification or elaboration stage: the client is more closely aware of reality. He integrates the possibility of change or selects alternative ways of behaving. He takes responsibility for himself and his behaviour (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:28-31).

3.4.3 Human integration

George Brown, as a Neo-humanist, manifests his belief in the uniqueness and potential of man. He states that "we see each individual as a unique human being with enormous potential" (Brown, 1971a: Preface 12; 1971a:14). He believes that each individual has enormous potential, so that he makes use of only a very small portion of it: "Every human being manifests only a very small percentage of his potential - perhaps five to ten percent - geniuses, perhaps fifteen to twenty-five percent" (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:9). His philosophical presupposition, permeating his works and projects, is based on an assumption that the growth and development of all human potential is desired and good (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:296; Brown, 1970:95). He regards this potential as a base for reliability of his theory and practice (Brown, 1971a: Preface 12).

He concentrates on two aspects of the potential of man: intellect (the cognitive) and emotion (the affective). He contrasts these two aspects with each other in the historical development of modern Western thought. According to him, the Age of Enlightenment, that emphasized reason (the cognitive) as a panacea for ignorance, superstition, passions and fantasy (the affective), emerged as a reaction to the

Baroque period. The overemphasis on reason, however, eventually led to the Romantic period, which stressed emotion, the irrational, and the individual. In the same manner, the Romanticists neglected or repressed the intellect and its use, because of their excessive anti-reaction to the Age of Enlightenment (Brown, 1975b:175-176; 1971b:191-192; Hackbarth, 1977:128). Consequently, these two modern trends failed to understand the holistic nature of being human. There emerges a need to integrate the polarities between reason and emotion. The polarities are also described as "the polarities between the Apollonian (reason) and the Dionysian (emotion)" (Brown, 1975b:176; 1971b:192), or the separation between the House of Montague (mind) and the House of Capulet (feeling) (Brown, 1970:92-95).

"Cognitive" is defined as "the activity of the mind in knowing an object, to intellectual functioning. What an individual learns and the intellectual process of learning it, would fall within the cognitive domain" (Brown, 1971a:4). This term is also used, more often than not, to refer to academic subject matter in Brown's educational theory (Hackbarth, 1977:130-131).

"Affective" is defined as "the feeling or emotional aspect of experience and learning. How a child or adult feels about wanting to learn, how he feels as he learns, and what he feels after he has learned are included in the affective domain." (Brown, 1971a:4). Brown wants to define this domain broadly. The umbrella of the affective domain covers such features as interest, anxiety, concerns (Brown, 1975b:181), appreciation, adjustment, motivation, personal relevance (Brown, 1971a:6), personal meaning (Brown, 1971a:7), self-concept (Brown, 1971a:12), and moral commitments. It also contains all the non-cognitive learnings, intuition, prelogical activity, the will, attitudes and values (Brown, 1975b:173;

1971a:4; 1975b:183). Every significant advance, innovation, invention or new idea is regarded as a consequence of the affective functions. He contends that "a big leap" in any area is not the result of the cognitive approach to a certain problem (Brown, 1970:92, 93), because creativity is connected with the affective function (Brown, 1975b:174; 1970:96). "The creative process relies on an essentially intuitive process in all cases. Intuition is strongly rooted in emotions" (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:8).

As Steyn (1993:183, 184, 193) points out indirectly in her article on Transpersonal Education, Brown (1975b:202; 1973:519-520; Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:9), as a Neo-humanist, tries to extend the boundaries of the affective domain into the transpersonal self that is connected with the spiritual or mystical realm of man. The transpersonal self is regarded as the locus of the will and intuition. It is "a source of intuitive energy" (Brown, 1973:519). Intuition from the transpersonal self is described as "an enormous source of hitherto generally untapped energy to be used practically in learning and personal growth" (Brown, 1975b:202).

The relationship between the cognitive and the affective aspects is indestructibly "symbiotic" (Brown, 1971a:11; 1973:518). One cannot be excluded (or divorced) from the other in any case (Brown, 1970:96). In reality, an intellectual activity of man is accompanied inseparably by a emotional dimension (Brown, 1971a:9). "The purest, highest form of abstract thinking is coupled with congruent feelings on the part of the thinker, even in the grossest sense of pleasure, boredom, or pain" (Brown, 1971a:11). It is often compared to two sides of a coin (Brown, 1970:94). Any side of the coin must not be denied at all. When man denies one side with reckless abandon, he frequently "moves into a colored cardboard world of pseudo-reality" (Brown, 1970:94). When these two sides

are in conflict, the potential of man is tragically wasted. This condition usually makes human potentialities unrealized, "because the cardboard person, through living in his computed fantasies, persists in maintaining his separation from the real world ... As a consequence, both his so-called conscious or cognitive knowledge and his intuitive and affective resources are shut off from enrichment through real and total experience" (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:26).

Separation or denial of the affective aspect has a pathological effect on being human. Brown points out three pathological effects caused by denial of the existence of genuine feelings, which are often related to one another. These are (1) the replacement of real feelings by pseudo-feelings, (2) the fear of change, and (3) the substitution of fantasy and illusion for reality (Brown, 1971a:12). They exert a negative influence on self-concept (Brown, 1971a:12). They subtract humanness from man (Brown, 1973:520).

The affective aspects play a major role in the relationship between intellect and affect. According to Brown (1970:92; Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:8), they motivate and sustain the very pursuit of knowledge and truth. "Denying or ignoring the existence of feelings ... is like building a house without a foundation or framework" (Brown, 1971a:6).

An ideal person refers to a harmoniously integrated man. Since the integration is a characteristic of human nature, it is necessary to help man realize himself as a total human being (Brown, 1970:96). A well-integrated person is "a healthy individual" who makes use of his intellectual potentiality and can accept, differentiate and control his own feelings (Brown, 1971a:12). He is "a whole person" in terms of both himself (intellect and affect) and relationships with others ("I-thou" relationship) (Brown, 1971a:237). He is an "alive, creative

person" (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:25, 26). What he thinks coincides with what he feels. He is an "independent, fully functioning individual", who can perceive clearly and act rationally, and who can make choices for himself and take responsibility for his own and social life (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:300).

Brown regards maturity (growth) as a new awareness acquired by genuine confrontation of reality. It usually occurs when man experiences (and stays with) his own feelings. When he makes contact with his own feelings, he experiences reality more totally, as a more integrated person. The condition of the experience of reality at that moment is called awareness. Though awareness involves both the cognitive process and feeling, affective learning can provide very useful instruments to stimulate maturity. As the individual moves from one instant of awareness to the next, he becomes more mature (Brown, 1970:94; 1971a:17). Moreover, the healthy (harmonious) integration produces his personal existential responsibility and independent creativity (Brown, 1971b:192; Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:27)

3.4.4 Confluent Education for human integration

Confluence does not refer to the neurotic mechanism that Perls diagnoses as a dysfunctional boundary mechanism by which the individual loses the ability to differentiate between the self and the group or organization (Merry & Brown, 1990:137). The main goal of the Ford-Esalen Project (1967-1968) was to develop some integrating curricula and techniques which would involve all the affective and the cognitive domains of learning and facilitate their integration for relevant learning. The concept "integration" came to be termed "confluence" later on (Brown, 1975b:178).

Confluent Education is an educational attempt to integrate the basic polarity between intellect and affect (the Age of Enlightenment and the Age of Romanticism, the Apollonian and the Dionysian, reason and emotion, mind and feelings) that has been manifested in the analysis of the previous chapter (3.4.3). Confluence is expressed metaphorically as "wedding" (Brown, 1970:96), "weaving" (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975: preface 9), and "bridge" (Brown, 1971a:5). Confluent Education attempts "to resolve the polarity common to all, ... so that like two brooks flowing together into one stream, they will by their confluence lose their individual boundaries in the greater whole" (Brown, 1971b:192; Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:3). Accordingly, it can be defined as the integration (flowing together, or synthesis) of the affective and cognitive elements (domains) in individual and group learning (Brown, 1971a:3, 21; 1971b:192; Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:11).

According to Brown (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:3), Confluent Education is an education appropriate to the direction of life. He considers it as "nothing less than education per se" (Brown, 1975b:179). Its main attempt to integrate intellect with affect in learning, enables the education to be meaningful and relevant to the students (Brown, 1973:516). It makes teaching and learning become "both more human and more productive within that context" (Brown, 1971a: Preface 12). He also believes that it is a proper approach to the development of the individual's potential as a whole (Brown, 1971a:237). Both the cognitive and affective aspects are utilized in teaching and learning.

Brown has criticized modern education for isolating learning from the affective elements pathologically. According to his diagnosis, the intellectual aspect is split from the emotional in modern education (Brown, 1970:92). Schools rely exclusively on the rational (intellectual) way of knowing and objective

thinking (Brown, 1973:518; 1970:93; 1971a:10, 11). Attention is seldom paid to the emotional components in formal educational processes. The affective aspects, more often than not, are denied, repressed, or distorted (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:8). As a result, modern education has a negative effect on even cognitive learning itself (Brown, 1971a:16). The atmosphere of the classroom is dead, so that "learning is mechanistic, routine, over-ritualized, dull and boring. The teacher is robotized, and the children are conceived of as containers or receptacles whose primary function is to receive and hold subject matter" (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:1). Modern schools suffer from an increasing number of dropouts and retarded students from disadvantaged families (Brown, 1971a:6). Consequently, the overconfidence in intellect as the exclusive way of knowing, is "a grand illusion of educational pedants" (Brown, 1973:518), and "the typical pedagogical aberration" befogging the students in illusion and fantasy (Brown, 1971a:8).

Brown (1971a:4) assumes that "there is no intellectual learning without some sort of feeling, and there are no feelings without the mind's being somehow involved". Affect is the other side of the same coin. It has a positive effect on cognitive learning, and even on rationality itself as in the passion of the scholar (Brown, 1975b:175; 1970:96). In this sense, he holds that educators should also capitalize affect, instead of ignoring, denying, or repressing it. "The term "confluent" was chosen because of (the very) need intentionally to highlight the neglected function of the affective domain in learning" (Brown, 1975b:179).

Confluent Education is an affective (psychological) approach to education, as is evident in the project's name (the Ford-Esalen Project in Affective Education) (Brown, 1971a: Preface 15-16). Its efforts aim to incorporate positively emotional components

into learning, so that the learner may become personally involved and his behaviour may change through the experience (Brown, 1971a:16; 1971b:192). Affective aspects are intended to play a vital and crucial role in all the school activities (Brown, 1971a:254).

Brown (1973:519) has attempted to apply the psychological or therapeutic endeavour of Gestalt therapy to a pedagogical context. He applied a number of Gestalt techniques directly to classroom situations (Brown, 1971a:27-28, 53). He emphasizes inwardly such elements of Gestalt therapy as 'Here and Now' (reality awareness) and self-responsibility (Simpson, 1976:51-52). He states that "The good teacher knows what is happening Now. He knows how his students are responding Now. And he knows what he is doing Now, how he is doing it, and how he feels as he does it. Experiencing the Now and taking responsibility for the Now are essential for successful teaching in confluent education" (Brown, 1971a:249).

When affective components are integrated with cognitive learning within the content of conventional curricula, the content can get in touch with the Now. The teacher can then deal with the individual Nows of his students and the students become aware of the true reality in the context of his universe (Brown, 1971a:245-246, 248). Brown believes that growth and change occur only through the experience of reality. Techniques of Gestalt therapy, accordingly, are provided to help facilitate change and growth through enabling the student to experience his reality. "As he more openly experiences the reality of himself, he will at the same time experience himself within reality, that is, himself partaking of the universe" (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:28).

An important goal of Confluent Education is to help the student become more responsible for his learning and

behaviour as a citizen in a democratic society (Brown, 1971a:228-229; 1973:516-517). DRICE projects focus on increasing the ability to take responsibility (Brown, 1971b:194-195), because a healthy integration of the cognitive domain with the affective, in a sense refers to taking personal existential responsibility (Brown, 1971b:192). Responsibility can be learned and taken by a student, when he learns to be more in touch with reality and he assumes the responsibility successfully (Brown, 1971b:193; 1971a:241; 1973:516). When the student takes as much responsibility for his learning and behaviour as he can, he is genuinely regarded as a human being (Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:1-3).

Brown, however, actually fails to develop the paradigm or clarified models of the human integration of learning (Hackbarth, 1977:130), even though he edited some cases of Aaron Hillman and Gloria Castillo and he himself attempted to sophisticate the nature and formulation of the integration (Brown, 1971a:101-193; 1975b:188; Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:11). Some members of his school have made efforts to develop new models and methods. For example, John M. Shiflett has contributed to the measurement of the consequences of Confluent Education. Thomas Yeoman and Aaron Hillman have developed some confluent models with other psychological or affective principles (Brown, 1975b:183-187; Brown, Yeomans & Grizzard, 1975:12, 97-162; Simpson, 1976:54-55).

3.4.5 Remarks on human integration

Major characteristics of Brown's theory of human integration can be identified as follows:

3.4.5.1 Each individual is a unique human being with enormous potential. The development of all the potential is the chief desired goal. Authoritarian and moral norms toward perfection endowed from outside man, are considered to be negative for a healthy personality, because they block or waste the enrichment of the potential. A whole person (well-integrated person) makes use of all his potential. He accepts his own emotions and controls them well. He is a creative, independent, existential and responsible person.

3.4.5.2 The human self is divided into two selves: the intellectual-moral self and the biological-psychological self. However, the real self, which motivates human behaviours and gives meaning to life, is the biological-psychological self. The self is often identified with the affective domain of man. The affective domain includes the perceptual, affective, aesthetic, moral and pistical aspects of man. It also contains the self and its functions, such as motivation, personal meaning and relevance, self-concept, the will and the transpersonal self (the spiritual realm of man). The affective domain plays the leading role in human behaviour and learning. Growth and change occur when the affective aspects work, because then the individual gets in touch with true reality.

3.4.5.3 Human structure (and potential) is simplified to the two domains: the cognitive and the affective aspects. The relationship of the two is indestructibly symbiotic (holistic) in being human, in experience and in learning. Overemphasis of one aspect (consequently, exclusion or denial of the other) has a pathological effect on being human and on learning. An ideally whole person is characterized by a well-integrated personality consisting of the two domains. The integration implies such a thorough confluence of the two that they lose their own boundaries in the greater whole.

3.4.5.4 The educational efforts to integrate the two aspects are called Confluent Education. Confluent Education is an affective approach to the pedagogical context. Its efforts aim to incorporate emotional components (or awareness) positively into conventional learning by means of Gestalt techniques. Affective aspects are intended to play the vital and crucial role in all the school activities, because then a student can be personally involved in the learning and the learning becomes meaningful and relevant to the student.

3.5 Robert E. Valett: Humanistic Education

3.5.1 General

Robert E. Valett was a director and psychologist of special education in the 1960s, and he has been a professor of education at California State University in Fresno since the 1970s. He wrote some guidebooks on special educational programmes, based on behaviour modification techniques: *The remediation of learning disabilities: a handbook of psychoeducational resource programs* (1967), and *Modifying children's behavior* (1969).

He seemed to devote his study to the humanistic psychology and education of the 1970s. His theory on human needs and self-actualization has been deeply influenced by Maslow, while his humanistic educational concept on human potentialities and integration is influenced by Jung (Valett, 1977: Preface 8-9; 1977:39, 47, 65). Valett's major writings on Neo-humanistic education are *Self-actualization: A guide to happiness and self-determination* (1974) and *Humanistic Education developing the total person* (1977).

He led affective-humanistic educational training courses in specialist programs for teaching exceptional students at the California State University, Fresno (Valett, 1977:211-212). His concern in special education necessarily made him integrate Neo-Humanism and behaviour modification. He does not believe that behaviour therapy is inconsistent with Neo-humanism. Instead, Neo-Humanistic principles can promote the effectiveness of behaviour modification (Valett, 1977:186). He tries to develop a "humanistic behavior modification" (Valett, 1977:171-188).

In this chapter, the researcher will analyse only Valett's concept of human integration in his Neo-humanistic educational theory.

3.5.2 Self-actualization

Valett is an evolutionist in his anthropological presuppositions. Man is regarded as an animal of the planet Earth. He, as part of nature, has evolved biologically over countless centuries of time and experience. Highly-evolved neurological and brain structures enable him to think abstractly and reflect on his own actions. This evolution is an ongoing process leading to a positive future (Valett, 1974:24, 32). Valett (1977:6) states that "Humanity is engaged in a continual process of becoming and evolving to higher levels of conscious awareness and being". His evolutionistic belief is so broad that it includes the biological principle of survival and the positive direction of human evolution and social organization (Valett, 1977:9, 12).

Man is a biological-psychological organism. On the one hand, he has strong biological drives which motivate his behaviour (Valett, 1974:14). As a living organism, he functions biologically interacting with the forces of society (Valett,

1977:39). His motions can be explained by "genetic engineering" (Valett, 1974:50) and constant flow of "molecules of energy" (Valett, 1974:25). On the other hand, man has psychological (sometimes spiritual or mystical) needs, energy and potentialities. He has some basic needs which can be arranged in a hierarchical order. They are physical security, love, creative expression, cognitive mastery, social competency and self-worth (Valett, 1977:19). Man has, without exception, the power and latent potentialities within himself to become more self-actualized and fulfilled (Valett, 1974:4). He also has certain "life and personal energy" (Valett, 1974:33), "psychic energy" (Valett, 1974:26), or "Self-energy" (Valett, 1974:47), which has resulted from the interaction and evolution of natural forces in the universe. These are often manifested in creative works, and are such a powerful and dynamic force that man can use them for self-realization, personality healing and improvement of the world (Valett, 1974:28, 32, 76). "Indeed the depth of any man's potential is a mystery - even to himself" (Valett, 1974:11).

The self is regarded as "the center of being" (Valett, 1974:16) and "the source of psychic energy that is finally realized in individual patterns of behavior and life-styles" (Valett, 1977:34-36). In this sense, it is called "the essential (or internal) Self" (Valett, 1974:20, 11). Though it contains conscious functions, it is mainly considered as the essence (source) of what is called the unconscious (Valett, 1974:16, 21). Valett (1977:34-36) construes it as "the unique seed or make-up of the human individual with its germ of potentialities, unrealized abilities, predispositions, and inclinations".

The self also has collective (in human species) inheritance and tendencies. Valett (1977:34-36) holds, on the basis of the theory of Jung, that it includes genetic traits or propensities acquired from the process of the evolution of human species as

well as collective tendencies from racial and cultural inheritance. The self, mystically enough, extends to the Universe. He sometimes calls the self "the universal Self" (Valett, 1974:16), because he believes that the self is the mystical source of life energy that "transcends individuals, our planetary system, and the galaxies" (Valett, 1974:16). He regards the universal self (of man as a cosmic species) as "the inner man, or soul, which radiates great power, potentiality, wisdom, peace, and happiness" (Valett, 1974:16, 34).

The self should be accepted and esteemed for its own worth (Valett, 1977:18, 69). Valett (1974:91) states that self-esteem and self-confidence are desirable attributes. Man should become aware of the potentialities and functioning of the self (Valett, 1974:21, 1977:18). He should develop more positive self-concepts for maturity (Valett, 1977: Preface 8; 1977:3).

In the process of self-actualization, some affective elements such as beliefs, aspirations, ideas and purposes, that are inextricably tied to values or value systems, determine its direction by motivating human behaviours (Valett, 1977:39, 194). They make some kinds of human behaviours meaningful. They generate and feed the human will. In accordance with the affective elements, the will, as a predisposition or as a purposive force, channels personal energy and potentialities into a specific life-style and impels man to move in the determined specific way (Valett, 1974:33, 37, 45, 93). In this sense, Valett (1974:11) contends that what a person thinks and how he acts determines what he becomes. He states that "life is an ongoing process of self-assertion, renewal, and search for values" (Valett, 1974:92).

The internal Self is waiting to be actualized (Valett, 1974:11). "Self-actualization is a process of realizing one's unique individuality, capability, and potential for continued growth

and development" (Valett, 1974:10). Valett (1974:95) includes, in a self-actualization checklist, such items as understanding basic human needs, expressing human feeling, self-awareness and control, becoming aware of human values, and developing social and personal maturity. The table of contents of his book *Self-actualization* (1974) has the following items: happiness and joy, self-understanding, self-functioning, self-improvement and management, self-discipline and control, tension reduction, self-renewal, self-confidence and celebration. In a word, to be a self-actualized person refers to becoming a better person or "true being" (Valett, 1974:4, 37), in the sense that he can develop, channel and use his potentialities and energy for total human functioning. Such an individual usually feels much happier than others do, because he knows how to enjoy happiness from direct communion with his unique self, not from material gratification (Valett, 1974:16).

According to Valett, all persons have the need, power and tendency for self-actualization, even though only a few of them become fully self-actualized. They begin the journey toward self-actualization from their childhood, and the search continues throughout their lives (Valett, 1974:4, 11, 14, 58). First of all, awareness of their own self (and potentiality) is a prerequisite to self-actualization (Valett, 1974:4, 5, 10, 11). They need to accept and believe in themselves positively. They then need to formulate life values, aspirations and concrete personal goals (Valett, 1974:10, 34). They must also focus all their life energy on the realization of the potentiality while doing proper actions and utilizing diverse experiences (Valett, 1974:4, 5, 10, 83).

3.5.3 A total person

A self-actualized person is a totally developed person. He is also called a whole (or total), balanced, humane, mature, educated and responsible person (Valett, 1977:1, 12, 27, 68). The totality includes affective (feeling), cognitive (thinking) and psychomotor aspects (behaviours) (Valett, 1977:5, 6, 12, 21). On the one hand, the totality is composed of thinking, feeling, re-creating, and transcending in the self function (Valett, 1977:6). On the other hand, the totality consists of thinking (cognitive), perceiving (sensory), intuiting (instinctual), and feeling (affective) in the self-awareness (Valett, 1977:35). All aspects, for a total person, are balanced and integrated with one another. The man feels full of energy, and finds himself in "good spirit" and full of life (Valett, 1977:6). He is "a good and relatively happy person who is capable of living a creative and meaningful life" (Valett, 1977:6, 38). All his potentialities function totally in him (Valett, 1974:4, 21), and he can use and develop them to the fullest possible extent (Valett, 1977: Preface 7; 1977:12, 27).

The three major aspects (affective, cognitive, psychomotor) are composed of stages or domains developmentally and hierarchically. The lowest stage is the psychomotor. It is related to gross motor skills (crawling), sensory-motor skills (body spatial organization) and perceptual-motor skills (visual-motor integration). Man develops unconscious stimulation, sensory exploration and concrete relationships in this stage. The next is the cognitive domain, which is connected with language skills (fluency and encoding) and conceptual ability (comprehension). A person develops conscious awareness, verbal expression and thinking in this domain. The highest stage is the affective. It concerns the social and personal skills (value judgements). An individual develops feeling and intuiting, self-identification and expression, and personal

transcendence in this stage (Valett, 1977:21, 31). It is regarded as the most intrinsic part of man (Valett, 1977: Preface 7). According to Valett, this stage is characterized by the awareness of emotions and interests, attitudes, beliefs and value orientations. It has primacy over the cognitive and motor aspects of behaviour, though it is intimately related to them. It determines most human behaviors and sifts the motor and cognitive inputs of experience (Valett, 1977:23).

Man, as a total person, aims at self-realization (individuation and potential becoming), through self-awareness (affective, instinctual, cognitive, and sensory), with a balancing of the personal and social needs and demands, on the basis of the full development of the skills of each stage (psychomotor, cognitive and affective) (Valett, 1977:35).

3.5.4 Humanistic education developing the total person

Valett defines Humanistic Education as the "education that is concerned with the development of the total person" (Valett, 1977:1). It means that Humanistic Education aims to provide learning experiences that will help students develop all their potentialities to the fullest possible extent. It tries to integrate all the learning in meaningful ways to enable them to create a more wholesome way of life. It also attempts to facilitate their growth and behavioral changes so that they may become more self-directed, wholesome, balanced, self-actualized, responsible and social persons (Valett, 1977:1, 2, 13, 27).

Humanistic Education is concerned with all human functions and their balanced integration. Valett believes that in the integrated state, the students can experience a sense of personal wholeness and find themselves in "good spirits" and

full of life (Valett, 1977:5, 6, 205). The wholeness contains the more intrinsic and higher level as well as the cognitive and psychomotor in education (Valett, 1977: Preface 7; 1977:5, 6). The higher aspect often leads persons to transcend immediate personal and societal needs (Valett, 1977:1, 2, 5, 12). Its highest state of the wholeness can be reached by altruistic behaviour (Valett, 1977:196), and it is accompanied with happiness. Because Valett (1977:38, 191) regards a transcendent-altruistic state of mind as the wholeness (or happiness) and the highest goal of life.

Humanistic education, in fact, is an affective form of education, because it stresses the primacy of affective development over the cognitive and motor aspects of behaviour (Valett, 1977:12). Teachers in Humanistic Education are interested in meeting the individual needs, aspirations and feelings of the learner (Valett, 1977:5, 197). They are asked to pay all their attention to the development of emotive abilities, the shaping of affective desires, the fuller expression of aesthetic qualities, and the enhancement of powers of self-direction and control of the student (Valett, 1977:12). Most programmes are provided to develop self-awareness, insight, and self-understanding like the mental health models (Valett, 1977:13, 156). According to Valett (1977:9, 12, 24), beliefs and values, which determine human behaviours and enable the individual to become transcendent and altruistic, belong to the affective domain. He believes that the goals for such components can be best attained by the affective (humanistic) education (Valett, 1977:201).

Valett (1977:6-7) presents the principles of humanistic education as follows:

- Humanity is engaged in a continual process of "becoming and evolving" to higher levels of conscious awareness and being.

- Human abilities, skills, and potentialities can be actualized and developed through proper education.
- Humanity is capable of learning how to develop "good" human potentialities and more effective supporting social systems.
- People can learn how to become more balanced, complete, effective, and happy persons.
- Self-development and social responsibility are the final goals of education.
- The most important thing about a person is the human spirit to love, create, and transcend.
- Persons act and behave according to their values, dreams, and aspirations.
- People need to develop personal and social goals and values to live by.
- Cognitive learning is dependent on the effective-emotional state and the self-confidence and esteem of the person involved.
- Basic "self-knowledge" (self-awareness, understanding, acceptance, expression, assertion, control, and self-renewal) is the fundamental knowledge to be learned by all persons.
- A humanistic educational system furthers the continuous progress of persons at their own rate of learning through the provision of individualized objectives and programmes.
- The humanistic educator is essentially a facilitator who guides and supports the learner in the process of becoming a unique person.

Valett (1977:52-70) developed a humanistic educational model, which aims at the attainment of affective-humanistic objectives. He presents the rationale and concrete programmes of Humanistic Education (Valett, 1977:57-70, 76-113). His humanistic rationale consists of five stages (levels).

(1) Stage one: understanding basic human needs

The student must be able to demonstrate his understanding and appreciation of the basic human needs and people's attempts to satisfy them in life.

(2) Stage two: expressing human feelings

The student must be able to understand and express his feelings about major life concerns. Learning experiences for the development of the emotive potentiality are provided.

(3) Stage three: self-awareness and control

The student becomes more aware of his self and his relationship with other people, and develops self-control.

(4) Stage four: becoming aware of human values

The student becomes aware of the major personal attitudes, social skills, and diverse values that influence human behaviour.

(5) Stage five: developing social and personal maturity (self-actualization)

The student improves his proficiency in predicting the personal consequences of his behaviour, in gradually assuming social responsibility, in adapting to changing events, and in becoming increasingly able to transcend egocentric concerns, and in renewing his self.

Valett (1977:37) intends to describe man as a total person in whom all human aspects (for example, feeling, thoughts, sensory data and intuitive inclination), are inextricably integrated. He accordingly wants to develop a humanistic education as an integrating instrument. However, this form of education, as the model shows, turns out to be only a kind of affective education.

3.5.5 Remarks on human integration

Major characteristics of Valett's theory of human integration can be identified as follows:

3.5.5.1 Man is a highly evolved and continuously evolving biological-psychological organism. He has sufficient potential and some mysterious life energy within himself for self-realization, personality healing and improvement of the world. Happiness, self-esteem and self-confidence in a state of self-actualization are the most desirable attributes. However, the complete happiness as the highest goal of life can be reached by transcendent-altruistic behavior. Man is a transcendent being in the sense that his self is mystically extended to the Universe, as is contended by a doctrine of Deism or Oriental religious teaching of the self-absorption into the Universe. Self-actualization is the integrating principle of man and his life.

3.5.5.2 The self of man is regarded as the centre of being and the source of psychic energy and potential: the internal Self. The self has a collective inheritance and tendency acquired from the process of the evolution of the human species. The self also extends to the Universe: the universal Self. The universal Self is a mystical source of life energy which radiates power, potential, wisdom, peace and happiness. The self should be accepted and appreciated unconditionally. The potential and functioning of the self should be recognized properly. In the process of the actualization of the self, affective aspects determine the direction, by motivating human behavior. The affective aspects generate and guide the human will, so that the will channels personal energy and potential into a specific direction.

3.5.5.3 Man, as a total person, is composed of psychomotor, cognitive and affective aspects. The psychomotor aspect (behaviour) contains the physical, biological, percipient functions. The cognitive aspect (thinking) includes lingual and logical functions. The affective aspect (feeling) is composed of affective, social, moral, aesthetic and pistical functions. The

affective aspect functions as the self of man, because it is often characterized by the will, self-awareness, self-control, personal value, aspirations, personal goals and personal transcendence. These three aspects are hierarchically interrelated with one another. The highest stage is the affective aspect and the lowest is the psychomotor. Self-actualization refers to the state of the complete and harmonious development of all the aspects of man. However, the affective aspect plays the leading and integrating role in human behaviour and personality. It gives meaning to human life and behaviour. It often forces a person to transcend his immediate needs and to become altruistic.

3.5.5.4 The educational effort to effect human integration is Humanistic Education. Humanistic Education tries to integrate all the learning experiences in a meaningful way to enable them to create a totally developed personality and life. Humanistic Education is concerned with all human functions and their balanced integration. However, Humanistic Education is an affective education which stresses the primacy of the affective aspects over others. It is exclusively, interested in the so-called affective domain: the self and the a-logical aspects of man. The important goals (or concerns) of Humanistic Education are self-awareness, self-control, personal needs, emotions, personal attitudes, values, social responsibility, and transcendence of ego-centredness for altruism.

3.6 Conclusion

The educational efforts for human integration of four important Neo-humanistic theorists have been analysed thus far. On the basis of these analyses, the general characteristics

of human integration of these Neo-Humanists can be summarized as follows:

3.6.1 Man-centredness: self-sufficiency and self-actualization

Human origin is explained by the evolutionistic presupposition (3.2.5.1, 3.5.5.1). Man is a highly developed biological-psychological organism. He has sufficient potential, mysterious life energy and a trustworthy tendency toward self-actualization (realization) within himself. He is autonomous in the sense that he does not obey any norms except his inner needs of the organism. Norms endowed from outside himself are often considered to be negative for a healthy personality and self-actualization. Man (or his inner nature) is absolutely trustworthy, so that his organism (or self) should be accepted and appreciated unconditionally. Self-actualization is the ultimate goal and integrating principle of human life (3.2.5.1, 3.3.5.1, 3.4.5.1, 3.5.5.1).

3.6.2 The human self and the affective domain

Concepts of the self are not identical in Neo-Humanistic educationists. That which motivates human behaviour and determines human life, is self-concepts (Combs), human concerns (including self-concept) (Weinstein), and the biological-psychological self (Brown). However, the self (the internal and the universal Self) in Valett, is the equivalent of the biological-psychological organism. Valett contends that the affective aspects of man motivate and direct human behaviour and life. In all cases, the human self is identified with (or includes) the affective aspects of man. Therefore, the self(-concept or self-functions) and the affective aspects are not distinguished from each other (3.2.5.2, 3.3.5.2, 3.4.5.2, 3.5.5.2).

3.6.3 The wholeness of man

Human structure is composed of roughly two (the cognitive and the affective) (Combs, Weinstein and Brown) or three (the psychomotor, the cognitive and the affective) aspects (Valett). The affective domain includes the percipient, affective, aesthetic, social, moral and pistical aspects and all the self-functions. Though a so-called well-integrated personality in Neo-Humanistic Education has almost all the aspects of man, most of these aspects are often reduced to the affective. The affective aspects play the leading and integrating part in being human. They motivate and determine human perception, learning, behavior and life. They make human life and activities meaningful. The logical is sometimes contradictory to the affective, though the integration of the two is stressed (e.g. 3.2.5.3). The logical is not significantly dealt with in learning. The biological is less emphasized in comparison with the previous chapter (2.6.3). Consequently, Neo-Humanistic educational philosophy is characterized by the overemphasis of the affective domain. The affective domain, as a matter of fact, is the most important integrating principle that Neo-Humanistic educationists want to suggest in personality, education and life (3.2.5.3, 3.3.5.2, 3.4.5.3, 3.4.5.3, 3.5.5.3).

3.6.4 Educational efforts for human integration

Neo-Humanistic education is an educational attempt at human integration. The four theorists develop their own strategies for the process of human integration. They want to interweave harmoniously the above-mentioned two or three aspects in an educational context. However, they concentrate all their efforts on the affective aspects, because they believe that the affective domain is the integrating principle. Neo-Humanistic educational efforts aim to incorporate emotional components into conventional learning and to develop affective curricula or programs positively. Affective aspects are intended to play a vital and crucial role in all school activities.

The objectives of Neo-Humanistic education are focused upon self-concerns, self-awareness, self-concept, personal meaning and affective functions. Humanistic educational objectives can be achieved by affective educational procedures and techniques. Therefore, Neo-Humanistic education is called affective education. Three Neo-Humanistic educational theorists (Combs, Brown and Valett) except Weinstein, fail actually to develop clarified paradigms or models for human integration (3.2.5.4, 3.3.5.4, 3.4.5.4, 3.5.5.4).

In conclusion, the principles and efforts of human integration in Neo-Humanistic education have been analysed and identified thus far. Only one principle of human integration (the affective domain) was conspicuously emphasized in Neo-Humanistic Education. However, religion as an integrating principle was hidden, and the self was reduced to the biological-psychological organism or the affective aspect of man. The number of human aspects and their relationships were not developed adequately. Therefore, in order to reveal the whole and balanced concept of human integration, the next chapter will deal with the concept of being human and the principles of human integration from a reformational Christian perspective.

4 TRUE HUMAN INTEGRATION ACCORDING TO A REFORMATIONAL VIEW OF MAN

4.1 Introduction

A few important anthropological topics of Neo-Humanistic education (the concept of being human, the explanations of human integration and the educational efforts to effect human integration) have been identified in the previous chapters (2 and 3). Now, in order that the Neo-Humanistic view of human integration can be discussed more fully and can be evaluated more sophisticatedly, an attempt to describe a Christian (Reformational) anthropological view of man, which reveals principles of true human wholeness (or integration), will be done in this chapter.

The Reformational view of man developed in this chapter is based, *inter alia*, on the philosophy of the Cosmonomic Idea that has been developed by Herman Dooyeweerd, his colleagues, adherents and sympathetic critics. The pivotal Dutch term *wetsidee* of this philosophy (Idea of the law), refers to the transcendental ground-idea of the philosopher in question (Dooyeweerd, 1984a:93; Spier, 1979:23-24). The term "law" refers to the Divine ordinances, wills, orders and norms under which God, as the Creator and Sovereign Ruler, has placed His entire cosmos (creation) (Spier, 1979:31; Van Dyk, 1972a:112; 1972b:177; Young, 1952:116). The philosophy of the Cosmonomic Idea is often equated with "Reformational (or Christian) philosophy", because the philosophers of the Cosmonomic Idea wish to follow the Protestant Reformers (especially Calvin) in desiring an ongoing reformation, a continuous re-formation on the basis of the Scriptures (Wolters, 1985:1; Van Dyk, 1972a:112). Generally speaking, a Reformational philosophy starts by distancing itself from any synthesis of Biblical principles and motives with

those derived from non-Christian philosophy. Obversely, Reformational philosophy tries to formulate purely Biblical-philosophical thought (Spier, 1979:25, 27).

Reformational philosophy belongs to the tradition of John Calvin and Abraham Kuyper (Geertsema, 1993:131-136; Van Dyk, 1972b:177). Dooyeweerd (1984a: 522; cf. Young, 1952:26) contends that a real reformation of philosophic thought historically proceeds from Calvin's point of departure. Though Calvin did not develop a system of philosophy, he tried to break with any synthesis between Christian and non-Christian principles, and cleared the way to a Biblical philosophy. He subjected all scientific thoughts to the absolute norm of Holy Scripture (Spier, 1979:27). Abraham Kuyper returned to Calvin's point of departure and developed many important foundational principles of the philosophy of the Cosmonomic Idea (e.g. the principle of sovereignty in one's own sphere) (Spier, 1979:28; Young, 1952:48, 67-69, 94-95, 98). Geertsema (1993:136) summarizes the understanding of the Biblical message of Calvin and Kuyper as follows: "the person and work of Christ concerns the whole of reality and the Word of God holds for all of life. Moreover, there is no realm of human existence that is not afflicted by the ravages of sin. The antithesis is therefore total. the religious antithesis is primarily and decisively redemptive: it is meant to liberate and to renew".

Christian (i.c. Reformational) philosophy as a school was founded in the twentieth century (from 1926 onwards) by Dooyeweerd (1894-1977), Vollenhoven (in Netherlands), and Stoker (in South Africa) (Dooyeweerd, 1984a: Foreword 7; 1980:197; Young, 1952:14; Wolters, 1985:1; Van Dyk, 1972a:111). Though the members of this school sought to develop a Christian philosophy on the basis of a Biblical view of the world in their own ways (Wolters, 1985:97), Dooyeweerd,

generally speaking, gave "more explicit formulation to the principle of the *Wetsidee* (the Cosmonomic Idea) and he devoted himself to working out its consequences (with Vollenhoven) systematically" (Young, 1952:96). Stoker criticized Dooyeweerd's view of the *Wetsidee* constructively and called attention to various points which required further investigation (Stoker, 1933; Dooyeweerd, 1984a: Foreword 7; 1984a:94; Young, 1952:96-97, 99, 107, 118, 130-132).

The philosophy of the Cosmonomic Idea can be regarded as the most significant development in Christian thinking since the Reformation (Van Dyk, 1972b:177). The contributions of the *Wetsidee* philosophers (with adherents and sympathetic critics) have come through theology, philosophy, education, other academic disciplines, and social actions arising from a desire to be obedient to the Scriptures in all areas of life and service (Wolters, 1985:1).

Dooyeweerd did not publish an anthropological work *per se*, even though he wrote manuscripts and chapters on philosophical anthropology. However, as Ouweneel (1986:434) points out, Dooyeweerd's anthropology "should have become the crown of his thinking" and Dooyeweerd included anthropological thoughts in nearly all his writings. From the beginning of the *Wetidee* school, philosophical anthropology has been one of its important subjects. Many Reformational philosophers have discussed anthropological problems in their own works. Moreover, from the late-1980s (more specifically since 1986) (cf. Stafleu, 1991:102, Ouweneel, 1986), anthropological discussions in Reformational circles have been more active in *Philosophia Reformata*. The journal focused on the anthropological problems of the *Wetsidee* in 1989 (54:1), and especially in 1993 (58:2).

The Reformational anthropology of *Wetsidee* philosophers deals with the essence, the origin, and the unity of man in a radical transcendental critique of theoretical thought. Reformational anthropology focuses upon the structure of man, not merely in his organic aspect and/or in his psychic aspect (psychology), but man as a total creature of God (Van Dyk, 1972b:180; Ouweneel, 1986:434). This anthropology can heal "fractured theories of humanity and gives ... not just a head full of split-hair concepts but horizons within which to think integratively" (Seerveld, 1988:29).

4.2 A Reformational view of man: Image of God

4.2.1 General

The questions: "Who is man?", "what is man?", or "what is his origin and his final destination?", contain "a mystery that cannot be explained by man himself" (Dooyeweerd, 1980:179, 195, 111). Even though man has worked out a number of views on the ontological structure of man by means of inner examination and theoretical knowledge (science), no answer to the questions has been satisfactory, thus the questions arise again and again (Berkouwer, 1981:20). Man appears to be "*homo absconditus*, hidden man" (Berkouwer, 1981:20).

Reformational philosophers believe that true knowledge of man only comes from the revelation of God. There are two reasons for this belief. Firstly, when a simple epistemological principle is applied to the possibility of self-knowledge, it is evident that man cannot know himself completely unless he can distinguish a knowable object outside himself. Man is both subject and object in the questions about himself. He cannot become a separated knowable object. The result is that man obtains a great amount of data about his own functions

which he can distinguish, as an object of his knowing, from his knowing self. However, the deepest self of man that cannot become an object to his knowing self, and thus always remains a mystery. True knowledge of man comes from the revelation of God, which deals with man as the object of God's knowing (Fowler:1987:39).

Secondly, man lost all true self-knowledge when he lost true knowledge of God at the Fall (Dooyeweerd, 1980:195). Self-knowledge of man comes from the heart. As a result of the Fall that affected the heart directly, man keeps on seeking for a pseudo-point of rest for his restless heart in the creation instead of seeking it in God. Man cannot get to true self-knowledge on the basis of his own intellectual insight, because true self-knowledge depends absolutely on true knowledge of God (Berkouwer, 1981:21-22; Van der Walt, 1978b:231-232, 234; Fowler, 1991:68; cf. Ouweneel, 1993:210). The knowledge of God is not to be found by man himself, but is given through the revelation of God to the reborn heart by the Holy Spirit (Strauss, 1990:44-45).

God's Word brings about a real reformation of the contemporary views of man, because it unveils the actual and true nature of the total man which conforms to reality (Dooyeweerd, 1980:195, 189; Berkouwer, 1981:21). The revelation of God is the most important source of knowledge about the nature of man, and gives special perspectives on human nature. It uncovers the religious root and centre of human nature in its creation, fall into sin and redemption by Jesus Christ (Duvenage, 1981:111; Dooyeweerd, 1980:195). Without the light of divine revelation, man can never obtain anything except a picture in which the unique nature of man does not appear (Berkouwer, 1981:21). Dooyeweerd (1980:111), therefore, avers that "outside of the central biblical revelation of creation, the fall into sin and redemption through

Jesus Christ, no real answer is to be found to this question (what or who is man?)".

A Reformational philosophical anthropology is defined as "an attempt to describe the nature of man properly, a description which can pass the test of the Word of God" (Van der Walt & Dekker, 1983:86). Reformational anthropology can be said to have *a priori* characteristics from the very beginning, because Reformational philosophers regard the revelation of God as the most important source of human nature. No anthropological view is free from religious, *a priori* presupposition (Schoeman, 1975:75; Dekker, 1985:95).

4.2.2 Image of God (from the perspective of the creation, fall and redemption of man)

4.2.2.1 The uniqueness of man: the image of God

Reformational philosophers decisively oppose all the Evolutionistic attempts to link man and animals (Strauss, 1990:26-40; Stafleu, 1991:103). The uniqueness of man in his fundamental nature and behaviors is of exceeding significance for Reformational philosophical study of man (Stoker, 1967: 98).

Man was created as a unique being by God. The uniqueness of man is characterized by the fact that he was created in the image of God (Fernhout, 1978:10). A law coming from God's specific creation became valid only for man and guaranteed the uniqueness of man. Accordingly, "man is man because as a creature (structure of individuality) he was created to be man, that is uniquely man" (Van Dyk, 1972b:180). "He is very unique in his capacity, acts, behaviours and destination" (Stoker, 1967:91).

Man was distinguished by God from the rest of creation by the fact that he is the image of God (Duvenage, 1981:129; Van der Walt, 1990:15; Fowler, 1981:6). Nowhere does Scripture state that anything in created reality or even an angel is the image of God, but uses this term only for man (Berkouwer, 1981:84,86). Man differs from all the other creatures such as matter, a plant, an animal and an angel or a demon (Stoker, 1967:91). Though he has physical, biological and psychological functions, he can not on this account be defined as an animal or a physical thing. Man can be qualified by none of his functions, because he is the image of God (Young, 1952:142-143).

Scripture constantly emphasizes the glory and honour of the image of God (Berkouwer, 1981:84). The creation account in Genesis culminates in the account of the creation of man (Berkouwer, 1981:84). Man reflects the everlasting power and deity of God (Taljaard, 1976:151). Man is of more value than plants or animals (Berkouwer, 1978:138). He is distinct in that he has a conception of self (Geertsema, 1993:147-148). A prominent characteristic of man contrasted with animals, however, is the normative act-structure (Geertsema, 1993:146-147). This means that man, in contradiction to an animal, has higher aspects (or structures) (nine aspects from the logical to the pistical) which are led by norms and principles (Van der Walt, 1983:44). Even other substructures of man, such as the physical-chemical, the biological and the psychological aspects, are dependent on and directed by the normative act-structure (Strauss, 1990:46).

All the bodily structures of man and his activities are concentrated on the heart which belongs to the central-religious dimension. This means that man as the image of God is a religious being, not some kind of superior animal. The most important characteristic of the uniqueness of man is his

religious dimension (God-relatedness) which sets him apart from other creatures (Strauss, 1990:46; Fowler, 1991:4; Kock, 1974:5). Man is made to walk before the face of his Maker in the fullness of his existence (Van Dyk, 1972b:180).

The unique human relation to God includes God's gracious Words and calling spoken to man (Fowler, 1991:6). Man is a unique being who was created to respond to God's calling (De Graaff, 1973:38; Geertsema, 1993:148-149). He was created as "the crown of the creation", and at the same time, he was to carry out the cultural mandate on the earth (Strauss, 1990:39). In the special position of administration, he is called to look after the whole creation to the glory of God (Duvenage, 1981:126). In relation to the cosmos, therefore, man is the religious-creational centre of the whole cosmos (Duvenage, 1981:111). Therefore, "to be human is to be very much more than an animal" (Fowler, 1991:9).

4.2.2.2 The meaning of the image of God (from the perspective of the creation of man)

Man was created in the image of God (Genesis 1:26-27, 5:1). The meaning of the image of God, however, is not easy to identify; these are "enigmatic words" (Van der Walt, 1982:64-65). In Christian, also in Reformational circles, as Taljaard (1976:154) has already pointed out, there has been no consensus of opinion about the meaning of the image of God, though many Christian theologians and philosophers have struggled with this issue.

The image of God has been long regarded as something ontic (analogous to God) in man such as the divine soul, a self-conscious reason, or a moral sense. Sometimes, the image of God was considered to be something virtuous (analogous to God

in a wide sense or in a narrow sense) that man possesses or carries (Stoker, 1967:87, 90-91; Berkouwer, 1978: 59-60). Calvin considered that the soul constituted the image of God and that man was called the image of God because man had something equal to God or that God "made Himself perceptible in the form of an image by means of engraved marks of likeness" (Van der Walt, 1978b:244, 245-246). Dooyeweerd also interpreted the image of God by means of the combination of the doctrine *analogia entis* with his monarchianistic system (Taljaard, 1976:154-155).

Dooyeweerd attempted to find the meaning of the image of God in the heart of man. The heart was considered to be analogous to God when he stated that "man was created in the image of God. Just as God is the absolute Origin of all that exists outside of Himself, so He created man as a being, in whom the entire diversity of aspects and faculties of the temporal world is concentrated within the religious center of his existence, which we call our I, and which the Holy Scripture calls our heart, in a pregnant religious sense" (Dooyeweerd, 1980:189). However, this kind of interpretation was increasingly criticized, because the Biblical texts (Gen. 1:26-27, 5:1) do not support this interpretation (Taljaard, 1976:155). Berkouwer (1981:60) holds that "if we try to find the image of God in such ontic qualities, and define the image in the wider sense in terms of such qualities, we soon are involved in speculations which have no support from Scripture". The search to locate the image of God somewhere inside man is to be basically on the wrong track, because the image of God cannot be found by looking inside man at some of his faculties (Fernhout, 1978:12). The image of God is not some particular quality of human existence or some component of the human person in the sense of the continuity of essence between God and man (Berkouwer, 1981:59-60; Fowler, 1981:6; Van der

Walt, 1990:14-15; 1978b:245; 1982:64-66; Duvenage, 1981:127; Spykman, 1985:37).

Some of the Reformational philosophers and educational theorists have, often and subconsciously, described man as the image-bearer of God, though they did not intend the expression to mean some ontic, or certain characteristics of man (for example, Stoker, 1967:98; Taljaard, 1976:151, 187; Olthuis, 1972:35; Fernhout, 1978:12, 16; Schoeman, 1975:74, 75; Van Brummelen, 1990:139, 150; 1972a:80). This expression (the image-bearer) is also criticized, because the use of such language, irrespective of the state of being man, assumes an ontic reality in man which makes him the image of God. The image is not an addendum or some additional attribute which man bears in some aspects of his life (Duvenage, 1981:126; Van der Walt, 1978b:246). Man can never lay down the image like an office-bearer or like a weapon-bearer (Van der Walt, 1990:14-15; 1978a:120-121; 1982:66; Duvenage, 1981:129; Kock, 1974:4; Spykman, 1985:37).

Instead, many Reformational theologians and philosophers concentrate their attention on man's special relationship with God which is implied in his being the image of God (Van der Walt, 1978a:120; 1982:65; Kock, 1974:4; Spykman, 1985:37). Berkouwer (1978:139) strongly emphasizes that no decisive explanation about the image of God may be given when man is abstracted from God. Scripture is always concerned with man in relationship to God, so that the theological and philosophical discussion of the image of God should reflect something of the seriousness of what Scripture means by the relatedness of man in his totality to God (Berkouwer, 1981:35, 59-60). Fowler (1981:5) describes the image of God as the God-relatedness of man. He states that "humanity exists only in relation to God. Just as an image has meaning only in relation to what it is imaging so being human has meaning only in relation to God. ...

the human person always and only exists as a creature in relation to God" (Fowler, 1981:6; cf. Schrotenboer, 1978:160). So the image of God appears in man when he stands in the correct relationship to God (Van der Walt, 1982:65).

Moreover, some Reformational philosophers maintain that the image of God as a special relationship between God and man should refer to "man's being a son of God" (Stoker, 1967:101-102), "the relationship between Father and son", "a child-Father relationship" or "a relationship between God and man" (Taljaard, 1976:153, 155; Van der Walt, 1978a:120-123; 1982:65-66; Duvenage, 1981:127-129). Taljaard (1976:153) states that the fact that man was created in the image of God means that "man was created as the son of God". However, Duvenage (1981:129) criticizes the meaning of "the image of God" as the Father-son relationship on the basis that only Christians, according to the New Testament, become children of God in Christ and only they enjoy the relationship. The dignity of the image of God, however, must apply not only to Christians but to all human beings.

Man is the image of God (i.e. there exists a special relationship between God and man), because he was created in the image of God (Van der Walt, 1978b: 245; Fowler, 1981:6; Duvenage, 1981:129; Spykman, 1985:38). The whole man is God's image (Stoker, 1967:102; Van der Walt, 1990:15; Fowler, 1981:6; Fernhout, 1978:13; Olthuis, 1985:2). The image of God, however, is not a static entity, but it implies man's dynamical interactive and developing (or maturing, renewable) relationship with God (Stoker, 1967:98; Spykman, 1985:37; Van der Walt, 1990:15; 1978a:122). In a well-developed relationship, certain qualities such as true knowledge, righteousness and holiness apparently show themselves (Van der Walt, 1978a:124). In other words, the image of God can be put into the following words: "to be human", "to be image of

God" (Fowler, 1991:5), or "imager" of God (Spykman, 1985:36; Van der Walt, 1990:16).

Man is the imager of God in whom God's image is creaturely embodied (Spykman, 1985:36). Man, as "God's representative" or "the visible (re)presentation and the reflection of His perfection", "represents", "reflects", "mirrors", "echoes", and "images" God (or Christ as the true image of God) (Spykman, 1985:37; Van der Walt, 1990:15; 1982:66; Berkouwer, 1978:139; 1981:54; Schrotenboer, 1978:151, 160). As the imager of God, man is to love God with all his abilities, talents, time, strength and means. He is to reflect His love, justice and holiness in all that he thinks or does. He is to love his fellow men. He is to obey and respond to God's commandments affirmatively. He is to answer to God's calling to fulfil the cultural task in the world. He is to be God's servant to do his duty as imager of God in the midst of his world (Stoker, 1967:102; Spykman, 1985:37, 39; Van der Walt, 1990:15; 1978a:120-121; Fernhout, 1978:12; Taljaard, 1976:155-159). In this sense, the image of God is a gift (indicative) and at the same time a task or duty (imperative or direction) (Van der Walt, 1978a:123; 1982:66; 1990:15, 83; Duvenage, 1981:126-129; Olthuis, 1993:170-172).

4.2.2.3 The meaning of the image of God (from the perspective of the fall and redemption of man)

The meaning of the image of God can never be explained properly without considering the unfolding drama of the creation, the fall and the redemption of man (Stoker, 1967:92-94, 111; Spykman, 1985:38; Van der Walt, 1990:83). The reason is that the relationship between God and man that is implied in the image of God, is inevitably determined by the state of the fall and the redemption.

After the Fall, the image of God was not lost, but was radically deformed (*deformitas*) (Stoker, 1967:93; Spykman, 1985:38). Since the image of God does not consist of ontic qualities, it is not proper to talk about the good remnants of the image of God at the Fall (Van der Walt, 1978a:130; Berkouwer, 1981:154). Man is still the image of God even at and after his Fall (Berkouwer, 1978:141; Van der Walt, 1978a:127). No substantial, structural or functional loss took place. There was, instead, a drastic change in religious direction (or orientation) of man at the Fall (Spier, 1979:129; Van der Walt, 1978a:127-128; Spykman, 1985:38, 76; Taljaard, 1976:159; Duvenage, 1981:132).

The root of human sin has turned man's heart against God (Spier, 1979:126-127). Sin is a negatively fixed attitude or a position, that man adopts in his heart toward God. Sin can, accordingly, be defined as man's denial of the relationship with God (Fowler, 1981:11). As the result of the Fall, man became a being in alienation from God (Fowler, 1987:3). The alienation affected man's whole existence in relationship to himself and his environment, because his relationship to God is the root of all his life (Berkouwer, 1981:128; Fowler, 1987:3-4, 187; Olthuis, 1993:170). Negatively, man takes up a position that puts him in conflict with God (Fowler, 1991:19-20). The nature of the relationship changes from one of love (faith, obedience) to one of hate (unbelief, disobedience) (Fowler, 1991:6; Van der Walt, 1978a:127-128). The apostate direction of the human heart goes toward "lawlessness" (Fowler, 1991:19, 21). Man rejects God's Word as the normative principle for his life. He no longer orientates his will toward the will of God (Fowler, 1987:3; Van der Walt, 1978a:130). Instead, he proclaims his own self-sufficiency and autonomy (Fowler, 1987:3; Seerveld, 1988:27). The image of God came to be idolatrously perverted, because man wanted to be like God instead of being the image of God (Van der Walt, 1978a:121;

1990:17; Fowler, 1991:6). Man's allegiance is completely changed from God to the Devil (or man's own self), so that man displays a deformed image and no longer the image of the true God (Van der Walt, 1978a:122).

At the Fall, the whole man, not only an aspect of man, fell into sin. Sin radically affected the whole man (Berkouwer, 1981:231; Van der Walt, 1978a:117, 127; Fowler, 1987:187; Olthuis, 1993:170). Sin lies in the very depths of our existence and influences every area of human life (Spier, 1979:125). Consequently, sin can never be localized (Van der Walt, 1978a:115; 1990:18). Man has suffered from all the effects of sin since the first Fall (Van der Walt, 1978a:116). He is perniciously clinging to evil, so that he is unwilling and unable to do any true good (Olthuis, 1993:170; Taljaard, 1976:160). Man is indeed totally corrupted (Berkouwer, 1981:184; Taljaard, 1976:159). Death only is the punishment for sin (Taljaard, 1976:160, 161).

The image of God, however, is restored in Christ. Jesus Christ came to rescue man from sin, the power of Satan and death so that man can be free to be fully the image of God again (Fowler, 1981:11; Taljaard, 1976:161). Christ removed the alienation of man from God by the reconciling act of His crucifixion. Christ paid completely for the sin of man on the cross (Taljaard, 1976:165). Redemption in Jesus Christ, accordingly, is "the ultimate and decisive antidote" (Wolters, 1985:49) to man's holistically distorted state.

Man becomes the re-imager (*reformitas*) of God through Christ's redemptive work (Spykman, 1985:38). This restoration does not refer to an ontic (structural) or quantitative renewal, but a religious directional change, that is, the restoration of man's relationship with God (Van der Walt, 1978a:127; Fowler, 1981:9; Spykman, 1985:39, 76; cf. Wolters,

1985:49). However, this restored relationship can be called "a new relationship with God" (Berkouwer, 1981:99), because this relationship is not only restored but also more developed. In Christ man comes, in a real and full sense, into the child-Father relationship with God (Berkouwer, 1981:104; cf. Van der Walt, 1978a:122). Man in Christ is restored to a positive relationship of loving acceptance with God, the heavenly Father (Taljaard, 1976:165). Moreover, this relationship will be permanent to the extent that even death cannot destroy it (Berkouwer, 1981:107; Taljaard, 1976:163-164).

The restoration of man's relationship with God influences man's other relationships: the relationship with himself, and the relationship with his earthly environment (Fowler, 1987: 5; Olthuis, 1993:170). In this sense, the redemption of Christ influences the whole man. In other words, the whole man, not only an aspect of man, is saved by Christ (Van der Walt, 1978a:117, 127; Fowler, 1981:9; 1987:187).

The image of God in redemption is clearly understood in connection with the witness regarding Jesus Christ, who is the image of the invisible God (Berkouwer, 1978:140; 1981:107). Christ is "the perfect and ultimate revelation of the redeemed and redeeming image of God. As the God-man (or the Son of God) He exemplifies all the imaging God was ever meant to be" (Spykman, 1985:40; cf. Fernhout, 1978:21, 32; Stafleu, 1991:121-122). It is clear in the New Testament that God is renewing man in His image through Christ. God regards man as His son (that is, Christ's brothers) in Christ, and leads man to be conformed to the image of the first born Son. The theme of conforming to the image of Christ is interwoven with the idea of growing to maturity in Christ (Fernhout, 1978:21-23, 27, 34). Conforming to the image of Jesus Christ, man is transformed more and more into the image of God by the Holy Spirit (Berkouwer, 1978:140; Olthuis, 1976:4; 1985:2). This is

called the doctrine of sanctification which is led by the Holy Spirit (cf. Van der Walt, 1978a:122; Duvenage, 1981:132; Olthuis, 1972:36; 1993:170).

As a re-imager of God, man is called upon to represent God once again in this world (Berkouwer, 1978:139). He can again exhibit the image of God in his obedience to God's commandments (Taljaard, 1976:164, 166; Van der Walt, 1978a:122, 128). He lives once again in the service of God and his neighbour in Christian discipleship (Berkouwer, 1978:141; Spykman, 1985:38). Man, as the child of God, "should live a committed life, a (new) life committed to the service of God, a life of worship. All his activities should be seen as worship, and in this, the gift of God, the Holy Spirit" (Taljaard, 1976:168; cf. Berkouwer, 1981:99).

4.2.3 Image of God in three relationships

4.2.3.1 General

The description of the creation of man, as the image of God, in Genesis 1:26-31, includes three relationships of man. The image of God cannot be understood properly without total consideration of this Scriptural context (Duvenage, 1981:110-111). The three relations are namely (1) man's relationship with God (or idols), (2) man's relationship with fellow man/woman, and (3) man's relationship with the world (Van der Walt, 1983:40; Van der Walt & Dekker, 1983:77).

4.2.3.2 A religious being: man's relationship with God

Man can never be understood apart from God, as the discussion of the meaning of the image of God has already

revealed in the previous section (4.2.2). Scripture is always concerned with man in relationship to God (Berkouwer, 1981:59-60, 195, 349; Stoker, 1967:100). So man's relationship with God is regarded as something "essential" or "constitutive" for man's nature (or for being man) (Berkouwer, 1978:138; 1981:23; Stoker, 1967:96-97, 103; Olthuis, 1978:184; De Graaff, 1980:4). Man's being without God, accordingly, is "the ontological impossibility of man's nature" (Berkouwer, 1981:92). When man is considered to be isolated from God, he loses his humanity (Stoker, 1967:112; cf. De Graaff & Olthuis, 1978:1; Olthuis, 1978:184; 1985:1). Therefore, "being human means being with God" (Dekker, 1985:142)

Man's relationship with God is not an added minor constitution to being human nor the most important of the relationships of human life. Instead, his humanness itself depends on this relationship (Berkouwer, 1981:195). This relationship is at the core of human life. It defines the human being and existence. It determines all other relationships, all human functions and activities (Taljaard, 1976:169). It is "the central directing relationship in relation to which alone all others have meaning" (Fowler, 1981:7). This relationship, in other words, is "decisive", "radical", "total" and "integrative" for the whole being of man (Berkouwer, 1981:32; Fowler, 1987:1; Dekker, 1985:142). So human personality does not exist by itself without this relationship, because man always and only exists in relation to God (Fowler, 1981:6; 1987:1-2; Van Belle, 1977:82). It is only in this relationship that man can reveal his riches and glory (Berkouwer, 1981:114). In this sense, this religious dependent relationship gives "a correct (philosophical) insight in(to) the essence and functioning of man's being" (Ouweneel, 1986:439).

Man is related to God in his totality, because his relationship to God encompasses his whole existence (Berkouwer, 1978:138;

Taljaard, 1976:168; Van der Walt, 1990:5-6; De Graaff, 1980:4). At no time is man neutral or isolated from this relationship. No area of human life can be isolated from this (Berkouwer, 1981:32; Fowler, 1981:6-7). In this sense, Fowler (1981:7) states that "loving God is not merely the most important love of our life. It is the love without which there is no other love. Serving God is not merely the service that should have first call on our time. All we do is ... serving God". Therefore, according to Berkouwer (1978:138), Scripture described man in relation to God as "the man of God", and Reformational philosophers express man as "man in *coram Deo* (in the presence of God)" (cf. Seerveld, 1988:17). Man is ultimately a religious being (Berkouwer, 1981:195; Schoeman, 1985:103). In the words of Taljaard (1976:169), "the all-embracing characteristic of man is that he is a religious being".

In the fall and redemption of man, two religious relationships which are absolutely antithetical to each other may direct human life in relation to God (Fowler, 1987:187). One is wholehearted love for God in a believing response to God's Word (the realm of God's kingdom; positive relationship to God; obedience to God). The other is devotion to a creaturely principle that is substituted for God (the realm of sin and rebellion against God; negative relationship to God; disobedience to God) (Taljaard, 1976:154; Fowler, 1980:26; 1987:186-187; Van der Walt, 1990:83; 1978a:108; De Graaff, 1973:37; Olthuis, 1985:2; Seerveld, 1988:18).

In man's relationship to God, God is the Creator, Redeemer and Speaker. Man is, accordingly, the man of God: his whole existence belongs to God. Man is completely dependent on Him and is also God-directed (Stoker, 1967:86, 96; Van der Walt, 1990:9; Schoeman, 1985:102; 1988:156; Kock, 1974:4). "As a religious being (unity)" (De Graaff, 1973:37-38; 1980:3-4) and "as a responsibly answering being" (Geertsema, 1993:148),

he answers to God (and His norms) from his heart, the religious center of his existence (cf. Schoeman, 1988:158-159; Van Brummelen, 1972:80). Consequently, he should serve and glorify God in love. Since he exists in a covenantal relationship with God, he should live in true obedience to His gracious, covenant Words (Van der Walt, 1978a:120-121; Spykman, 1985:37; Fowler, 1991:6; Olthuis, 1976:2). He should love his neighbours according to God's commandments (the religious law of love) (Taljaard, 1976:156, 168-169). He should serve God in love by cultivating his earthly creation according to the calling of God (Fowler, 1987:1). In other words, he should live "a committed life, a life committed to the service of God, a life of worship" in all his activities in accordance with God's Word (Taljaard, 1976:169; cf. Fernhout, 1978:26; Van Brummelen, 1990:139).

4.2.3.3 A being-in-relation with neighbours: man's relationship with fellowman/-woman

Though Olthuis (1976), Fowler (1981) and Van der Walt (1990) extend their interest in man's relationship with fellowman/-woman to concrete matters such as sexuality, marriage, family, friendship and context (e.g. Africa), it is true that relatively little attention has been paid to this relationship (with fellowman/-woman) in comparison with the relationship with God in the recent discussion of Reformational anthropology (Stafleu, 1991:102).

Man's relationship with God is at the very centre of his life and binds inseparably man's relationship with his fellowman/-woman (Fowler, 1981:11; cf. Van der Walt, 1990:48). The nature of his relationship with God, naturally, reveals the nature of his fellowman/-woman relationships. A healthy

relationship with God enriches the relationships with his fellow humans (Fowler, 1981:13).

Man was created with both individual (subjective) identity and communal identity (universality) (Taljaard, 1976:171; Fowler, 1990:109). The individuality and communality of man are not fundamentally opposed to each other, but they are two sides of the differentiated unity of humanity. These two aspects affirm, complement and fulfil each other. In so doing this, injustice to one side distorts the other and destroys the whole. When either side is denied, human life is impoverished. No side of the two must be reduced to the other (Olthuis, 1993:161; Fowler, 1981:12; 1991:12).

God created all mankind, even Eve, from Adam. So "all mankind is of the same blood: onebloodedness of all mankind" (Taljaard, 1976:172). God redeemed man in this relationship. In the restored community (kingdom of God), man is as closely related as the various parts of the human body are related to one another (Fowler, 1981:12).

Humanity is "co-humanity" or "a unity" (Olthuis, 1985:2, 4; 1976:3; cf. Dekker, 1985:143). "To be human is be(coming) co-human" (Olthuis, 1993:160). "Humanity means relationships" (Fowler, 1981:11), because man is created for communal life and he exists only in a community (Fowler, 1981:12; 1991:10, 11). All men and women together form the corporate whole humanity, so that all men/women are "all associates" (Olthuis, 1976:3; 1985:4), and they "belong to one another" (Fowler, 1981:11-12; 1991:11). Man's relationship with his fellowman/-woman is so "essential" or "constitutive" for the nature of man that man cannot exist without the relationship (Olthuis, 1993:160; Fowler, 1981:11; cf. Berkouwer, 1978:139; Duvenage, 1981:133; Kotze, 1971:97). As Seerveld (1988:59, 62) mentions, "humans have a specially bonded, poignantly

intimate connection: humans are inescapably neighborhooded".
"Neighborhoodedness (*Mitsein*) is given with human nature".

To deny these relationships with fellowman/-woman is to deny man's humanity (Fowler, 1981:12, 14). Man cannot be fully human without this relationship (Van der Walt, 1990:48; Olthuis, 1976:3). When this relationship fails to be affirmed and is restricted, it results in restricting the potential for the development of man's humanity (Fowler, 1981:18). Loss of the experience of community causes "a serious impoverishing deprivation" in human life (Fowler, 1991:11, 12). So it is right to state that man cannot be understood without considering this relationship (Duvenage, 1981:111).

There are different kinds of human relationships, for example, marriage, family, school, church and state. The Reformational principle of these relationships provides no basis for developing a hierarchy of relationships. Each of them has its own distinctive structure and authority within the limits of its own relationship (sovereignty in its own sphere), so that none of them can ever be an exclusive life-encompassing relationship (Fowler, 1981:15, 17; Van der Walt, 1978a:139). All the relationships, at the same time, are intertwined in a relationship of interaction (Van der Walt, 1978a:140). Therefore, the diversity of relationships, the limitations of each kind of relationship and the interaction of the relationships must be considered (Fowler, 1981:18), and all the relationships should be subject to the "ordering" and "governing" Word of God (Fowler, 1991:12).

The Word that God gives man in relation to his fellowman/-woman is the commandment of love: "Thou shall love thy neighbour as thyself" (Matthew 22:39, KJV). According to Scripture, all human beings without exception become neighbours, and they become brothers and sisters in Jesus

Christ (Seerveld, 1988:62-64; Fowler, 1981:15). Man's humanity can be affirmed and fulfilled when each member of the community relates to every other member with the love of God (Fowler, 1987:2; 1981:13). Love means "a relationship of acceptance in self-giving", "a relationship with an unbreakable bond" (Fowler, 1981:11, 14), "faithfulness" (Fowler, 1981:13), "respect" (Seerveld, 1988:62), "troth" (Olthuis, 1976:20-21), "lending assistance (*bystandverlening*)" (Kotzé, 1971:97).

However, this commandment of love for fellowman/-woman does not relate to every relationship in the same way. It is "fulfilled in a variety of relationships each of which has its own distinctive structure" (Fowler, 1981:15, 18). For example, in the relationship between male and female, humanity is "bi-humanity" (Fowler, 1981:6), "bi-unity" (Olthuis, 1976:4, 6; 1985:4; 1993:161) or "dual-sided" (Van der Walt, 1990:14, 15, 77), because male and female are two complementary kinds of humanity which together constitute humanity (Fowler, 1981:25, 26, 28; Olthuis, 1976:5; 1993:161, 162, 164). The commandment of love in marriage is expressed as "troth", which refers to exclusive, lifelong partnership of love (Olthuis, 1976:20). Their sexuality should reveal the "troth relationship" of permanent commitment (Fowler, 1981:35).

Man's relationship with fellowman/-woman means "partnership" to serve the Lord (Olthuis, 1976:3, 19), because all human beings as images of God are servants of the Lord. "Humankind is one in its calling to serve God" (Olthuis, 1976:4). To serve and glorify God is His intention for humanity (Olthuis, 1976:16).

4.2.3.4 A being fulfilling the calling of God: man's relationship with the world

Man's relationship with the world is also essential and basic, without which man cannot be understood properly (Duvenage, 1981:111; Fowler, 1981:20). The first man was created "from the dust of the ground" by God (Gen. 2:7). Man obtains life-sustaining food from the ground. After the Fall, he is destined to return to the ground (Gen. 3:19). In other words, he was created in a dynamically integrated cosmic web of living and non-living creatures. Man is part of the cosmic whole, in which all the creatures of the world exist in interdependence with one another. He is made up of chemical, organic and psychic aspects in his sub-systems. He lives within the delicate and complex processes of nature. Therefore, man is by nature a being "totally, fully and enduringly related to all of creation" (Olthuis, 1993:156-157). As Olthuis (1993:158) states, "we are fundamentally in a position of mutuality and interdependence with nature. We are of the earth, creatures among creatures".

Worldliness belongs to the nature of humanity. Being human is being worldliness or "be(com)ing-related-in-the-world" (Fowler, 1981:18-19; Olthuis, 1993:157). To deny our worldliness is to deny our humanity. So man's escape from the world is impossible as well as not defended by Scripture (Fowler, 1981:18). Man is destined to exist and find his blessedness, fulfilment and life in relation to this earthly creation. He is also destined to find the purpose of his existence in working with this world. Therefore, "the whole earthly creation and humanity remain inseparably bound together" (Fowler, 1981:19-20; cf. Dekker, 1985:146).

Man is not a trivial part of the cosmos (cf. Stafleu, 1991:123-124). He was created as "the crown of creation" (Taljaard,

1976:152), so that he has a unique status and role to play in the cosmos (Stoker, 1967:102; Van Dyk, 1972a:103). He was created and appointed to rule and subdue the earth as God's steward. So man's enslavement to the world is not defended by Scripture (Fowler, 1981:18). The nature of the image of God, in this sense, can be described in terms of the calling of God (duty or task) which should be fulfilled (Stoker, 1967:104; Berkouwer, 1981:54; Stafleu, 1991:121-122; cf. Van der Walt, 1990:2-3, 82-83; 1978a:123; Duvenage, 1981:126; De Graaff, 1973:38; Dekker, 1985:117). Man is a being fulfilling the calling of God. He is a *mandator Dei* who has a special task or calling in relationship with the world (Stoker, 1967:111; Strauss, 1990:39; Fernhout, 1978:13). According to Scripture, It is "man's goal and destiny" on earth that he rules and cares for the earth (Taljaard, 1976:152; Olthuis, 1993:158). His life can be fulfilled only by carrying out this task (Fowler, 1981:19).

The Biblical concept of stewardship was derived from *oikonomos* (steward) which literally means the person in charge of a household. The word is sometimes translated into a manager, vicar, custodian or representative. Man, as a steward, is not the owner of the creation who has the right to do with it as he pleases, but the servant of God who has a delegated authority. Accordingly, the status involves responsibility to the Giver of the authority. The role of the status (office) is service (Van der Walt, 1990:15, 22-23, 55; 1978a:137-139; Spykman, 1985:41-42). Van der Walt (1990:23), in a word, states that "to be human means to be involved in a responsible way in God's world!". Man is a responsible being with a commission to rule and subdue the creation according to the Word of God (Fowler, 1987:120; Dekker, 1985:124).

Man "as a co-partner, co-worker and co-creator with God" (Olthuis, 1993:158, 171; Fowler, 1991:48; Dekker, 1985:124) rules and shapes God's creation actively. Man creates culture (Stoker, 1967:102). So man is called to have a cultural calling and task (*kulturele mandaathouer*) (Strauss, 1990:39). He has God's calling in all his cultural activities (Van der Walt, 1978a:141-142; Duvenage, 1981:140-145, 159; Dekker, 1985:121, 148, 151). His calling (task) on this world extends to the comprehensive kingdom of God (Van der Walt, 1990: 82-83; Duvenage, 1981:132; Dekker, 1985:127). The calling of God is heard through all the activities of man in the world.

As a faithful steward, man should not exploit (or neglect) God's creation for his own self-gratification, but preserve (or cultivate) it with the greatest care for God's glory (Fowler, 1990:85; Van der Walt, 1978a:141; Van Brummelen, 1972a:83). He should develop and optimize the gifts (ability and talents) with which God endowed him (Duvenage, 1981:161). In a communal context, man should exercise his authority of the office responsibly and effectively (considering its limitation) (Fowler, 1991:14-15). He should recognize that every man has a universal calling as a steward in creation; each, however, has been equipped in a variety of ways for the task (Fowler, 1987:16; 1991:12; cf. Spykman, 1985:39). God's intention is that humanity should be a neighborly unity of creation-caring persons in the service of God (Olthuis, 1985:3). Humanity as a whole should create a true culture of the kingdom of God in accordance to the Word of God. "We are free to serve God in the fullness of our worldly existence" (Fowler, 1981:19).

These above-mentioned three relationships are not only the context of the creation of man, but also the context of man's life. Man cannot escape these relationships (Kock, 1974:3-4). So man is called a being who lives through relationships

(Dekker, 1985:140). Each relationship reveals a facet of imaging God, and is internally united with the other two relationships (Stoker, 1967:105). Thus Fowler (1987:3) states that "the three relationships converge in the integrity of our humanity as the created image of God". And Spykman (1985:37) states: "it (the image of God) speaks of a living set of relationships".

However, the first relationship (man's relationship with God) is the most fundamental, and forms the basis for all other relationships. It governs the other two (Van der Walt, 1983:40, 43; Dekker, 1985:99, 141). As a result, all the relationships form a coherence (or integration) in harmony with the relationship with God as the central, governing relationship of the three (Fowler, 1987:2, 7). Man exists in a radically and totally integrated relationship to God (Van der Walt & Dekker, 1983:77).

4.2.4 A holistic being

4.2.4.1 General: traditional dualistic concept of man

Christian churches in history have in many cases traditionally accepted the dichotomistic (or dualistic) concept of man as a composition of the body and the rational soul. In the dualistic concept of man, the soul is regarded as something divine (transcendent, supratemporal and immortal), while the body is regarded as something material (cosmic, temporal and mortal). The soul is the higher (glorious) part. The body, however, is the lower, so that it is often held in contempt (Van der Walt, 1978b:240; Berkouwer, 1978:140; Fowler, 1981:1).

This dualistic concept of man was derived from a synthesis of Christian tenets with a Greek philosophical framework

(especially, that of Plato and Aristotle), and thrive in Gnosticism. It was retained and developed in Scholasticism (Thomas Aquinas) (Duvenage, 1981:146; Berkouwer, 1978:140; Schoeman, 1975:77). The dualistic effect was so tenacious that Reformational theologians like Calvin could not succeed in cutting it off completely (cf. Van der Walt, 1978b:229-252). According to Van der Walt (1978b:240, 245, 251), Calvin, on the basis of a dualistic ontology, still clearly differentiated the soul from the body, and regarded the soul as the divine part of man.

The dualistic framework in anthropology left its traces in some Reformational philosophers' concepts of man. Dooyeweerd (1984a:44; Spier, 1979:259; cf. Berkouwer, 1981:212-213; Blosser, 1993:194-195) however criticized the dualistic concept of man as an unbiblical interpretation. On the other hand, many Reformational philosophers criticize Dooyeweerd's concept of the heart (e.g. its supratemporality) and his dichotomistic distinction between heart and body, on the basis that the concepts imply a new dualistic framework (temporal/supratemporal, and separated in two parts) (cf. Blosser, 1993:204-209; Taljaard, 1976:180-182; Duvenage, 1981:154; Troost, 1989:82). Ouweneel (1993:218-219; 1989b:108), in defending Dooyeweerd, argues that this criticism is based on a misunderstanding of Dooyeweerd's concept of man. Ouweneel contends that Dooyeweerd's concepts of man should not be interpreted in dualistic fashion because Dooyeweerd totally rejected any anthropological dualism. At any rate, Dooyeweerd has often been accused that he did not completely get rid of "a certain degree of dualism" (e.g. Van der Walt, 1978a:118; Blosser, 1993:194-209). According to Van der Walt (1978a:119), Taljaard was also haunted by "the age-old pseudo-problem of soul and body" (dualism) in his concepts of immortality of the soul and the dualistic distinction between soul and body at death.

According to Scripture, man is not a combination of two different parts (soul and body) but an indivisible complex unity (Van der Walt, 1978b:238). Scripture does not present a dualistic view of man (Ridderbos, 1978:55; Fowler, 1991:4; Hoff, 1978:81). It radically excludes any idea of an anthropological dualism or of an ontic structure of higher and lower (Berkouwer, 1981:206; Olthuis, 1985:3). The fact that man is described in terms of body and soul in Scripture does not necessarily imply that man is composed of two distinct components, because Scripture repeatedly identifies soul with body, instead of regarding soul as a separate entity from body (Fowler, 1981:3; Hoff, 1978:117). Therefore, "any dualism is extremely unbiblical. There is no dualism between body and soul" (Von Meyenfeldt, 1978:74).

Reformational anthropology radically excludes every kind of dualism in the temporal bodily existence of man (e.g. soul (heart)/body, spiritual/material, mental/physical, mind/body) (Berkouwer, 1978:140; Blosser, 1993:194-195; Hoff, 1978:81). Dualism in anthropology is a false presumption, because the complex being of man can only arbitrarily be divided into body and soul (Van der Walt, 1978a:105; Fowler, 1981:9; Schoeman, 1988:155). Consequently, any dualistic interpretation of man is "meaningless" (Fowler, 1981:9), "unwholesome" and "dangerous" (Van der Walt, 1978a:106). It causes "anthropological schizophrenia" (Van der Walt, 1978a:106). It is "not a harmful theoretical idea but has fatal consequences in practical life" (Van der Walt, 1978a:115).

4.2.4.2 Human wholeness: a Biblical concept

Reformational philosophers have emphasized the need for an integral or holistic view of man on the basis of Scriptural concepts of man (De Graaff & Olthuis, 1978:1; Berkouwer,

1981:75; Van der Walt, 1990: Preface 4; Spykman, 1985:45). They believe that man is thoroughly "a whole being" (Van der Walt, 1990:3), "a single, indivisible entity" (Fowler, 1981:5; 1991:10), who exists in a bodily mode of existence. Man is the image of God in his whole existence and life (Stoker, 1967:102; Berkouwer, 1978:138, 141; 1981:31). Scripture is always concerned with the whole man (in the actuality of his existence) in relation to God (Berkouwer, 1981: 200, 230; Van der Walt, 1990:6-7).

Many terms in Scriptures are used to describe man in an impressive diversity and often overlapping way. However, the diversity of the terms accentuates the wholeness and integration of man instead of losing sight of it, because the terms are related to the same basic reality of humanness (wholeness) (Berkouwer, 1981:200). Accordingly, terms (or concepts) such as soul, spirit, heart, flesh and body, denote the whole man in relationship to God from different angles or viewpoints like "different facets of the diamond and ... colors of the prism" (Van der Walt, 1978a:110; cf. De Graaff & Olthuis, 1978:1, 2; Ridderbos, 1978:55; Van der Walt, 1978a:108, 110, 111; 1990:6-7; Spykman, 1985:47). Each of these terms portrays a different dimension of the whole man in relationship to God. The wholeness of man, at the same time, is concentrated in each term (Olthuis, 1985:1-2; 1993:160). Therefore, man is either body, soul, spirit, or bodyspirit (spiritbody) (e.g. Berkouwer, 1981:94; Van der Walt, 1990:7; Olthuis, 1993:160).

A few important Scriptural concepts of man have been defined by Reformational theologians and philosophers. These are:

- 1) Man is body. "Body" refers to "man himself according to a certain mode of his existence", his "concrete mode of existence, co-extensive with man himself" (Ridderbos, 1978:55, 57). It describes the whole man in his temporal bodily existence, who

can experience his responsibility as an earthly, physical creature (Ridderbos, 1978:59). In other words, "body" is "the whole man looked at from the point of view of his/her concrete, creaturely, functional existence, from outside in; man as a tangible, visible creature" (Olthuis, 1985:2; 1993:160; cf. Van der Walt, 1990:6; Duvenage, 1981:153, 155). Therefore, man is holistically body.

2) Man is flesh. "Flesh" is sometimes used as the equivalent for "body", or is used synonymously in describing the whole man in his temporal bodily existence (Ridderbos, 1978:57, 58). "Flesh" often denotes the whole man as weak, fragile, perishable or sinful, in contrast to God (Van der Walt, 1978a:109-110; 1990:6). In other words, "flesh" denotes "the whole man looked at from his/her creaturely frailty and transitoriness; often mankind in sin judged by God" (Olthuis, 1985:2; cf. Duvenage, 1981:153).

3) Man is soul. "Soul" refers to "the natural (or earthly) life of man" subject to death and destruction (Ridderbos, 1978:63). It implies this-worldliness and man's perishable status. It is considered to be synonymous with blood. It denotes concrete, living, breathing and emotional whole personality (Von Meyenfeldt, 1978:73-74; Hoff, 1978:84, 88, 90, 96, 98, 101, 102, 107, 125; Van der Walt, 1978a:109, 113; Duvenage, 1981:152; 1990:6; Fowler, 1991:4). In other words, "soul" denotes "the whole man seen as vibrantly alive; dependent for life on God, vulnerable and capable of perishing; the whole person" (Olthuis, 1985:1). In Scripture, man is described as a living soul (Gen. 2:7). He is "every inch a soul; and soul is every inch a man" (Von Meyenfeldt, 1978:74; cf. Hoff, 1978:81; Fowler, 1981:3, 5)

4) Man is spirit. "Spirit" denotes "man in his natural, inner existence, approached from within" (Ridderbos, 1978:64). It

indicates "the inner, motivating (or directing) self bursting out in concrete life expression" (Ridderbos, 1978:55; cf. Olthuis, 1985:120) and the whole man looked at from the inside out (Olthuis, 1985:2; 1993:160; Van der Walt, 1990:6; Duvenage, 1981:152-153, 156). "Spirit" as a directing principle indicates the religious centre of man (Taljaard, 1976:184). A spiritual life refers to a normal life in the world in the service of God (Fowler, 1991:80). Therefore, "spirit is man himself, man himself is spirit" (Van der Walt, 1978a:109). Man is "totally spirit" (Olthuis, 1993:160).

5) Man is heart. "Heart" denotes "the fact that in our thoughts and actions we are motivated from 'within', from the center of our existence in response to God's Word" (Ridderbos, 1978:55, 62-62). It indicates the total orientation or direction of man, from which his full human existence is directed and formed (Berkouwer, 1981:203). So it is often used as the equivalent of the human self (Ridderbos, 1978:61, 63). "Heart" as "the central point (nucleus) of man" or "a concentration point of man" (Van der Walt, 1978a:111; cf. Duvenage, 1981:152), represents the whole man and his whole life. It has a predominantly religious significance in relationship to God (Berkouwer, 1981:202, 214; Von Meyenfeldt, 1978:70-71, 74; Van der Walt, 1990:6). Olthuis (1985:2) defines "heart" as "the whole man looked at from his/her dynamic, motivating inner self, 'blowing out' (breath, wind) into life expression; from the inside out; directed in the way of the Spirit of God or against him".

4.2.4.3 Human wholeness in multi-dimensional structures

Herman Dooyeweerd created a holistic view of man on the basis of a Christian cosmology (especially, his modal theory) (Ouweneel, 1993:210; Stafleu, 1991:102, 104). His theory of

modality (law-sphere, aspect or dimension) makes a contribution to elucidating the complexity (multi-dimensionality) of man (Van der Walt, 1978a:105). On the basis of the modal theory, man is often regarded as a modally determined being (*n modaalbepaalde wese*) (Van Wyk, 1974:2; Van der Walt & Dekker, 1983:81).

Dooyeweerd's original modal theory has been partly modified in name, number, order and meaning by his adherents and critics (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1984b: vol 1, part 1; Spier, 1979:35, 43, 66-104; Kalsbeek, 1975:100; Fowler, 1991:217; Ouweneel, 1986:435; Fowler, 1991:216, 221). On the basis of recent modified interpretations of Ouweneel (1986:435), Roper and Fowler (Fowler, 1991:217, 220-221), sixteen modalities (aspects) in creation can be identified: (1) the numerical mode (discrete quantity) (2) the spatial (continuous extension) (3) the kinematic (motion) (4) the physical (energy) (5) the biotic (vitality or life) (6) the percipient (sense perception) (7) the affective (emotional feeling) (8) the logical (correlation, distinctions) (9) the aesthetic (allusiveness or nuance) (10) the cultural (formative power) (11) the lingual (symbolic meaning) (12) the social (social intercourse) (13) the economic (management of limited resources) (14) the jural (retribution) (15) the ethical (love) (16) the pistical (faith, ultimate certitude).

These modalities of reality can be compared to different colours of light which are made when light passes through a prism (Van der Walt, 1978a:105). Modalities together form one unbreakable coherence (sphere universality) and no one modality can be reduced to another (sphere sovereignty) (Van Dyk, 1972b:177). So each aspect of reality has its own peculiar meaning and laws (Spier, 1979:46). Every aspect exists in coherence with others and points beyond itself toward the latter (Spier, 1979:20). All entities in the world function

in each of these modalities, either as a subject or as an object (however, man uniquely possesses subject functions in all modalities) (Ouweneel, 1986:435; Van Dyk, 1972b:179).

When this modal theory is applied to man, it is obvious that man engages in all sixteen modes of existence. The human body is a complicated whole of these modalities. The whole personality (or existence) of man consists of four structures of human functioning (Schoeman, 1980:89-90; 1975:78, 93-116; 1985:105-111; 1988:168-173, 211-243; cf. Fowler, 1991:223; Van der Walt, 1978a:112; Duvenage, 1981:154; Strauss, 1990:45-46; Van der Walt & Dekker, 1983:81-82):

- 1) The physico-chemical body structure: this structure includes the first four modes of human existence (the numerical, the spatial, the kinematic, the physical modalities).
- 2) The biotic body structure: this structure encompasses the organic life of man and belongs to the biotic aspect of reality. It is based on (and interlocked with) the physico-chemical body structure.
- 3) The psychical body structure: this structure refers to the percipient and the affective aspects of human life. It is based on (and interlocked with) the physico-chemical and the biotic body structures.
- 4) The normative (or act) structure: this structure includes nine normative modes of existence (the logical, aesthetic, cultural, lingual, social, economic, jural, ethical and pistical modalities). It is based on (and interlocked with) the foregoing three body structures (the physico-chemical, the biotic and the psychical). Man is unique, in the sense that he is characterized by this normative structure.

As the above list reveals, all the modalities are found in man (Taljaard, 1976:175). Each aspect of man is distinguished as a distinct and as an irreducible mode with its own law (Fowler, 1991:218, 223). All human modes of existence are equally

important. None of them should be overestimated or reduced (Stoker, 1967:104; Duvenage, 1981:148). Each of these structures and modalities of man can be studied separately in a scientific investigation (Stoker, 1967:110, 111; Fowler, 1991:223). As Dooyeweerd (1980:181) mentions, "man's experience presents itself only in a rich diversity of aspects". Man is "a multi-dimensional being" of complex and dynamic configuration of a variety of (bodily) functions (Van der Walt, 1990:11-12; 1978a:104; De Graaf, 1980:4-5).

Man, at the same time, partakes of the basic feature of modal coherence. The human body structure is the enkaptic whole structure of all human temporal functions, in which all the structures are interwoven in an inseparable coherence and in a typically human way (individuality). The four body structures (and modes within each structure) of man cannot be separated from one another, though they can be distinguished by their own functioning. One structure cannot operate in isolation from the others (Schoeman, 1980:89-90; 1975:77-78; cf. Spier, 1979:259; Fowler, 1991:218, 223-224; Olthuis, 1985:4-6; Van Dyk, 1972b:179-180; Dekker, 1985:159). All the modes of human existence are concentrated in the heart (selfhood) of man, the religious concentrating point (Schoeman, 1980:91; 1985:105; Van der Walt, 1990:11-12). Therefore, the human body structure, its temporal existence and activities reveal a wonderful wholeness concentrating on (or integrating in) the heart or flowing from the heart (Taljaard, 1976:177, 184-185).

Man is characterized by inseparable or indivisible complexity (wholeness) (Schoeman, 1980:87). The complexity should be called a "wholeness", because "a unit", "a unity" or "a totality" still implies the idea of a combination of parts or a mathematical concept (Taljaard, 1976:184; Van der Walt, 1978a:104, 125-126, 238). The body structures and modalities (aspects) are not substances or component parts of

man, but functional structures (the law-governed structures of man's functioning). "Human body is a human body in the complex interaction (wholeness) of the four structures under the special laws that God sets for human life" (Fowler, 1991:224; cf. De Graaff, 1980:4; Fowler, 1991: Preface 2). Man is a multi-dimensional whole and religious being, who is subject to and respond to God's norms for each dimension of existence.

4.2.4.4 Enkaptic wholeness (coherence) of individuality structure

God created individuals, that is, concrete things with their own typical nature (the theory of individuality) (Spier, 1979:164). Man was created to be man with his own individual structures (Van der walt & Dekker, 1983:79). So he "holds a unique position in the cosmos in that he alone possesses subject functions in all the modalities" (Ouweneel, 1993:211).

Man is not only an independent being with his own identity, but also an enkaptic wholeness of mutually irreducible identity-structures (Ouweneel, 1986:437). Dooyeweerd used the term "*enkapsis*". This term was originally coined by Heidenhein (a biologist), in order to indicate a state of intertwinement (interwoven-coherence) of two or many distinctive structures, in which all the structures still retain their own nature (Strauss, 1990:49 Footnote 3; Spier, 1979:185, 248).

According to the modal theory of Dooyeweerd, each modality of the human being has its own irreducible nuclear moment which guarantees its own internal sovereignty. At the same time, many modal moments are grouped around the nuclear moment within the structure of the modality. Some modal

moments point back to earlier modalities (retrociatory or analogical moments), and some modal moments point forward toward later modalities (anticipatory moments) (Spier, 1979:63; Dooyeweerd, 1984b:164). So "both the retrociatory and the anticipatory moments remain qualified by the nucleus of the modal meaning" (Dooyeweerd, 1984b:75). No meaning-nucleus exists in itself but represents itself in the inner coherence with the retrociatory and the anticipatory moments (Dooyeweerd, 1984b:163, 181). The modal meaning-functions of the anticipatory modalities are "guiding or directing meaning-functions" (Dooyeweerd, 1984b:184-185), which guide or direct other functions (therefore, the pistical modality functions as the leading one).

In this way, the retrociatory and anticipatory moments constitute an internal coherence of all the moments of the modalities (Spier, 1979:63-65), and this intra-modal coherence of the meaning-nucleus leads to the inter-modal coherence of all the modalities (Dooyeweerd, 1984b:163). No modality exists in isolation from others. Every modality contains moments which point toward all other modalities by means of retrociations and anticipations. Each function is indissolubly connected with all the other functions in its full integral coherence (sphere universality) (Spier, 1979:112; Dooyeweerd, 1984b:188; 1984a:176). According to Spier (1979:21), "all the aspects have been created together and are sustained by God in an unbreakable coherence".

This theory of modal intertwinement (*enkapsis*) is applied to the human body in Reformational anthropology. Ouweneel (1993:210) points out that for Dooyeweerd, "anthropology is the alpha and omega of cosmology". Stafleu (1991:102) states that "Dooyeweerd's theory of enkaptic structural interlacement should be one of the starting points of anthropology". The human body is a wholeness of four complicated structures (the

physico-chemical, the biotic, the psychological and the normative), in which each structure is enkaptically interwoven with the other three (4.2.4.3; cf. Spier, 1979:260, 264; Brummer, 1961:74; Fowler, 1991:223; Schoeman, 1975:78). The normative (act) structure is mostly anticipatory and leading, and is the qualifying structure of the enkaptic structural whole of the human body (Ouweneel, 1993:216, 217; Stafleu, 1991:120). However, the substructures (the first three structures) of man do not lose their own nature in the enkaptic wholeness (Strauss, 1990:49, Footnote 3). Each structure is indissolubly intertwined with the other three in an inseparable coherence (e.g. Ouweneel, 1993:216, 217; 1986:437; Berkouwer, 1981:256; Strauss, 1990:49). However, these structures are not component parts of which man is composed, because they are the law-governed structures of man's functioning. Man is a holistic being of complex interaction of the four structures "in a wonderful way" (Fowler, 1991:224; Van der Walt & Dekker, 1983:81).

4.3 Principles of true human integration

4.3.1 General

Four principles of human integration (wholeness) of Reformational anthropology, viz. religion, image of God, heart and a living soul (body), have been distinctively revealed in the section of this chapter (4.2).

4.3.2 Religion

The word "religion" is derived from the Latin "*re*" + "*ligare*" (to bind). It literally means "re-binding" ("*herbinding*" or "*terugbinding*"). Religion refers to the bond of the human

heart to God (Van der Walt & Dekker, 1983:2; Schoeman, 1985:103). Dooyeweerd (1984a:57) defined it as "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". Religion mainly indicates man's essential relationship and response to God and His Word (cf. Taljaard, 1976:153, 155; Van der Walt, 1978a:132; Duvenage, 1981:130; Schrotenboer, 1978:158; Berkouwer, 1978:138; Spykman, 1985:35; De Graaff, 1980:4). It refers to the total, central (or radical) and integral relationship to God (Van der Walt, 1990:12-13; Schoeman, 1980:7).

Religion, as man's fundamental relationship (and response) to God, encompasses the whole life of man, because it is expressed in all the activities of the human in this world. All human relationships (with fellowmen/-women, and the world), functions (aspects) and activities (inner, personal and communal) are parts of religious life and are religious in character. Nothing can be withdrawn from it. There is no zone of religious neutrality to retreat into (Spier, 1979:5, 17; Taljaard, 1976:169; Fowler, 1981:7, 9, 25; Olthuis, 1978:166). Religion is "the whole of man" (Ecclesiastes, 12:13). In other words, "life is religion" (Van der Walt, 1978a:132, 137; cf. Schrotenboer, 1978:158; Olthuis, 1978:165, 190; Seerveld, 1988:18; Kraay, 1980:8). "Life in its entirety is religion" (Olthuis & Zylstra, 1972:168; Schrotenboer, 1978:147; Spykman, 1985:35). Religion is total in human existence.

Religion cannot be identified with an aspect (dimension, function or quality) of human life. It cannot be reduced to the pistical (e.g. a set of beliefs and church creeds) or/and the moral aspect of man. So it cannot be measured on the basis of pistical activities. Religion is not a compartment or corner of human life, but the "heart", "core" or "root" of life (Fowler,

1991:7; 1980:24; 1987:186; 1981:9; Schrotenboer, 1978:159; De Graaff, 1980:4; Spykman, 1985:35; Ouweneel, 1989a:63-64; Duvenage, 1981:131). It is "the absolutely central sphere of human existence" (Dooyeweerd, 1984a:57), "the most fundamental and prominent one" (Taljaard, 1976:153) or "the essence of man" (Schoeman, 1985:103). Religion transcends (in the sense that it cannot be identified with (and defined by) any aspects of man) and involves all the modal aspects of man (Dooyeweerd, 1984a:57; Ouweneel, 1989a:63-64). It is so central (or radical) that it always makes man function religiously in all his aspects. In this sense, man is "distinguished by his religious character" (Fowler, 1980:24), and "to live as a human is to be religious" (Fowler, 1991:7). The concept of religion plays a central role in Reformational anthropology (Ouweneel, 1989a:63-64).

Religion is "the directing principle" (Fowler, 1981:7), "the central motivating power" (Van der Walt & Dekker, 1983:2), "the governing principle" or "the driving force" for all human existence and activities (Fowler, 1987:186). It directs and determines all human relationships, functions and activities (Taljaard, 1976:169; Fowler, 1987:187). It inspires the formation of norms and visions and ways of life (Fowler, 1987:33; Olthuis, 1978:164). It gives man's life meaning and order (Fowler, 1981:7, 9; Van der Walt, 1978a:107-108). In other words, religion is "the integrating principle" that ties all the aspects of human life together and directs all of life's experiences (Fowler, 1981:7-8; 1991:9; Olthuis, 1978:170; cf. Duvenage, 1981:159; Van Wyk, 1974:1).

Religion, as an integrating principle, directs all human life to the true God or to a supposed god (creature). Man directs himself toward God anastatically (*teosentries*) or apostatically (*kosmosentries*) (Van der Walt & Dekker, 1983:2; Schrotenboer, 1978:154-155; Van der Walt, 1978a:107, 135; Olthuis &

Zylstra, 1972:168; Ouweneel, 1989a:63-64). True integration of human personality can be found in true religion, in which man, in Christ, serves the only true God and obeys His Word in love (Van der Walt, 1990:12-13; Taljaard, 1976:155; Fowler, 1987:2-3, 6-7; Schrotenboer, 1978:160; Duvenage, 1981:130). Man can experience "wholeness, integration and satisfaction" in true religion only, where he is really free (Olthuis, 1978:185). However, false religion tends to shatter the integration of human personality in a thousand ways, because it denies the true Origin and continuously looks around to find (and absolutize) a pseudo-origin (a part or aspect of creation or human autonomy) (Fowler, 1981:8; cf. Schrotenboer, 1978:155).

4.3.3 Image of God

"Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, in our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move along the ground". So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them" (Gen. 1:26-27, NIV).

Man was created as a unique being by God. The uniqueness of man is guaranteed by the fact that he was created in the image of God. God distinguished man from other creatures in the order and purpose of creation. God created man as the image of God. As a result, man is subject to a unique structural law coming from God's specific creation. A prominent characteristic of man, contrasted with animals, is the normative act-structure (4.2.2.1).

The image of God implicates man's relationship with God which is the most important characteristic of the uniqueness of

man (Strauss, 1990:46). The meaning of the image of God is characterized mainly by man's relationship with God (4.2.2.2; Berkouwer, 1981:32-36; Fowler, 1981:6-8; Taljaard, 1976:169). This relationship is regarded as something constitutive for man's nature, so that man's humanness itself depends on this relationship. The relationship encompasses man's whole existence, and determines all human functions and activities. Man's relationship with God was defined as "religion" in the previous section (4.3.2). Man as the image of God, should live a committed life to the service of God in all his activities in accordance with His Word (4.2.3.2).

The image of God includes man's relationship with fellowman/-woman. Man was created with both an individual and communal identity. Communality belongs to the nature of man. Every man/woman belongs to others in a community. In this sense, humanity is called "co-humanity" (Olthuis, 1985:2). To deny these relationships with fellowman/-woman is to deny man's humanity (Fowler, 1981:12). Man's humanity can be affirmed and fulfilled when each member of the community relates to every other member with love in accordance with God's commandment. Man's relationship with fellowman/-woman means a partnership to serve the Lord, because all human beings are images of God who serve and glorify God (4.2.3.3).

The image of God also implicates man's relationship with the world. Man was created in a dynamically integrated cosmic web of living and non-living creatures. He is by nature a being totally related to all of creation (Olthuis, 1993:156-157). In the creation, God, created man as God's steward to rule over all the earth and all the creatures. Man should preserve and cultivate God's creation for His glory with the greatest care. In this sense, the nature of the image of God can be described in terms of the calling of God which should be fulfilled in this

world. This calling includes cultural tasks and tasks of the kingdom of God (4.2.3.4).

The image of God reveals an integration of the above-mentioned three relationships of man (with God, fellowman/-woman and the world). Man is a unique being who should serve God in three harmoniously integrated relationships. Therefore, the image of God is an integrating principle of man's relationships with God, fellowman/-woman and the world (Fowler, 1987:3). However, the first relationship (man's relationship with God) forms the basis for the other two relationships. Thus all the relationships form an integration in harmony with the first relationship (Fowler, 1987:2,7).

This notion of the image of God as an integrating principle should be considered from the perspective of the creation, fall and redemption (4.2.2.2, 4.2.2.3). There was a drastic change (apostate) in the religious direction of the image of God at the fall. Man's depths of existence and his all relationships fell into sin at the Fall. However, the image of God was restored in Christ. There is a religious directional change toward God (anastate) in all his relationships. The redemption of Christ restores the whole man and all his relationships. Therefore, true integration of the image of God can exist in the redemption of Christ (4.2.2.3).

4.3.4 Heart

"Heart", which is often used as the equivalent of the self(hood), ego or "I", is seen "the concentration point of man" (Van der Walt, 1978a:111), "the concentrating-point of our individual existence" (Dooyeweerd, 1984a:59; Spier, 1979:16), "the religious center of our existence (and experience)" (Dooyeweerd, 1980:32, 190; Ridderbos, 1978:55), or "the core

of our beings" (Van der Walt, 1990:13). It is also like "the eye of a hurricane", which is a place of concentrated energy (Schrotenboer, 1978:157; cf. Van der Walt, 1978a:135).

The heart is the starting-point of entire human life, "out of which are all the issues of life" (Proverbs 4:23 KJV; cf. Spykman, 1985:64; Von Meyenfeldt, 1978:69; Troost, 1989:82; Strauss, 1990:44; Van der Walt, 1983:43). It is "the center of awareness, intention and action" in all the multi-dimensional experiences of man (Olthuis, 1985:5). Vision of self, world and life is determined by the heart (religion) (Van der Walt, 1990:21). The heart motivates, directs and forms (in other words, leads and governs) the total life of man (Berkouwer, 1981:203; Ridderbos, 1978:62-63; Taljaard, 1976:183, 184). It is "the hidden player on the keyboard of man's functions" (Schrotenboer, 1978:159; cf. Dooyeweerd, 1980:194). "The heart is behind all man's doings" (Von Meyenfeldt, 1978:74). Man's whole life is an outflow from his heart, because all human actions start from the heart (Taljaard, 1976:181; Van der Walt, 1978a:111; Schoeman, 1975:80).

The heart, as "the concentrating-point of (all man's) functions" (Dooyeweerd, 1984a:5; cf. Blosser, 1993:203; Ouweneel, 1993:211) or "the unifying center of our life" (Spykman, 1985:46), integrates all the various functions and structures of man coherently. Accordingly, it both functions in all modal aspects of man and represents itself as a wholeness in the coherence of all the functions within all the modal aspects of man (Dooyeweerd, 1984a:4, 51, 174; cf. 1980:180, 181; Berkouwer, 1981:214; Schoeman, 1988:159). Since the heart relates to all the aspects of our experience and existence, Van der Walt (1990:13) states that man's life as a whole is centred (or concentrated) in the heart. In this sense, it represents the whole man and his whole life (Olthuis, 1985:2; Van der Walt, 1990:6; Von Meyenfeldt, 1978:70). The heart denotes the

whole man, "who is ... not addressed as a loose conglomeration of functions, but in his concentrated unity" (Berkouwer, 1981:202; cf. Olthuis, 1985:4; Ouweneel, 1993:218).

The heart, as "the religious center (or core) of existence" (Dooyeweerd, 1980:186, 187; 1984a:506), naturally has a religious significance. In other words, "religion is a matter of the heart" (Von Meyenfeldt, 1978:73). Man hears religious calling emanating from the heart (Van der Walt, 1990:13; Fowler, 1991:91). As Dooyeweerd (1980:189) mentions, the heart is "endowed with the innate religious impulse to concentrate his whole upon the service of love to God". Man hears the Word of God which He addresses to his heart, as the real centre of man (Dooyeweerd, 1980:187; Ridderbos, 1978:62; De Graaff, 1973:37). In response, man reacts from the heart to God and His Word positively or negatively (Schrotenboer, 1978:149, 154; Spykman, 1985:46; Van der Walt, 1978a:108; Strauss, 1990:45). "The human heart can never be neutral" (Spier, 1979:17). A religious direction antithetically (anastatically or apostatically) begins from the heart (Schoeman, 1980:7). A negative change of religious direction against God is sin (Van der Walt, 1990:19; Fowler, 1991:19-20). A change into an antithetical direction prevents man from achieving true wholeness (Dooyeweerd, 1980:37; Fowler, 1991:187). Sin shatters the true integration of the human personality and life. Unless the heart is turned back to God, man wanders restlessly in search of a place of rest (Fowler, 1991:211). However, the Holy Spirit opens man's heart, redirects it to God and encourages man to obey His Word again (Dooyeweerd, 1980:186; Ouweneel, 1993:211).

To summarize, the heart is the religious core of man in which all human life is integrated (or concentrated) (Fowler, 1991:7-8; Van der Walt, 1990:11-12; Blosser, 1993:194; Strauss, 1990:46). It is a fundamental integrating principle of man.

The integration of man can be enhanced by an active (educational) process of true religious commitment of the heart (Van der Walt & Dekker, 1983:9-10; Olthuis, 1993:166; cf. De Graaff, 1973:38).

4.3.5 A living soul (or a body): a holistic being

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen. 2:7 KJV).

God created man as a holistic being: a living soul (body). Many terms in Scripture (e.g. soul, spirit, heart, flesh and body) are used to describe man in an impressively diverse and often overlapping way. However, the diversity of the terms accentuates the wholeness and integration of man, because they are related to the same basic reality of human wholeness (Berkouwer, 1981:200). They denote a holistic man in relation to God from different viewpoints, so that each term portrays a different dimension of the holistic man in relation to God (4.2.4.2).

According to Scripture, man is not a combination of two different parts (soul and body) but an indivisible complex unity (Van der Walt, 1978b:238). Scripture often identifies soul with body (Hoff, 1978:117). It excludes any idea of an anthropological dualism or of an ontic structure of higher and lower (Berkouwer, 1981:206). On the basis of the Scriptural view of man, Reformational anthropology radically excludes every kind of dualism in the temporal bodily existence of man (Berkouwer, 1978:140; Hoff, 1978:81; 4.2.4.1).

Man as a holistic being is characterized by multi-dimensionality. He is a complicated wholeness engaging in all

sixteen modes of existence (from the numerical to the pistical modality). The whole personality of man consists of four structures of human functioning: the physico-chemical, biotic, psychical and normative (act) structure. Each aspect of man is distinguished as a distinct irreducible mode with its own law, and all the modes of existence are equally important. None of them, accordingly, should be overestimated or reduced to a certain aspect (4.2.4.3; Stoker, 1967:104).

At the same time, man as a holistic being is characterized by an enkaptic wholeness of mutually irreducible identity-structures (Ouweneel, 1986:437). Each function and structure of man is enkaptically interwoven with all the other functions and structures in an inseparable coherence (retroicipation and anticipation). The normative (act) structure is mostly anticipatory in the enkaptic structural whole of the human body. Man's whole being, in a wonderful way, is a complex interaction of the four structures (4.2.4.4, 4.2.4.3).

Consequently, the fact that man was created as a living soul reveals an integrating principle that guarantees human wholeness. This does not support any dualistic concepts of man or any overemphasis (or reduction) of a certain aspect. Instead, it firmly supports a harmonious integration of human personality. Man is a holistic being in his multi-dimensional enkaptic body structures.

4.4 Conclusion

In a Reformational view of man, man is always seen as the image of God. He is a unique being in co-existence with other creatures. In all his relationships and activities, he is an ultimately religious being in the presence of God, to Whom and to Whose Word he should respond. He is a holistic being with

multi-dimensional structures of temporal existence. The main principles of integration, according to a Reformational anthropology are religion, image of God, heart and a living soul (body). These principles, however, do not refer to four separable features of man, but refer to a holistic religious existence before God.

In this chapter, the main principles of true human integration were identified for further discussion of the efforts toward human integration in the Neo-Humanistic education. In the next chapter, the concept of human integration of Neo-Humanism will be critically discussed and evaluated on the basis of a Reformational view of man.

5 CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF THE EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE HUMAN INTEGRATION IN NEO-HUMANISTIC EDUCATION

5.1 Introduction

Human integration in both Neo-Humanistic Education (2 and 3) and a Reformational view of man (4), have been identified individually. In this chapter, I will discuss and evaluate critically the concept of human integration and some efforts for the integration in Neo-humanistic Education. This discussion and evaluation will be based on the perspective of the integrating principles of a Reformational anthropology which have been outlined in the previous chapter (4.3), viz. religion, image of God, heart (self) and a living soul.

5.2 Critical discussion of the notion of human integration

5.2.1 Religion

5.2.1.1 Brief summary: "religion" as integrating principle

Religion, which refers to the fundamental relationship to God or to a supposed god (idol), is the most important integrating principle of being human and of human life as a whole. Religion is the core of life, and encompasses the whole life of man. Religion, as a motivating principle, directs all human life toward God anastatically (theocentrically) or apostatically (anthropocentrically or cosmocentrically) (4.3.2).

5.2.1.2 Some characteristics of Neo-Humanism

Neo-Humanism in education has the following characteristics in terms of religion:

5.2.1.2.1 Man's origin is explained by optimistic Evolutionism. Man is the most developed biological(-psychological) organism or higher animal (2.6.1, 3.6.1). The uniqueness of man which comes from his own genetic history and diverse experiences, confirms the dignity and integrity of individuals (3.2.5.1). The evolutionistic presupposition of human origin in Neo-Humanism completely excludes the true God as the Creator of man from the discussion of human existence. Man is a being who came to existence by chance without his Creator. As a result, Neo-Humanism is atheistic.

5.2.1.2.2 Man is a self-sufficient being. He is inherently good and trustworthy. He has, by nature, a positive tendency toward self-actualization and unlimited sufficient potential for self-fulfilment, self-help, self-insight, self-learning, self-cure and self-change (2.4.5.1). The inner nature of man is the source of creativity, love, truth and knowledge about man and the world. Human nature knows the best way toward self-actualization. Man has godlike qualities or mysterious life energy (2.5.5.1, 3.5.5.1). He can save himself and solve his every problem (2.5.5.1, 3.2.5.1). Therefore, Neo-Humanism does not recognize human sin and depravity caused by the Fall, and denies the necessity of the redemption of man. Neo-Humanism, consequently, does not need the intervention of the Saviour in any human problem (cf. Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:47).

5.2.1.2.3 Man is a biological organism that is always seeking for satisfaction (or happiness) of its inner needs. The gratification of basic needs is closely correlated with psychological health, and their frustration often causes psychological illnesses and deficiency diseases. Full satisfaction of lower needs automatically leads man to seek for the gratification of higher ones. Thus human maturity is

regarded as a process of progressive gratification of basic needs toward self-actualization (2.5.3). The state of self-actualization gives man the full gratification of his basic needs (2.5.5.1, 3.2.5.1). Meaningful life and significant learning come from the gratification of man's inner affective domain (3.3.5.1). Self-happiness is the most desirable goal of life, even though complete happiness can be reached by transcendent-altruistic behaviour (3.5.5.1, 2.5.3). In Neo-Humanism, seeking for self-satisfaction (or happiness) is regarded as desirable for man. The most important goal of life is complete self-satisfaction, not self-sacrifice for the glory of God (Rom. 12:1).

5.2.1.2.4 Man should be completely free from all oppression, threat and strain caused by social influences, because they obstruct man's good disposition and capacity (2.2.6.1). These negative social influences are "every control of society as an organized system" (2.3.5.3), "negative values, beliefs and attitudes of the self-concept" (2.4.5.1), and "authoritarian and moral norms toward perfection" (3.4.5.1). In a positive sense, the freedom of man indicates free expression and the satisfaction of the inner nature (or needs) of man (2.3.5.1, 2.5.5.1, 2.3.5.3). The society supporting this freedom is a so-called "anarchistic community" (2.3.5.3). Therefore, something from outside man himself, that interferes, advises and warns against man's seeking and acting toward self-satisfaction, is considered to be negative by nature. Freedom from everything outside, is the most important precondition for self-expression and self-gratification in Neo-Humanism.

5.2.1.2.5 Man is an autonomous being. He does not accept the negative traditions, inhibitions and regulations incongruent with the impulses of his inner nature. He does not have to accept any moral norms toward perfection endowed from outside himself (3.4.5.1). Norms endowed from outside himself are often considered to be negative for a healthy

personality and self-actualization (3.6.1). The absolute norms that man should follow are the inner laws and needs of man. He obeys the motivation and tendency of his inner nature (3.3.5.1, 2.6.1, 2.5.5.1). He must establish himself and his life in accordance with his inner tendency and its demands. Education is considered to be an attempt to naturalize man according to his inborn spontaneous interest and impetus (2.3.5.1). As a result, man is characterized by creativity and spontaneity, not by conformity (3.2.5.1, 3.4.5.1). Since he has an irrefutable right to his life and all his activities, he makes his own choices through his spontaneous will, and plays his significant part voluntarily in his every activity (2.2.6.1, 2.4.5.1). Neo-Humanists abhor the conformists who obey any norms coming from outside themselves. Therefore, they do not want to recognize and to obey any norms bestowed on man by God. Neo-Humanism is characterized by radical atheistic autonomy.

5.2.1.2.6 The self-actualization (or self-realization) is the ultimate goal of human organism. It indicates "a biologically and psychologically fully-functioning organism" (2.4.5.1) or full development of the inner nature and potential of man. A self-actualized man makes full use of all his potential and mysterious life energy in accordance with his inner nature (3.4.5.1, 3.5.5.1). In other words, he is the actualization of his potential and inner good nature. Self-actualization is the ultimate goal of human life and maturity (2.5.5.1, 2.6). It is an important integrating principle that directs and concentrates man's whole life and all his activities (3.2.5.1).

In Neo-Humanism, a self-actualized person implies the deification of man. He is a deified person who has godlike qualities and takes part in the godlike world (e.g. Taoistic perception and experiences, and self-absorption into the Universe) (2.5.5.1, 3.5.5.1). Man sees himself as a god. Self-

actualization of man is good if it denotes fulfilment of his potential and talents bestowed by God, but it is evil if it denotes idealization (or deification) of man. In Neo-Humanism, the goal of life is not the achievement of the will of God for the kingdom of God, but self-actualization.

These above-mentioned characteristics definitely reveal the radical anthropocentrism of Neo-Humanism (cf. Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:46). Neo-Humanism completely excludes God, and man himself takes God's place. Man becomes an idol in terms of religion. Therefore, the religious direction of Neo-Humanism is apostate.

5.2.1.3 Additional critical discussion

5.2.1.3.1 Humanism is a religion (Sproul, 1986:63; Clouser, 1991:39; Fowler, 1987:193). Humanistic anthropology does not remain a mere theory (or model) designed with a set of experimental data. Humanistic theorists are radically committed to their religious presuppositions (De Graaff, 1973:36). Humanism obviously reveals an attempt at the deification of man, as revealed in the first seduction of the serpent: "you will be like God" (Gen. 3:5). Man (and human principle) is completely substituted for God (and His Word) (Fowler, 1987:189). As Schrottenboer (1978:148-149) states, "humanistic religion is centered around man and his strength ... (its) virtue is self-realization ... God (if His existence is recognized) becomes a symbol of man's own powers which he tries to realize in his life". Everything, except himself, is considered in terms of the extent to which it can serve himself. Humanism often results in producing egoism (Berkouwer, 1981:353-354; Vitz, 1977:37-49).

Neo-Humanism also underlies religion deeply (Evans, 1993:106). It is called a "cult of self-worship" (Vitz, 1977: Title). Neo-Humanism as an apostatic religion attempts the deification of man in the sense that it identifies man with God, or in the sense that it regards man as an independent, masterful, autonomous and autarkical being who is disconnected from God (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:46; Stoker, 1967:103-104). Neo-Humanism holds doctrines of human goodness, potential, self-sufficiency and self-actualization (cf. Van Brummelen, 1972a:70). It has a strong belief in the absolute self-sufficiency of human personality (freedom) (cf. Dooyeweerd, 1980:178-179).

Neo-Humanistic anthropology is basically incompatible with a Reformational view of man (De Graaff, 1973:39). The concept of human integration of Neo-Humanism is "an illusion" (Berkouwer, 1981:354), because "true integration denotes the integral development of man for his religious calling (of the anastatic direction) in life" (Fowler, 1980:57). A truly integrated personality and life is characterized by the religious service of God (not an idol). However, Neo-Humanism causes man's religious relationship with God to disintegrate. It goes toward a disintegrating direction in seeking for a deified illusion.

5.2.1.3.2 According to Neo-Humanism, man should be free to be himself, and free from all laws outside himself. This freedom is closely associated with the idea of personal autonomy. It denotes that man has the right to set rules and standards for his own life. It also implies that man has the ability to make decisions about his own life in accordance with his own law (Fowler, 1990:106; 1987:190-191; Schrotenboer, 1978:155; Olthuis, 1972:20; Schoeman, 1988:166). Autonomous human needs and perception play a most important normative role. Man is an "autonomous meaning-

maker" (Fowler, 1987:194; cf. Olthuis & Zylstra, 1972:170), who has the key to the meaning of life and the world.

All claim of human autonomy is rejected in Reformational anthropology. Man cannot be the measure of things. Man and the world are subject to the law of the Creator (and Redeemer), because God established His law in creation, and gave man His Word as norms for his religious life (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:45). Man is "created by God in such a manner that he can hear and respond to God's Word" (De Graaff, 1973:37). He is "required to positivize the structural norms as positive norms for the various aspects of life, which are formed by man in response to the given normative law" (Fowler, 1980:48; cf. Schoeman, 1988:158). Accordingly, the idea of human autonomy of Neo-Humanism results in isolating human life from the norms of God as well as in deifying man as God, the norm-Giver. It leads to man's alienation (disintegration) from his own authenticity (Schoeman, 1988:158).

Human integration is a desirable feature in the personality and education of man. However, the human integration of Neo-Humanism in an apostatic direction fails to reach the ideal of complete integration. True integration cannot be achieved in separation from God (and His Word), because all creatures are integrated in the Triune God (Fowler, 1990:19-20; Van Dyk, 1972b:183). Only in the anastatic direction in which man's potential is considered to be "gift and call", the human self-actualization as an integrated state, can be justified (Olthuis, 1993:171).

5.2.2 Image of God

5.2.2.1 Brief summary: "image of God" as integrating principle

Man as the image of God is a unique being distinguished from other living and non-living creatures. The image of God implies three essential relationships (with God, fellowman/-woman and the world). The image of God is also an integrating principle of these relationships for the service of God. Full integration in the relationship with God indicates a committed life to the service of God in all relationships and activities of man. Good integration in relationships with fellowman/-woman can be achieved by love (troth) and partnership to serve the Lord. The relationship with the world can be fully integrated by stewardship to serve the Lord, in which man preserves (and cultivates) the world and fulfills the calling of God. The image of God should be considered from the perspective of creation, fall and redemption. True integration of the image of God can exist only in the redemption of Christ (4.3.3).

5.2.2.2 Some characteristics of Neo-Humanism

Neo-Humanism has the following characteristics in terms of the image of God*.

* Since man's relationship with God has been dealt with in the previous section (religion) (5.2.2), only the other three characteristics are dealt with in this section.

5.2.2.2.1 An individual is unique on account of his own genetic history and diverse experiences. Neo-Humanists are convinced that the uniqueness of the human being confirms the dignity and integrity of individuals (3.2.5.1). However, humanity is not unique, because man is a product of continuous evolution of life. Man is not a uniquely created being but only a highly evolved and continuously evolving organism (3.5.5.1). Thus he is seen as a higher animal with higher needs (2.3.5.1, 2.5.5.1; De Graaff, 1973:35-36). Therefore, the continuity of man and animals is more basic than the uniqueness of man (cf. Van Dyk, 1972b:177; Duvenage, 1981:114).

5.2.2.2.2 Though communality of man is constitutive of human nature (e.g. 3.3.5.2), the communality is often described in negative terms. It threatens man's inner needs, and makes man form a negative self-concept, and disturbs the self-actualizing process (2.2.6.2, 2.4.5.2). Sometimes man is called a social animal. However, the ideal society refers to an anarchistic community which supports the freedom and autonomy of the individual (2.3.4). The major interest of Neo-Humanism is the individual himself. In this sense, Neo-Humanism is basically individualistic and/or subjectivistic (cf. Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:45; Van Dyk, 1972b:177).

5.2.2.2.3 Man is a product of the world on the basis of Evolutionism. Thus all the activities of man are inseparably engaged in the whole world where he is located. In other words, his every experience is a whole way-of-being-in-the-world (2.2.6.3, 2.3.5.3). Man has the mysterious energy of the Universe, and the self of man is mystically extended to the Universe, as is contended by a doctrine of Deism or Oriental religious teaching of the self-absorption into the Universe (3.5.5.1). Holism in Neo-Humanism is often applied to all the areas of the world (2.6.3).

Man's relationship with the world is also essential for human nature. Man's self-concept includes his perceptions of the world (3.2.5.2). Human concerns denote the most persistent underlying uneasiness that man has about himself and his relationship with the world (3.3.5.2). However, the world is regarded only as the womb of man. Man was born from the world and just lives in connection with the world. In Neo-Humanism, the world is not something that man, as a steward of God, should cultivate for the service of God. There is no calling or no task to fulfil in the world. Neo-Humanism has little interest in the cultivation of the world (cf. Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:44).

5.2.2.3 Additional critical discussion

In Neo-Humanism, man is not a unique being distinguished from God or from other creatures. The Neo-Humanist finds himself in an apostatic relationship with God, a reluctant or negative relationship with fellowman/-woman, and a passive relationship with the world. The most important relationship in Neo-Humanism is the relationship to man himself (Steyn, 1989:118). All these characteristics pertain to the image of God under the Fall. Neo-Humanism does not recognize the "empirical understanding of the darker aspects of man" (Berkouwer, 1981:14). Redeemed by Christ, man as the image of God should love his fellowman/-woman as himself in accordance with God's commandments. He also has God's calling in the world as the responsible unfold of the creation (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:48; Fowler, 1980:53;1987:14; De Graaff, 1973:39-40; Stoker, 1967:103-104; Schoeman, 1988:158). With reference to the image of God as an integrating principle, Neo-Humanism does not succeed in integrating man's three relationships (with God, fellowman/-

woman and the world) harmoniously and respectively. The concept of human integration of Neo-Humanism reveals only disintegrated or poorly integrated relationships.

5.2.3 Heart (the self)

5.2.3.1 Brief summary: "heart" (the self) as integrating principle

The heart (the self) is the religious core of man in which he responds to God and His Word, positively or negatively. It motivates, directs and governs awareness, intention and action in his whole life. It functions in all modal aspects of man and represents itself as a whole in the coherence of all the functions within all the modal aspects of man. In other words, the heart, as the concentrating point of man, integrates all the functions in all modal aspects of man (4.3.4).

5.2.3.2 Some characteristics of Neo-Humanism

Neo-Humanism has the following characteristics in terms of the heart:

5.2.3.2.1 The concepts of the self are not the same for all Neo-Humanists. The self, as a motivator, director and integrating principle of human behaviour, is often identified with the biological-psychical nature of man. Some Neo-Humanists emphasize the biological inner nature of the organism (Rogers & Maslow), and some emphasize the psychical nature (Holt, Goodman, Combs, Weinstein, Brown & Valett). Goodman and Combs distinguish the self from certain aspects of man. Goodman regards the self as the system of contact with the environment at the boundary of the organism. However, the

self has mainly psychical (affective) functions (2.3.5.2). In Combs, the real motivator and integrator of human life are perceptions of the self (or self-concept). The perceptions of the self are also considered to be the affective function of man (3.2.5.2). In this sense, the motivator, leader or integrator of human life and activity in Neo-Humanism is the biological-psychical nature of man.

5.2.3.2.2 The self-concept as a conceptual gestalt is dealt with either positively or negatively by Neo-Humanists. In the case of Neo-Humanists (Rogers, Maslow) who emphasize the biological nature of man, the self-concept is often seen to play a secondary or negative role in the process of self-actualization. When the self-concept is incongruent with experiences of the biological organism, it disturbs the actualizing process and causes psychological maladjustments. In such cases, the self-concept should be reorganized so that it may attain better congruence with experiences of the biological organism (2.4.5.2). However, Neo-Humanists who emphasize the psychical nature of man have more regard for the positive role of the self-concept. A positive self-concept is an important integrating factor or principle in the theories of Combs (3.2.4.4, 3.2.5.2), Weinstein (3.3.5.2) and Brown (3.4.5.2). A function for the self-concept is recognized in human integration. However, the integrating principle is not the self but the self-concept which is regarded as the psychical function of man. Therefore, the real self as an integrating principle in Neo-Humanism is the biological-psychical nature of man.

5.2.3.3 Additional critical discussion

In Neo-Humanism, the self is frequently identified with the biological-psychical nature of man. The self as a religious core does not direct man and his life to God, but to man himself in

his biological-psychical functions (cf. Schrotenboer, 1978:155). The biological-psychical functions of the human being are absolutized. They are regarded as motivators, directors and integrators of all the other functions of man. Therefore, it can be asserted that the heart is hidden away in the biological-psychical functions. The heart keeps functioning by absolutizing the biological-psychical functions of man in a religious sense (cf. Spier, 1979:18). The heart keeps directing and integrating all the functions of man through the biological-psychical functions. Neo-Humanists could not find or recognize the real heart, the true integrating principle which cannot be identified with any temporal modal aspects of man and which coheres all the functions of man to the direction of true service to God (Dekker, 1985:186-187; Spykman, 1985:46). Accordingly, education which denotes the religious forming of the heart of a child, becomes meaningless (cf. Van der Walt & Dekker, 1983:9). In this sense, Neo-Humanism cannot succeed in achieving the full integration of man in terms of the heart.

5.2.4 A living soul (or a body)

5.2.4.1 Brief summary: "a living soul" as integrating principle

God created man as a holistic being, a living soul (body). Various terms describe man from different angles as a holistic being in relation to God. Any kind of dualism with reference to the temporal bodily existence of man is rejected, because man is not a combination of two different parts. Man is characterized by multi-dimensionality and enkaptic wholeness. No aspect (or structure) of man should be overestimated or reduced to a certain aspect (or structure) of being human. Each function (or structure) of man is enkaptically interwoven with all the other functions (or structures) in an inseparable

coherence (retroicipation and anticipation). Recognition of the living soul of man as an integrating principle guarantees an insight into human wholeness (4.3.5).

5.2.4.2 Some characteristics of Neo-Humanism

In terms of a living soul, Neo-Humanism has the following characteristics:

5.2.4.2.1 Neo-Humanism begins with counter-emphasis of the a-logical aspects in reaction to the overemphasis of the logical aspect of man in classical humanism in education (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:46; Steyn, 1989:222). For a more balanced concept of human personality and education, Neo-Humanism attempts to integrate the logical with the a-logical (mainly affective) aspects (2.2.6.3). Generally speaking, all man's functions are reduced to merely two dimensions (or domains): the cognitive and the (biological-)affective (3.3.5.3, 3.4.5.3, 3.6.3, 2.2.6.3; except Valett, 3.5.5.3). The two dimensions are often juxtaposed with each other (2.4.5.3, 3.2.5.3). As a result, the integration of these two domains in Neo-Humanistic education always presupposes a dualistic interpretation of man (cf. Steyn, 1989:128, 132; Cronjé, 1989:11).

5.2.4.2.2 The biological and/or the affective aspects are absolutized in Neo-Humanist anthropology. Rogers and Maslow, for example, absolutize the biological aspect. They claim that human nature ultimately anchors in the biological aspect of man (2.5.5.3, 2.4.5.3; cf. Cronjé, 1989:210, 359). However, more conspicuously, Neo-Humanists overemphasize the affective aspect of man. The affective aspect plays the leading and integrating part in being human. It motivates and determines human perception, learning, behavior and life.

The affective aspect makes human life and activities meaningful and relevant (3.6.3, 3.4.5.4). It is the precondition and integrating factor in educational processes (2.2.6.3, 2.3.5.3, 3.2.5.4). The affective aspect serves to vivify cognitive curricula. It maintains a significant contact between students and the educational content (3.3.5.3). It gives meaning to human life and behaviour (3.5.5.3). Consequently, Neo-Humanistic educational philosophy is characterized by an overemphasis of the affective aspect (cf. Cronje, 1989:171). The affective domain is thus the most important integrating principle that Neo-humanistic educators want to suggest in personality, education and life (3.6.3).

5.2.4.2.3 Many aspects of man are reduced to the (biological-) affective aspect in Neo-Humanistic anthropology. Maslow and Rogers, for instance, regard all the aspects of man as parts of the biological essence of man. Maslow further claims that all the aspects of man are hierarchically integrated on the same biological continuum (2.5.5.3). In the theories of the other six Neo-Humanists who were analysed in the previous chapters (2, 3), many a-logical aspects are reduced to the affective aspect. The affective aspect contains, for example, also the percipient, affective, social, aesthetic, jurial, ethical and pistical aspects (3.2.5.3). In this way, many aspects of man are reduced to the biological, and affective aspects (cf. Steyn, 1990:221). As a result, many aspects of man are neglected, whereas the biological and affective are overemphasized.

5.2.4.2.4 In Neo-Humanism, the relationship between the cognitive and affective aspects is so indestructibly symbiotic that the two cannot be seen as contradictory to each other but rather as complementary. The integration of the two is therefore indispensable in education (2.2.6.3, 3.3.5.3). Overemphasis of one aspect will have a pathological effect on being human and on learning (3.4.5.3). However, the cognitive

aspect (which often includes the logical, lingual and cultural aspects) is often also seen as contradictory to the affective aspects of man (3.2.5.3, 2.4.5.3), and is not significantly dealt with in the actual educational context since it seems to be of rather little importance (2.5.5.3, 3.2.5.3, 3.6.3). The logical aspect is less important than the affective even in learning activities at school, despite the fact that the school finds its purpose and qualification in the logical aspect, according to Reformational theorists (Schoeman, 1985:84; Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:48; Cronjé, 1989:31, 363).

5.2.4.2.5 Neo-Humanists are not in agreement about the number of aspects of man. Neo-Humanists as a rule do not draw up their own lists of aspects (in number and in order) except, for instance, Maslow and Valett. In cases where they do, they discern the following lists:

- Holt: [the physical, biological, percipient, aesthetic, social, affective], and [the logical, lingual];
- Goodman: [the biological, affective], [the logical] and [the social];
- Rogers: [the physical, biological, affective], and [the intellectual, social, ethical, pistical];
- Maslow: [the biological], [the cognitive, affective, conative], [the social], and [the aesthetic, axiological, philosophical, spiritual];
- Combs: [the biological, percipient, social, affective, moral, pistical], and [the cognitive];
- Weinstein: [the cognitive], and [the affective, social, pistical];
- Brown: [the cognitive], and [the affective];
- Valett: the psychomotor [physical, biological, percipient], the cognitive [lingual, logical], and the affective [affective, social, moral, aesthetic, pistical].

No Neo-Humanist has succeeded in completely describing the multi-dimensionality of man in number and order (for example

from the numerical to the pistical). Almost every aspect is dealt with in terms of overestimation or reduction, and not in terms of its own law nucleus.

5.2.4.2.6 Neo-Humanists pay attention to the relationship between the cognitive and affective aspects (5.2.4.2.1, 5.2.4.2.4). Maslow and Valett, however, developed theories regarding the integral relationship of all the aspects of man. According to Maslow (cf. 5.2.4.2.5), all the aspects of man are integrated hierarchically in accordance with the theory of motivation, in which each aspect proceeds to a higher one through gratification of the basic needs. Aspects are often overlapping and synergic, so that each aspect is an expression of the whole integrated personality. Lower aspects of the hierarchy are more prepotent than higher ones. Therefore, the logical aspect is less important than the biological or affective aspect (2.5.5.3). Valett also emphasizes hierarchical relationships in human aspects (cf. 5.2.4.2.5). According to his theory, man is composed of three major aspects (the psychomotor, cognitive and affective), and each major aspect has sub-aspects (physical, biological, percipient/ lingual, logical/ affective, social, moral, aesthetic and pistical). These three major and ten sub-aspects are developmentally and hierarchically interrelated to one another. The highest in order is the affective (pistical) and the lowest is the psychomotor (physical). The affective aspects play the leading and integrating role in personality development. Self-actualization refers to the state of the complete and harmonious development of all the aspects of man (3.5.3, 3.5.5.3).

The integral relationship of all the aspects of man is recognized by Maslow and Valett. However, each aspect is not seen to be interwoven with all the other aspects on the basis of enkapsis (retrocipation and anticipation) (cf. Cronjé, 1989:221).

The interconnection among the aspects is not strong enough for one aspect to influence all other aspects. The anticipatory role of the aspects of man in Maslow's theory is completely reversed in comparison with a Reformational view of man portrayed in chapter 4. In Valett's theory, however, the order of the affective as a sub-aspect is changed with the cognitive as a major aspect in comparison with the Reformational view. Valett's hierarchy of aspects is relatively near to the Reformational theory of modality outlined in chapter 4.

5.2.4.2.7 Neo-Humanists try to effect integration between the cognitive and affective aspects (or domains) of man by means of educational actions. Neo-Humanistic educators attempt to introduce more affective factors into learning for the sake of the integration of personality and education, because those factors have been significantly neglected in logical aspect-centred classical humanistic school education. Their educational efforts are focused on also arousing the affective functions and on using some affective techniques (3.2.5.4, 3.3.5.4, 3.4.5.4, 3.5.5.4, 3.6.4). As a result, Neo-Humanistic Education in essence becomes an affective approach to education. Regardless of its employment of logical functions, Neo-Humanistic education, in actual educational contexts, is often manifested not as holistic education but as an affective education of which the starting point and destination are the affective side of the learners.

5.2.4.3 Additional critical discussion

5.2.4.3.1 Humanism is characterized by a dualistically contradictory religious basic motive, i.e. reason (nature or science) versus freedom (personality). Humanism keeps moving backward and forward between these two polar opposites. If the one pole is overemphasized (or absolutized),

the other pole is automatically drawn in to take its place. Modern man always seems to reveal the tension between his faith in science and faith in freedom, because he does not succeed in fully integrating the two poles. They are constantly retained as an antinomy (Dooyeweerd, 1980:19, 36-37, 67-68; 1984a:27, 68, 110-111, 175, 190-200, 206, 466-467, 499; Spier, 1979:109, 214, 20; Spykman, 1985:34).

Neo-Humanism in education gives preference to the freedom pole in the sense that it seems to a-logically react to the over-emphasized scientific (logical) faith in education (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:47; Steyn, 1989:123; Cronjé, 1989:231, 234, 359; cf. Fowler, 1987:26-27; De Graaff, 1973:43-44; Berkouwer, 1978:142; Van Brummelen, 1972a:71; Dekker, 1985:94). Regardless of all attempts of Neo-Humanistic educators to integrate the two poles mentioned in the previous paragraph, Neo-Humanistic Education has turned out to prefer the freedom side of humanism. Because of its basic religious motive, Neo-Humanism is destined to be unable to reach a perfect integration of the two poles. True integration can only be achieved by the truly integral Biblical religious motive (Fowler, 1980:42; 1987:193-195; De Graaff, 1973:45).

5.2.4.3.2 In Neo-Humanism, the biological or/and affective aspects of man is/are absolutized. Man is defined from the vantage point of one or two absolutized modal aspects. In a Reformational anthropology, this absolutized one(or two)-dimensional view is referred as an -ism or ideology. An -ism comes into being when an aspect is deified as the deepest basis of unity for all other aspects (Van der Walt, 1978a:103; Dooyeweerd, 1980:20; Spier, 1979:111; cf. Duvenage, 1981:119). The absolutized aspect is regarded as the most fundamental constituent of the human person with all else subordinate to it or an extension of it. Every phenomenon is explained in terms of the basic aspect (Duvenage, 1981:148).

Consequently, all the other aspects are reduced to the absolutized modality (Stoker, 1967:104; Van der Walt, 1990:11; Fowler, 1991:223-224; Spier, 1979:47; Dekker, 1985:94-95). Neo-Humanism, as a result of such reductionisms (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:44), reveals ideologies such as biologism (to Rogers and Maslow) (De Graaff, 1980:3; Olthuis, 1972:35; Cronjé, 1989:349), psychologism (or affectionism) (cf. Spier, 1979:75; Schoeman, 1975:96; 1988:216), or irrationalism (Van der Walt & Postma, 1987:47; De Graaff, 1973:46, 48; cf. Dooyeweerd, 1984a:110).

Such forms of reductionism lead to a distorted theoretical view of man which cannot appropriately portray the multi-dimensionality of man (Van der Walt, 1978a:102). The meaning of human life is also falsified and distorted (De Graaff, 1973:39). An absolutized aspect necessarily evokes its counter-absolutization soon after (Dooyeweerd, 1980:36). A one-dimensional view of man can, sometimes, also bring about cultural crises (Van der Walt, 1978a:104). In a fundamental sense, man's self-deification is also disguised in such reductionisms (Evans, 1993:103; De Graaff, 1973:39). Therefore, it can be concluded that Neo-Humanism can never succeed in achieving a true balanced integration of man.

A Reformational anthropology does not agree with any form of reductionism, for example functionalism, biologism, psychologism and irrationalism (Olthuis, 1985:3; 1978:179). It opposes every kind of -ism in anthropology, because man as a religious being is not qualified or identified by any aspects of and in creation (Strauss, 1990:47-48; Duvenage, 1981:112). A Reformational anthropology deals with every aspect of man according to its own law. Man is a multi-dimensional being (Fowler, 1987:13; De Graaff, 1980:5-6, 16). Reductionism is the result of distorted theoretical abstraction, and cannot be seen as actual integral reality (Dooyeweerd, 1980:13). "The

human body is the structural whole of temporal human existence in the intermodal coherence of all its modal aspects" (Dooyeweerd, 1984b:147). Each aspect is enkaptically interwoven with all other aspects.

5.2.5 Some immanent criticism of Neo-Humanistic Education

5.2.5.1 General

Neo-Humanistic anthropological theories and education reveal a number of inherent shortcomings which were outlined by means of the process of immanent criticism. This form of criticism does not lay bare the shortcomings of theories with reference to other theories (e.g. a Reformational anthropology), but by merely pointing out internal inconsistencies in a theory.

5.2.5.2 Some immanent criticism

In the discussion about Neo-Humanistic anthropology and its educational efforts to effect human integration, the following internal inconsistencies and shortcomings were brought to the surface:

5.2.5.2.1 Neo-Humanistic anthropology cannot present a holistic concept of man, because Neo-Humanist anthropology reveals a dualism with contradictory poles in the modal functions of man (i.e. cognition versus affect) and in the role of basic motives (i.e. science versus personality), which cannot be integrated easily in terms of humanism (2.6.3, 3.6.3, 5.2.4.2.1).

5.2.5.2.2 Neo-Humanistic anthropology and its concomitant educational efforts at human integration do not show a harmoniously balanced concept of human wholeness, because

the biological and psychical functions of man are overemphasized while other functions of man, for example the logical and social, are underestimated. Neo-Humanistic Education is a form of affective education, and cannot be regarded as holistic education (2.6.3, 3.6.3, 3.6.4).

5.2.5.2.3 The Neo-Humanistic concept of human integration refers to the individual-centred wholeness of man while neglecting the full recognition of the communality of man. This form of individualism evoked structuralism which is the emphasis of the structured social system (Richards, 1996:13). Neo-Marxism also criticized Neo-Humanism for not also considering the social and political dimensions of human life (1.2.3.6).

5.2.5.2.4 According to the tenets of Neo-Humanism, man basically has a good and trustworthy nature. He has a good propensity toward self-actualization. Then why does a society in which people live together often have a harmful influence on the individual's personality development? Neo-Humanists cannot explain adequately the origin and presence of evil in man and in society (2.6.1, 3.6.1).

5.3 Conclusion

The problem of human integration of Neo-Humanistic Education has been discussed from the perspective of four integrating principles of a Reformational anthropology. The first is religion: Neo-Humanism seeks the apostate directional integration. The second is the image of God: Neo-Humanism reveals an apostate relationship with God, a reluctant or negative relationship with the fellowman/-woman, and a passive relationship with the world. The third is the heart: the heart as the integrator of aspects of man, is hidden in Neo-

Humanism. The self as a motivator or director of human activities, is seen as identical with the (biological-)affective functions. The fourth is the living soul of man: Neo-Humanism is characterized by dualism and reductionism (biologism, psychologism (affectionism, or irrationalism). As a result of not adhering to these principles, Neo-Humanistic Education does not achieve a truly integrated concept of man, and therefore also cannot achieve a full integration of personality by means of educational efforts.

From an immanent critical point of view, Neo-Humanistic anthropological theories and education reveal a number of inherent shortcomings. Some important internal inconsistencies and shortcomings are (1) dualisms in the concept of man and in the role of basic motives, (2) overemphasis of the affective aspect which results in an affective education, not a truly holistic education, (3) an individual-centred concept of human wholeness which is also criticized by Neo-Marxism and Structuralism, and (4) an unsatisfactory explanation of the origin and presence of evil in man and in society.

6 FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

In this, the concluding chapter of this research report, the findings emanating from the research are presented, with conclusions drawn with reference to the stated aims of the research. A number of recommendations are offered.

6.2 Findings

From the perspective of Reformational anthropological principles, efforts at human integration by Neo-Humanistic Education amount to the following:

1 The Evolutionistic presupposition of human origin completely excludes the true God as the Creator of man in discussions of human existence (5.2.1.2.1).

2 Neo-Humanism has an optimistic view of man as being a self-sufficient being. Man is, by nature, good and trustworthy. He has a positive tendency toward self-actualization and sufficient potential (even godlike qualities) for self-fulfillment (5.2.1.2.2).

3 Man is a biological-psychological organism that is always seeking for satisfaction of his inner needs. Human maturity is a process of progressive gratification of basic needs toward self-actualization (5.2.1.2.3).

4 Man should be free from all the negative social influences. In a positive sense, he should have the freedom of self-expression and self-satisfaction (5.2.1.2.4).

5 Man is an autonomous being. Norms imposed from outside himself are negative for a healthy personality. The absolute norms that he should follow are his inner laws and needs. He has an irrefutable right to his life, and makes his own choices through his spontaneous will in every situation (5.2.1.2.5).

6 Self-actualization is the ultimate goal of the human organism. It denotes the full-actualization or full-functioning of human nature and its potential. It is an important integrating principle. A self-actualized person implies the deification of man (5.2.1.2.6).

7 An individual is unique on account of his own genetic history and diverse experiences. However, humanity is not unique, because man is a product of continuous evolution of life. Man is a higher animal with higher needs (5.2.2.2.1).

8 Man's relationship with God is characterized by anthropocentrism (5.2.1.2., 5.2.1.3).

9 Though the communality of man (his relationship with fellowman/-woman) is constitutive of his human nature, the social function of man is often seen as reluctant or negative. Neo-Humanism is basically individualistic or subjectivistic (5.2.2.2.2).

10 Man is a product of the world on the basis of Evolutionism. Man's relationship with the world is essential to human nature. However, the world is only a womb for man, in which he was born and lives every day (5.2.2.2.3).

11 The motivator, director or integrator of human life and activities is the biological-psychical nature of man. The self (heart) is hidden behind or identified with the biological-affective functions of man (5.2.3.2.1).

12 The self-concept as a conceptual Gestalt, is dealt with either positively or negatively. In a positive sense, the self-concept functions for the sake of human integration. However, the integrating principle is not the self (heart) but the self-concept which is the affective function of man (5.2.3.2.2).

13 Neo-Humanism always presupposes a dualistic interpretation of man: the cognitive (logical) and affective (a-logical) domains. Though Neo-Humanism attempts to integrate these two in the concept of personality and education, they often confront each other (5.2.4.2.1).

14 Of all the aspects of man, the biological or affective aspect seems generally to be overemphasized. This aspect (biological or affective) motivates and leads human perception, learning, behaviour and life. It makes human learning and activities meaningful and relevant. Neo-Humanistic educators seem to suggest the affective as the most important integrating principle in education (5.2.4.2.2).

15 All the other aspects of man are reduced to the biological or affective aspect. The biological or affective subsumes almost all a-logical aspects. As a result, while the biological or affective is overemphasized, the others are virtually ignored (5.2.4.2.3).

16 The relationship between the cognitive and affective aspects is indestructibly symbiotic, so that the two are complementary in being human. However, the cognitive is not dealt with to any degree of significance, even in school education (5.2.4.2.4).

17 Neo-Humanism does not succeed in completely describing the multi-dimensionality of man in number and in order of

modalities (e.g. from the numerical to the pistical), as is done in Reformational anthropology. Almost every aspect is dealt with in terms of overestimation or reduction, and not by its own law nucleus (5.2.4.2.5).

18 Internal developmental and hierarchical relationships among all the aspects of man are recognized by Maslow and Valett. However, the direction of prepotency in the hierarchy of the aspects was completely reversed in Maslow's motivational theory. In Valett's hierarchy of the aspects of man, the affective is more prepotent than the cognitive (5.2.4.2.6).

19 Neo-Humanistic Education is composed of various kinds of affective approaches to education. Regardless of its employment of some logical functions, Neo-Humanistic Education is often manifested not as a holistic education but as an affective education in which its starting point and destination are affect (sometimes defined as a positive self-concept) (5.2.4.2.7).

6.3 Conclusions

In accordance with the aim of this research (1.5), an anthropology of Neo-Humanism was identified in chapter 2, and the nature of the efforts to effect human integration in Neo-Humanistic Education was described in chapter 3. Some fundamental shortcomings of the concept of and educational efforts at human integration in Neo-Humanistic Education were analysed and evaluated in comparison to a Reformational anthropology with its four integrating principles (religion, image of God, heart and a living soul) in chapters 4 and 5.

Regarding human integration, Neo-Humanistic Education has achieved more success than classical humanistic education. The former makes an effort at overcoming defects of the logical aspect-centred classical humanistic education, and tries to integrate the logical with a-logical aspects of man. However, Neo-Humanistic Education does not succeed in achieving the desired balanced integration on account of its dualistic concept of man. It also overemphasizes the a-logical aspects as a reaction to the previous overemphasis of the logical. Furthermore, from the perspective of the integrating principles of a Reformational anthropology, the concepts of and efforts at human integration of Neo-Humanism were evaluated as being a distorted and unbalanced disintegration or an inadequate integration of human personality and education.

Therefore, the findings of this research (6.3) lead to the conclusion that Neo-Humanistic Education does not succeed in describing and achieving true human integration of the personality and education.

6.4 Recommendations

6.4.1 Recommendations pertaining to true human integration

The concept of man and human integration must be considered with reference to not only an individual himself but also to all his relationships and activities in this world. Human aspects and their mutual relationships must be investigated to discover a holistic concept of man. Any reductionism which absolutizes a certain function of man must be avoided to get a harmoniously balanced concept of human integration. True principles of human integration can be found not in any of the temporal modal functions of man, but from the perspective of a Scriptural anthropology.

6.4.2 Recommendations with regard to further research

1 It is necessary to evaluate Neo-Humanistic Education by means of some empirical studies. Many empirical studies on Neo-Humanistic Education have been done by Neo-Humanists themselves. However, little empirical study has been done on Neo-Humanistic Education by Reformational educational theorists, for example, by educational psychologists and counsellors. Psychological or educational techniques and curricula of Neo-Humanistic Education aiming at integrating human personality must also be evaluated through empirical studies.

2 More positive studies of Christian education about human integration in educational contexts are necessary. Some studies have been done by Christian educational theorists (e.g. Van Brummelen, 1972a & 1972b; Van Dyk, 1972a; Van Brummelen, 1988; Steensma & Van Brummelen, 1977; Fowler, Van Brummelen & Van Dyk, 1990). However, more attention must be paid to the problem of human integration as well as of well-integrated knowledge in the curriculum. It is also necessary to develop various techniques which can be applied to achieve a more integrated personality in the context of education.

6.5 General conclusion

This research project has revealed that achieving true human integration cannot be effected without the aid of a truly balanced anthropology. Neo-Humanistic Education is a case in point. Despite its shortcomings, a Reformational view of man in education seems to be able to guarantee a more balanced view of human integration, if only because it avoids all immanent contradictions such as dualistic views of human

modal functions and a dualism regarding the role of basic motives, but also because it recognizes a number of fundamental principles which determine the outcome of efforts at a holistic and integrated view of man.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLPORT, G. W. 1960. The open system in personality theory. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 61(3):301-310.

ALSCHULER, A. S. 1975. Humanistic education. (In Read, D. A. & Simon, S. B., eds. *Humanistic education sourcebook*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. p. 62-71.)

ANDERSON, L. W. 1981. *Assessing affective characteristics in the schools*. Boston: Allyn & Beacon.

APPLE, M. W. 1976. Humanism and the politics of educational argumentation. (In Weller, R. H., ed. *Humanistic education: visions and realities*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan. p. 315-330.)

ARNSTINE, D. 1975. Open education: an aspirin for the plague. (In Nyberg, D., ed. *The philosophy of open education*. London: Routledge. p.160-176.)

ASPY, D. N. 1974. *Towards a technology of humanizing education*. Champaign, Ill.: Reseach Press.

ASPY, D. N. 1977. An interpersonal approach to humanizing education. (In Weller, R. H., ed. *Humanistic education: visions and realities*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan. p. 123-157.)

ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT. 1962a. *Perceiving, behaving, becoming*. Washington D.C.: ASCD.

ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT. 1962b. What can man becoming? (In Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. *Perceiving, behaving, becoming*. Washington D.C.: ASCD. p.1-8.)

ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT. 1970. To nurture humaneness. Washington D.C.: ASCD.

AUBREY, E. E. 1959. Humanistic teaching and the place of ethical and religious values in higher education. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

AVILA, D., COMBS, A. W. & PURKEY, W. W., eds. 1977. The helping relationship sourcebook. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

BARROW, R. 1978. Radical education: a critique of freeschooling and deschooling. London: Martin Robertson.

BARROW, R. 1981. The philosophy of schooling. Sussex: Wheatheaf.

BATTLE, J. A. & SHANNON, R. L. 1974. The new idea in education. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

BEANE, J. A., LIPKA, R. P. & LUDEWIG, J. W. 1980. Synthesis of reseach on self-concept. *Educational Leadership*, 38(1):84-89.

BECKER, E. 1967. Beyond alienation. New York: Brasillier.

BEREITER, C. 1972. Schools without education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 42(3):390-413.

BERG, T. R. 1972. The modern Romantic critics of education. The Ohio State University. (Ph.D. dissertation.)

BERGER, M. L. 1982. The public schools can't do it all. *Contemporary Education*, 54(1):6-8.

BERKOUWER, G. C. 1978. The reformed faith and the modern concept of man. (In De Graaff, A. H. & Olthuis, J. H., eds. Toward a Biblical view of man: some readings. Toronto: Institute for Christian Studies. p. 133-144.)

BERKOUWER, G. C. 1981. Man: the image of God. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

BLOSSER, P. 1993. Reconnoitering Dooyeweerd's theory of man. *Philosophia Reformata*, 58(2):192-209.

BOSAK, B. W. 1977. A decade of radical educational trends: the 1960's. Arizona State University. (Ph.D. dissertation.)

BOYER, J. 1970. A philosophical analysis of the writings of Paul Goodman and Edgar Z. Friedenberg: critics of American public education. Wayne State University. (D.Ed. dissertation.)

BRAMMER, L. M. 1985. Self-actualization. (In Husen, T. & Postlethwaite, T. N., eds. The international encyclopedia of education. New York: Pergamon. 8:4503-4505.)

BRAUNER, C. J. & BURNS, H. W. 1965. Problems in education and philosophy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

BREMER, J. 1986. Look to the child. (In Hartman, W., ed. To educate the human potential. (Unpublished conference lecture.) Pretoria: Montessori Society. P. 6-22.)

BROUDY, H. S. 1980. Philosophical foundations of education. (In Walberg, H. J., ed. American education: diversity & research. Washington, D.C.: United States International Communication Agency. p. 14-24.)

BROWN, G. I. 1970. A plague and some medication. *Improving College and University Teaching*. 18:92-96. Spring.

BROWN, G. I. 1971a. Human teaching for human learning: an introduction to confluent education. New York: The Viking Press.

BROWN, G. I. 1971b. Human is as confluent does. *Theory into Practice*, 10:191-195, June.

BROWN, G. I. 1971c. Confluent education: exploring the affective domain. *College Board Review*, 80:4-10, Summer.

BROWN, G. I. 1973. I have things to tell. *Elementary English*, 50:515-520, April.

BROWN, G. I. 1975a. What is 'confluent education'? (In Read, D. A. & Simon, S. B., eds. *Humanistic education sourcebook*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. p.50-61.)

BROWN, G. I. 1975b. The training of teachers for affective roles. (In Ryan, K., ed. *Teacher education: the seventy-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press. p. 173-203.)

BROWN, G. I., YEOMANS, T. & GRIZZARD, L., eds. 1975. *The live classroom: innovations through confluent education and gestalt*. New York: Viking Press.

BROWN, J. W. 1973. *A humanistic approach to special education*. Gainesville: P. K. Younge Laboratory School, University of Florida.

BRUMMER, V. 1961. *Transcendental criticism and Christian philosophy*. Rijksuniversiteit. T.Wever- Franeker. (Ph.D. dissertation.)

BUGENTAL, J. F. T. 1967. *Challenges of humanistic psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

BUHLER, C. & ALLEN, M. 1972. *Introduction to humanistic psychology*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth.

BUSS, A. R. 1979. Humanistic psychology as liberal ideology: the socio-historical roots of Maslow's theory of self-actualization. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 19(3):43-55.

BYBEE, R. W. & WELCH, D. I. 1972. The third force: humanistic and science education. *Science Teacher*, 39:8-22, Nov.

CHU, L. 1980. Bridging humanism and behaviorism. *Educational Leadership*, 38(3):229.

CLOUSER, R. A. 1991. The myth of religious neutrality. Notre Dame, London: University of Notre Dame Press.

COETZEE, C. J. 1977. 'n Christlike antropologie en enkele didaktiese implikasies daarvan. *Fokus*, 5(3):555-571.

COHEN, S. 1973. The elementary school in the 20th century: a social context. (In Goodlad, J. I. & Shane, H. G., eds. *The elementary school in the US*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. p.60-86.)

COMBS, A. W. 1962. A perceptual view of the adequate personality. (In Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. *Perceiving, behaving, becoming*. Washington D.C.: ASCD. p.50-64.)

COMBS, A. W. 1964. Perception and self: scholastic underachievement in the academically capable. *Personal and Guidance Journal*, 43:47-51, Sept.

COMBS, A. W. 1965. The professional education of teachers: a perceptual view of teacher preparation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

COMBS, A. W. 1969. Florida studies in the helping professions. Gainesville, Flor.: University of Florida Press.

COMBS, A. W. 1970. An educational imperative: the human dimension. (In Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. *To nurture humaneness*. Washington D.C.: ASCD. p.173-188.)

COMBS, A. W. 1972. Some basic concepts for teacher education. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 23(3):286-290, Fall.

COMBS, A. W. 1974. Humanistic teacher education. Shields: Ford Collins.

COMBS, A. W. 1975a. Humanistic goals of education. (*In Read, D. A. & Simon, S. B., eds. Humanistic education sourcebook. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. p.91-100.*)

COMBS, A. W. 1975b. The human side of learning. (*In Read, D. A. & Simon, S. B., eds. Humanistic education sourcebook. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. p.123-129.*)

COMBS, A. W. 1975c. Sensitivity education: problems and promise. (*In Read, D. A. & Simon, S. B., eds. Humanistic education sourcebook. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. p.192-195.*)

COMBS, A. W. 1975d. The personal approach to good teaching. (*In Read, D. A. & Simon, S. B., eds. Humanistic education sourcebook. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. p.249-261.*)

COMBS, A. W. 1978. Assessing humanistic objectives: some general consideration. (*In Combs, A. W., et al. Humanistic education: objectives and assessment/ a report of the ASCE working group on humanistic education. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum. p.17-27.*)

COMBS, A. W. 1979. Myths in education: beliefs that hinder progress and their alternatives. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

COMBS, A. W. 1981a. Humanistic education: too tender for a tough world? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62(6):446-449, Feb.

COMBS, A. W. 1981b. What the future demands of education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62(5):369-372, Jan.

COMBS, A. W. 1982. Affective education or none at all. *Educational Leadership*, 39(7):495-497, April.

COMBS, A. W. 1989. A theory of therapy: guidelines for counseling practice. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.

COMBS, A. W., BLUME, R. A. & WASS, H. L. 1974. The professional education of teachers: a humanistic approach to teacher education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

COMBS, A. W. & GONZALEZ, D. M. 1994. Helping relationships: basic concepts for the helping professions. 4th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

COMBS, A. W., RICHARDS, A. C. & RICHARDS, F. 1976. Perceptual psychology: a humanistic approach to the study of persons. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

COX, R. 1987. The rich harvest of Abraham Maslow. (*In* Maslow, A. H. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row. P.245-271.)

CRONJE, C. P. 1989. Selfaktualisering en skoolstruktuur volgens sekere onderwyshumaniste. PU for CHE (D.Ed. thesis.)

DAGENAIS, J. J. 1972. Models of man. The Hague: Nijhoff.

DAVIS, D. C. 1971. Model for a humanistic education: the Danish folk high school. Columbus: Merrill.

DE GRAAFF, A. H. 1968. The educational ministry of the church: a perspective. Nutly: The Craig Press.

DE GRAAFF, A. H. 1973. The nature and aim of Christian education in Biblical studies. (*In* Oppewal, D., ed. Contrasting Christian approaches to teaching religion and Biblical studies. Grand Rapids: Calvin College. p.34-57).

DE GRAAFF, A. H. 1980. Psychology: sensitive openness and appropriate reactions. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (F2-17).

DE GRAAFF, A. H. & OLTHUIS, J. H., ed. 1978. Toward a Biblical view of man: some readings. Toronto: Institute for Christian Studies.

DE VLEESCHAUWER, H. J. & VERHEYEN, J. E. ca. 1945. Apperceptie. (In Casimir, R. & Verheyen, J. E., eds. *Paedagogische encyclopaedie*. Groningen: Wolters. 1:120-122.)

DE VOGEL, C. J. 1968. *Het humanisme*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

DE YONG, N. 1969. *Education in the truth*. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company.

DE YONG, N. 1977. *Philosophy of education: a Christian approach*. Nutley: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company.

DEARDEN, R. F. 1968. *The philosophy of primary education*. New York: Routledge & Paul.

DEIBER, J. D. & HOY, W. K. 1977. Custodial high schools and self-actualization of students. *Educational research quarterly*, 2(2):24-31.

DEKKER, E. I. 1985. Antropologische vooronderstellingen, opvoeding, onderwijs en opvoedkunde. (In Van der Walt, J. L., Dekker, E. I. & Van der Walt, I. D. *Die opvoedingsgebeure: 'n Skrifmatige perspektief*. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (F3-18). p. 92-189.)

DENTON, D. E. 1975. Open education: search for a new myth. *Educational Theory*, 25(4):397-406.

DETTERRING, R. W. 1955. Philosophical idealism in Rogerian psychology. *Educational Theory*, 5(4):206-214.

DOOYEWEERD, H. 1942. *De leer van den mensch in de wijsbegeerte der wetidee*. (Unpublished notes.)

DOOYEWEERD, H. *The theory of man, thirty-two propositions on anthropology*. (Unpublished notes.)

DOOYEWEERD, H. 1980. *In the twilight of western thought*. Nutly: The Craig Press.

DOOYEWEERD, H. 1984a. A new critique of theoretical thought. Vol.1. Ontario: Paideia Press.

DOOYEWEERD, H. 1984b. A new critique of theoretical thought. Vol.2. Ontario: Paideia Press.

DU TOIT, S. I., *et al.* 1988. Perspektiewe op menswees. Kaapstad: Academica.

DUVENAGE, B. 1981. Roeping en wetenskap: handleiding vir wetenskapsleer. Potchefstroom: Pro Rege.

EGAN, K. 1975. Open education: open to what? (*In* Nyberg, D., ed. *The philosophy of open education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. p.24-34.)

EHRENFELD, D. 1978. The arrogance of humanism. New York: Oxford University Press.

EISNER, E. W. 1973. The intelligence of feeling. (*In* Rubin, L. J., ed. *Facts and feeling in the classroom*. London: Ward Lock. p.193-214.)

ENGLER, W. H. 1973. Radical school reformers. The State University of New Jersey. (D.Ed. dissertation.)

ESLER, W. C. 1983. The American school dilemma. *The Clearing House*, 57:53-55.

EVANS, C. S. 1993. Human persons as substantial achievers. *Philosophia Reformata*, 58(2):100-112.

EVANS, M. J. & LEVINE, E. 1982. The humanistic, behavioral and cognitive approaches to education: a call for a synthesis. *Contemporary education*, 53:202-206.

FANTINI, M. & WEINSTEIN, G. 1968a. The disadvantaged: challenge to education. New York: Harper & Row.

FANTINI, M. & WEINSTEIN, G. 1968b. Making urban schools work. New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

FARMER, R. B. 1982. Secular humanism: the newest controversy in education. *College Student Journal*, 16(2):158-162.

FATZER, G. 1987. *Ganzheitliches Lernen: humanistische Pädagogik und Organisationsentwicklung*. Paderborn: Junfermann-Verlag.

FENSTERMACHER, G. D. 1972. Is humanistic education philosophical ? (In Jelinek, J. J., ed. *Philosophy of education 1971-1972*. Tempe: The Bureau of Educational Research and Services, Arizona State University. p. 73-78.)

FERNHOUT, H. 1978. Man: the image and glory of God. (In De Graaff, A. H. & Olthuis, J. H., eds. *Toward a Biblical view of man: some readings*. Toronto: Institute for Christian Studies. p. 5-34.)

FOWLER, S. 1980. *Issues in the philosophy of education*. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (IRS F2-12).

FOWLER, S. 1981. *On being human: toward a Biblical understanding*. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (IRS F1-168).

FOWLER, S. 1985. *The word of God*. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (IRS F2-33).

FOWLER, S. 1987. *Christian educational distinctives*. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (IRS F2-39).

FOWLER, S. 1991. *A Christian voice among students and scholars*. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (IRS F2-51).

FOWLER, S., VAN BRUMMELEN, H. W. & VAN DYK, J. 1990. *Christian schooling: education for freedom*. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (IRS F3-39).

FRAGER, R. 1987. The influence of Abraham Maslow. (In Maslow, A. H. *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row. Preface p. 33-41.)

FRIEDLANDER, Z. B. 1975. Some remarks on 'open education'. *American educational research journal*, 12(4):465-468.

FRIEDMAN, M. 1974. The hidden human image. New York: Delta.

FRIEDMAN, M. 1976. Aiming at the self: the paradox of encounter and the human potential movement. *Journal of humanistic psychology*, 16(2):5-34.

GEERTSEMA, H. 1993. *Homo respondens* on the historical nature of human reason. *Philosophia Reformata*, 58(2): 120-152.

GELLER, L. 1982. The failure of self-actualization theory: a critique of Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 22(2):56-73.

GIROUX, H. 1981. Ideology, culture and the process of schooling. London: Falmer Press.

GLAS, G. 1989. Emotie als structuur-probleem. *Philosophia Reformata*, 54(1):29-43.

GLASS, J. F. 1971. The humanistic challenge in sociology. *Journal of humanistic psychology*, 11:170-183.

GLASSER, W. 1969. Schools without failure. New York: Harper & Row.

GLOBE, F. 1970. The third force: the psychology of Abraham Maslow. New York: Grossman.

GOLDSTEIN, K. 1939. The organism. New York: American Book.

GOODLAD, J. I. 1979. What schools are for. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation.

GOODLAD, J. I. 1983. Access to knowledge. *Teachers college record*, 84(4):787-800.

GOODMAN, P. 1961. *Growing up absurd*. London: Victor Gollancz.

GOODMAN, P. 1975. *Compulsory mis-education and the community of scholars*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

GOTZ, I. Z. 1974. On man and his school. *Educational Theory*, 24(1)85-98.

GRAY, M. A. 1976. A comprehensive annotated bibliography of humanistic education. (In Simpson, E. L. *Humanistic education: an interpretation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger. p. 113-328.)

GREENING, TH. C. 1971. *Existential humanistic psychology*. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole.

GRIFFITHS, M. 1984. Emotions and education. *Journal of philosophy of education*, 18(2):223-231.

HACKBARTH, S. L. 1977. The integration of cognitive and affective dimension of learning: an analysis from the perspective of Merleau-Ponty's philosophy. (In Jelinek, J. J., ed. *Philosophy of education 1976-1977*. Tempe: The Far Western Philosophy of Education Society, Arizona State University. p. 128-143.)

HALL, C. S. & LINDZEY, G. 1967. *Theories of personality*. London: Wiley.

HAMACHEK, D. 1974. Characteristics of good teachers and implications for teacher education. (In Horton, L., ed. *Teacher education: trends, issues, innovations*. Danville, Ill.: the Interstate Printers & Publishers. p. 127-135.)

HAMACHEK, D. 1975. Introduction. (In Read, D. A. & Simon, S. B., eds. *Humanistic education sourcebook*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. Introduction p. 11-12.)

HAMMES, J. A. 1971. *Humanistic psychology: a Christian interpretation*. New York: Grune & Stratton.

HANIF, M., NAWAZ, M. & TANVEER, S. A. 1979. Open education vs. back to basics: an analysis of the issues. *Contemporary education*, 50(2):104-109.

HANNA, L. A. 1972. An education imperative: commitment to a humane and open society. (*In Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. To nurture humaneness. Washington D.C.: ASCD. p.212-230.*)

HARTMAN, W., ed. 1986. To educate the human potential. Pretoria: Montessori Society.

HEATH, D. H. 1971. Humanizing schools. New York: Hayden.

HILL, B. V. 1975. What's 'open' about open education? (*In Nyberg, D., ed. The philosophy of open education. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. p.3-13.*)

HOFF, T. 1978. Nephesh and the fulfillment it receives as psyche. (*In De Graaf, A. H. & Olthuis, J. H., eds. Toward a Biblical view of man: some readings. Toronto: Institute for Christian Studies. p. 77-131.*)

HOLCOMB, J. H. 1983. Can we should we save the public schools? *American education*, p. 34-37, June.

HOLDERIED, K. W. 1975. Ivan Illich and contemporaries: comparing views of school reform. Marquette University. (Ph.D. dissertation.)

HOLT, J. 1968. How children learn. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons.

HOLT, J. 1969a. How children fail. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons.

HOLT, J. 1969b. The underachieving school. New York: Pitman.

HOLT, J. 1971. What do I do Monday? London: Pitman House.

HOLT, J. 1972. *Freedom and beyond*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Company.

HOLT, J. 1976. *Instead of education: ways to help people do things better*. New York: Dell.

HOOTMAN, R. S. 1976. *The Romantic critics of the sixties: John Holt and company*. The University of Iowa. (Ph.D. dissertation.)

HUNT, D. E. & SULLIVAN, E. V. 1974. *Between psychology and education*. Hinsdale, Ill.: The Dryden Press.

HUSEN, T. 1982. Present trends in education. *Prospects*, 12(1):45-55.

JOURARD, S. M. 1974. *Healthy personality: an approach from the viewpoint of humanistic psychology*. New York: Macmillan.

KALSBECK, L. 1975. *Contours of a Christian philosophy*. (trans. Bernard & Josina Zylstra). Toronto: Wedge.

KARIER, C. J. 1967. *Man, society and education*. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company.

KATZ, M. B. 1971. The present moment in educational reform. *Harvard educational review*, 41(3):342-359.

KIM, S. S. 1984. *The modern school: its crisis and its future*. PU for CHE. (D.Ed. thesis.)

KIRSCHENBAUM, H. 1975. What is humanistic education? (In Roberts, T.B., ed. *Four psychologies applied to education*. New York: Wiley. p.327-329.)

KNELLER, G. F. 1984. *Movements of thought in modern education*. New York: Wiley.

KNIGHT, G. R. 1989. *Issues and alternatives in educational philosophy*. 2nd ed. Berrien springs, Mich.: Andew University Press.

KOCH, S. 1971. The image of man implicit in encounter group theory. *Journal of humanistic psychology*, 11:109-132.

KOCK, P. DE B. 1974. Die Christlike mensbeskouing. *Tydskrif vir wetenskap*, 10(1):3-11.

KOTZE, G. J. 1971. Die antropologiese onderbou van die Gereformeerde pastoraat met spesiale verwysing na die Client-centered Amerikaanse pastoraat. Kaap: Nasionale Raad vir Sosiale Navorsing Departement van Onderwys, Kuns en Wetenskap. (Th.D. thesis, PU for CHE.)

KRAAY, J. N. 1980. Successive conceptions in the development of the Christian philosophy of Herman Dooyeweerd (2). *Philosophia Reformata*, 45:5-46.

KRASNER, L. 1978. The future and the past in the behaviorism-humanism dialogue. *American psychologist*, 33:799-804, Sept.

KRUGER, M. M. & WHITTLE, E. P. 1991. Fundamental perspectives in education. Kenwyn: Juta & Company.

LUCAS, C. J. 1984. Foundations of education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

LYON, H. C. 1971. Learning to feel: feeling to learn. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.

MADSEN, K. B. 1971. Humanistic psychology and the philosophy of science. *Journal of humanistic psychology*, 11(1):1-10.

MAHRER, A. R. & GERVAIZE, P. A. 1985. Humanistic theory of development. (In Husen, T. & Postlethwaite, T. N., eds. The international encyclopedia of education. 4:2350-2353.)

MASLOW, A. H. 1962. Some basic propositions of a growth and selfactualizing psychology. (In Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Perceiving, behaving, becoming. Washington D.C.: ASCD. p.34-49.)

MASLOW, A. H. 1967. A theory of metamotivation: a biological rooting of the value-life. *Journal of humanistic psychology*, 7:93-127.

MASLOW, A. H. 1968a. Toward a psychology of being. 2nd ed. Princeton: Van Nostrand.

MASLOW, A. H. 1968b. Some educational implications of the humanistic psychologies. *Harvard educational review*, 38(4):685-696.

MASLOW, A. H. 1971. The farther reaches of human nature. New York: The Viking Press.

MASLOW, A. H. 1973. What is a Taoistic teacher? (*In* Rubin L. J., ed. Facts and feelings in the classroom. London: Wark Lock. p.147-170.)

MASLOW, A. H. 1977. The creative attitude. (*In* Avila, D., Combs, A. W. & Purkey, W. W., eds. The helping relationship sourcebook. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. p. 226-239.)

MASLOW, A. H. 1987. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.

MASLOW, A. H. & MITTELMANN, B. 1951. Principles of abnormal psychology: the dynamics of psychic illness. New York: Harper & Brothers.

MASON, R. E. 1972. Contemporary educational theory. New York: David Mckay.

MATSON, F. W. 1964. The broken image: man, science and society. New York: Brazillier.

MATSON, F. W. 1973. Without/within: behaviourism and humanism. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole.

MAYER, F. 1964. American ideas and education. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.

MEADE, E. J. jr. 1970. Foreword. (In Weinstein, G. & Fantini, M. D. Toward humanistic education: a curriculum of affect. New York: Praeger Publishers. Forward p. 9-11.)

MELICHAR, D. 1983. A leap of faith: the new right and secular humanism. *English journal*, 72(6):55-58.

MERRY, U. & BROWN, G. I. 1990. The neurotic behavior of organizations. New York: Gestalt Institute of Cleveland Press.

MILLER, W. C. 1971. Education and the emerging humanist movement. Ohio State University. (Ph.D. dissertation.)

MONTESSORI, R. 1986. Look to the child. (In Hartman, W., ed. To educate the human potential. (Unpublished conference lecture.) Pretoria: Montessori Society. p.1-5.)

MORRIS, V. C. & PAI, Y. 1976. Philosophy and the American school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

MOSES, M. & DICKENS, C. 1980. Three misconceptions about humanistic education. *Educational Leadership*, 38(3):227-228.

MOSHER, R. 1976. Education for human development. (In Weller, R. H., ed. Humanistic education: visions and realities. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation. p. 159-195.)

MURRY, A. H., BRADLEY, H., CRAIGIE, W. A. & ONIONS, C. T., eds. 1978. The Oxford English dictionary. Vol. 1 & 7. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

NASH, P. 1965. Book review: 'how children fail' by John Holt. *Harvard Educational Review*, 35:378-381, Summer.

NASH, P. 1975. Some historical antecedents to humanistic education. *Journal of education* (Boston), 157(2):8-19.

NASH, P. 1980. Humanism and humanistic education in the eighties: the lessons of two decades. *Journal of education* (Boston), 162(3):5-17.

NEVIL, D. D., ed. 1977. Humanistic psychology, new frontiers. New York: Gardner Press.

NEWMAN, J. W. 1994. America's teachers: an introduction to education. 2nd ed. New York: Longman.

NORD, W. 1977. A Marxist critique of humanistic psychology. *Journal of humanistic psychology*, 17(1):75-83.

NYBERG, D., ed. 1975. The philosophy of open education. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

O'BANION, T. 1978. Innovations in humanistic education. *Community College Review*, 5(3):21-27.

ODEN, T. C. 1972. The new pietism. *Journal of humanistic psychology*, 12:24-41.

OLAFSON, F. A. 1971. Humanism and education. (In Deighton, L. C., ed. The encyclopedia of education. New York: MacMillan. 4:519-523.)

OLTHUIS, J. H. 1972. To prod the "slumbering giant". (In Vriend, J., et al. To prod the "slumbering giant": crisis, commitment, and Christian education. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation. p.15-41.)

OLTHUIS, J. H. 1976. I pledge you my troth: a Christian view of marriage, family, friendship. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

OLTHUIS, J. H. 1978. Visions of life and ways of life: the nature of religion. (In De Graaff, A. H. & Olthuis, J. H., eds. Toward a Biblical view of man: some readings. Toronto: Institute for Christian Studies. p. 162-190.)

OLTHUIS, J. H. 1985. An integral anthropological model. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (J3-9).

OLTHUIS, J. H. 1993. Be(com)ing: humankind as gift and call. *Philosophia Reformata*, 58(2):153-172.

OLTHUIS, J. H. & ZYLSTRA, B. 1972. An educational creed. (In Vriend, J., et al. To prod the "slumbering giant": crisis, commitment, and Christian education. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation. p. 167-170.)

O'NEILL, W. F. 1969. Selected educational heresies. Glenview, Ill: Scott, Foresman and Company.

O'NEILL, W. F. 1983. Rethinking education. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.

OUWENEEL, W. J. 1986. De leer van de mens: proeve van een Christelijk-wijsgerige antropologie. Amsterdam: Buijten & Schipperheijn.

OUWENEEL, W. J. 1989a. De mens als religieus wezen. *Philosophia Reformata*, 54(1):44-64.

OUWENEEL, W. J. 1989b. Is het hart tijdelijk of niet-tijdelijk? *Philosophia Reformata*, 54(1):103-108.

OUWENEEL, W. J. 1993. Supratemporality in the transcendental anthropology of Herman Dooyeweerd. *Philosophia Reformata*, 58(2):210-220.

PATTERSON, C. H. 1973. Humanistic education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

PATTERSON, C. H. 1977a. Foundations for a theory of instruction and educational psychology. New York: Harper & Row.

PATTERSON, C. H. 1977b. The self in recent Rogerian theory. (In Avila, D., Combs, A. W. & Purkey, W. W., eds. The helping relationship sourcebook. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. p. 200-206.)

PERLS, F. S., HEFFERLINE, R. F. & GOODMAN, P. 1973. Gestalt therapy: excitement and growth in the human personality. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

PETERS, R. S. 1972. Reason and passion. (In Peters, R. S., ed. Education and the development of reason. London: Routledge & Paul. p.208-229.)

PETERS, R. S. 1975. On 'freedom to learn'. (In Rich, J. M., ed. Innovations in education: reformers and their critics. New York: Allyn & Bacon. p.104-110.)

PETERSON, M. L. 1986. Philosophy of education: issues and options. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

PHENIX, P. H. 1982. Promoting personal development through teaching. *Teachers college record*, 84(2):301-316.

PHILLIPS, W. M., WATKINS, J. T. & NOLL, G. 1974. Self-actualization, self-transcendence and personal philosophy. *Journal of humanistic psychology*, 13(3):53-73.

POWER, E. J. 1982. Philosophy of education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

PRIMACK, R & ASPY, D. 1980. The roots of humanism. *Educational Leadership*, 38(3):224-226.

READ, D. A. & SIMON, S. B., eds. 1975. Humanistic education sourcebook. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

REGAN, S. D. 1989. Journal review: an examination of the Journal of Humanistic Education and Development. *Journal of Humanistic Education and Development*, 28(1):2-8, Sep.

RICH, J. M. 1971. Humanistic foundations of education. Worthington: Charles A. Jones.

RICH, J. M. 1975. Innovations in education: reformers and their critics. New York: Allyn & Bacon.

RICH, J. M. 1977. On educating the emotions. *Educational theory*, 27(4):291-296.

RICHARDS, W. J. 1996. Postmodernism: an attempt at a delineation, exploration and evaluation. (Unpublished article in Seminar on Postmodernism and Education at the PU for CHE.)

RIDDERBOS, H. 1978. The Biblical words for man in the Pauline writings. (In De Graaf, A. H. & Olthuis, J. H., eds. *Toward a Biblical view of man: some readings*. Toronto: Institute for Christian Studies. p. 53-66.)

ROBERTS, C. 1979. The three facts of Humanism and their relation to problems of science and education. *Teacher's College Record*, 80(3):564-585, Feb.

ROBERTS, T. B., ed. 1975. *Four psychologies applied to education*. New York: Wiley.

ROGERS, C. R. 1951. *Client-centered therapy*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

ROGERS, C. R. 1955. Persons or science? a philosophical question. *The American Psychologist*, 10:267-278.

ROGERS, C. R. 1961. *On becoming a person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

ROGERS, C. R. 1962. Toward becoming a fully functioning person. (In Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. *Perceiving, behaving, becoming*. Washington D.C.: ASCD. p. 21-33.)

ROGERS, C. R. 1969. *Freedom to learn*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

ROGERS, C. R. 1973. My philosophy of interpersonal relationships and how it grew. *Journal of humanistic psychology*, 13(2):3-15.

ROGERS, C. R. 1974. Can learning encompass both ideas and feelings? *Education* (Milwaukee), 95(2)103-114.

ROGERS, C. R. 1975a. The interpersonal relationship in the facilitation of learning. (In Read, D. A. & Simon, S. B., eds. *Humanistic education sourcebook*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. p. 3-19.)

ROGERS, C. R. 1975b. Bringing together ideas and feelings in learning. (In Read, D. A. & Simon, S. B., eds. *Humanistic education sourcebook*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. p. 39-49.)

ROGERS, C. R. 1977a. The characteristics of a helping relationship. (In Avila, D., Combs, A. W. & Purkey, W. W., eds. *The helping relationship sourcebook*. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. p.3-18.)

ROGERS, C. R. 1977b. The interpersonal relationship in the facilitation of learning. (In Avila, D., Combs, A. W. & Purkey, W. W., eds. *The helping relationship sourcebook*. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. p.127-143.)

ROGERS, C. R., ed. 1983. *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.

ROSSITER, C. M. jr. 1976. Maxims for humanizing education. *Journal for humanistic psychology*, 16(1):75-80.

RUBIN, L. J., ed. 1973. *Facts and feeling in the classroom*. London: Ward Lock.

RUSHDOONY, R. J. 1980. Introduction. (In Dooyeweerd, H. *In the twilight of Western thought*. Nutley: The Craig Press. Introduction p. 7-16.)

SCHOEMAN, P. G. 1978. Elementere grondbegrippe van die pedagogiek. *Fokus*, 6(3):793-817, Aug.

SCHOEMAN, P. G. 1980. *Introduction to a philosophy of education*. Durban: Butterworths.

SCHOEMAN, P. G. 1985. Historical and fundamental education. Pretoria: De Jager HAUM.

SCHOEMAN, P. G. 1988. Wysgerige pedagogiek. Pretoria: Sacum Beperk.

SCHROTENBOER, P. G. 1978. The nature of religion. (*In De Graaf, A. H. & Olthuis, J. H., eds. Toward a Biblical view of man: some readings. Toronto: Institute for Christian Studies. p. 145-161.*)

SCHULTZ, D. P. 1977. Growth psychology: models of the healthy personality. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

SECKINGER, D. S. 1976. The Buber-Rogers dialogue: theory confirmed in experience. (*In Jelinek, J. J. Philosophy of education 1975-1976. Tempe: The Far Western Philosophy of Education Society, Arizona State University. p. 107-113.*)

SEERVELD, C. 1988. On being human. Ontario: Welch.

SEISS, R. 1981. Humane Padagogik. Bad Heilbrunn/OBB: Verlag Julius Klinkardt.

SEVERIN, F. T. 1973. Discovering man in psychology: a humanistic approach. New York: McGraw-Hill.

SHAPIRO, P. G. 1983. Confluent education: paradigm lost? *Journal of humanistic psychology*, 23(2):85-96.

SHINN, R. L. 1968. New directions in theology today, Vol.6. Man: the new humanism. London: Lutterworth.

SHUMAN, R. B. 1980. Toward refining the humanistic perspective. *Journal of education*, 14(3):91-103.

SILBERMAN, C. E. 1970. Crisis in the classroom. New York: Random House.

SIMMOES, A. 1976. The myth of the open classroom. *Education* (Milwaukee), 97(2):183-186.

SIMPSON, E. L. 1976. Humanistic education: an interpretation. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger.

SKINNER, B. F. 1971. Beyond freedom and dignity. New York: Knopf.

SMEDSLUND, J. 1972. Becoming a psychologist: theoretical foundations for a humanistic psychology. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

SNYGG, D. & COMBS, A. W. 1959. Individual behavior: a new frame of reference for psychology. New York: Harper & Row.

SONNIER, I. L. 1982. Holistic education. New York: Philosophical Library.

SPIER, J. M. 1979. An introduction to Christian philosophy. (trans. Freedman, D. H.). Nutly: The Craig Press.

SPROUL, R. C. 1986. Lifeviews. Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell.

SPYKMAN, G. J. 1985. Spectacles: Biblical perspectives on Christian scholarship. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (J2-7).

STAFLEU, M. D. 1991. Being human in the cosmos. *Philosophia Reformata*, 56(2):101-131.

STAHL, R. J., HUNT, B. S. & MATIYA, J. C. 1980. Humanism and behaviorism: is there really a difference? *Educational leadership*, 38(3):230-231.

STEENSMA, G. J. & VAN BRUMMELEN, H., eds. 1977. Shaping school curriculum: a Biblical view. Terre Haute: Signal.

STEIN, J., ed. 1984. The Random House college English. New York: Random House.

STENSRUD, R. H. 1984. Selfactualization. (In Corsini, R. J., ed. *Encyclopedia of psychology*. New York: Wiley. p.281-282.)

STEYN, J. 1989. Die nie-logies-analitiese aspekte van menswees by enkele Neo-Humanistiese opvoedkundige denkers. PU for CHE. (M.Ed. dissertation.)

STEYN, J. 1990. Die onderwysbenadering van enkele Neo-Humanistiese pedagogiese denkers. *Koers*, 55(2):221-233.

STEYN, J. 1993. Transpersonale onderwys van die New Age-beweging: 'n evaluering en perspektiefstelling. *Koers*, 58(2):183-194.

STOKER, H. G. 1933. Die wysbegeerte van die skeppingsidee of grondbeginsels van 'n Calvinistiese wysbegeerte. Pretoria: J. H. De Bussy.

STOKER, H. G. 1967. Oorsprong & rigting 1. Kaapstad: Tafelberg Uitgewers.

STOKER, H. G. 1970. Oorsprong & rigting 2. Kaapstad: Tafelberg Uitgewers.

STRAUSS, D. F. M. 1978. Inleiding: immanente kritiek, transendentale kritiek en transendente kritiek. (In Strauss, D. F. M., Smit, J. H. & Schoeman, P. G., eds. *Kompendium vir studente in die wysbegeerte en die wysgerige pedagogiek*. Part 1. Durban: Butterworth. p. 1-10.)

STRAUSS, D. F. M. 1990. Die mens en sy wereld. Bloemfontein: TEKSKOR BK.

SUTICH, A. J. & VICH, M. A. 1969. Readings in humanistic psychology. New York: The Free Press.

SWISHER, J. D., VICARY, J. R. & NADENICHEK, P. 1983. Humanistic education: a review of research. *Journal of Humanistic Education and Development*, 22(1):8-15, Sept.

TALJAARD, J. A. L. 1976. Polished lenses. Potchefstroom: Pro Rege Press.

TALJAARD, J. A. L. 1980. Preface. (*In* De Graaf, A. H. *Psychology: sensitive openness and appropriate reactions*. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (F2-17). Preface p. 1-2.)

TALJAARD, J. A. L. 1995. *Die sewende dag*. Piet Retief: Veritas Persvereniging.

THOMAS, S. M. 1985. Humanistic counseling. (*In* Husen, T. & Postlethwaite, T. N., eds. *The international encyclopedia of education*. New York: Pergamon. 4:2348-2350.)

TROOST, A. 1986. Moment uit een reformatorishe-antropologische karakterleer en deugdentheorie. *Philosophia Reformata*, 51(1,2):45-66.

TROOST, A. 1989. Kritiek van dr. J. D. Dengerink op de antropologie van H. Dooyeweerd. *Philosophia Reformata*, 54(1):65-82.

VALETT, R. E. 1963. *The practice of school psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

VALETT, R. E. 1967. *The remediation of learning disabilities: a handbook of psychoeducational resource programs*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Fearon Publishers.

VALETT, R. E. 1969. *Modifying children's behavior*. Belmont, Calif.: Fearon Publishers.

VALETT, R. E. 1974. *Self-actualization*. Niles, Ill.: Argus Communications.

VALETT, R. E. 1977. *Humanistic education: developing the total person*. Saint Louis: The C. V. Mosby Company.

VAN BELLE, H. A. 1977. W. A. Smit: mens en persoonlijkheid. *Philosophia Reformata*, 42:78-86.

VAN BELLE, H. A. 1980. Basic intent and therapeutic approach of Carl R. Rogers: a study of his view of man in relation to his view of therapy, personality and

interpersonal relations. Toronto: Wedge publishing Foundation.

VAN BRUMMELEN, H. 1972a. Towards a radical break with the public school curriculum. (*In* Vriend, J. *et al.* To prod the "slumbering giant": crisis, commitment, and Christian education. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation. p. 69-92.)

VAN BRUMMELEN, H. 1972b. Walking with God in the classroom: Christian approaches to learning and teaching. Ontario: Welch.

VANDENBERG, D. 1975a. Openness: the pedagogic atmosphere. (*In* Nyberg, D., *ed.* The philosophy of open education. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. p. 35-53.)

VANDENBERG, D. 1975b. Making sense out of 'existential thought and education'. (*In* Jelinek, J. J. Philosophy of education 1974-1975. Tempe: The Far Western Philosophy of Education Society, Arizona State University. p. 23-36.)

VANDENBERG, D. 1979. Existential and phenomenological influences in educational philosophy. *Teachers college record*, 81(2):166-191.

VANDENBERG, D. 1983. Human rights in education. New York: Philosophical Library.

VANDERSTELT, J. C. 1972. The struggle for Christian education in Western history. (*In* Vriend, J., *et al.* To prod the "slumbering giant": crisis, commitment, and Christian education. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation. p. 45-65.)

VAN DER WALT, B. J. 1978a. Horizon: surveying a route for contemporary Christian thought. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (IRS F3-10).

VAN DER WALT, B. J. 1978b. Heartbeat: taking the pulse of our Christian theological and philosophical heritage. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (IRS F3-9).

VAN DER WALT, B. J. 1982. *Visie en wetenskap*. Potchefstroom: Pro Rege.

VAN DER WALT, B. J. 1990. *Being human: a gift and a duty*. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (IRS F2-49).

VAN DER WALT, J. L. 1978. *Concept of science and the practice of educational science*. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE. (D.Ed. thesis.)

VAN DER WALT, J. L. 1980. *Opvoedkunde as lewende wetenskap*. Durban: Butterworth.

VAN DER WALT, J. L. 1982a. The possibility of a Christian science (of education/pedagogics). *Focus*, 10(2):2067-2080, June.

VAN DER WALT, J. L. 1982b. Die navorsingsmetode van die fundamentele opvoedkunde. *Koers*, 47(1):28-44.

VAN DER WALT, J. L. 1983. Geestelike weerbaarheid op die skole. (In Van Der Walt, B. J., et al. *Geestelike weerbaar of weerloos*. 3rd ed. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (F3-8). p. 39-57.)

VAN DER WALT, J. L. 1985. *Enkele irrationalistiese strominge in die fundamentele opvoedkunde*. 2nd ed. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (J2-3).

VAN DER WALT, J. L. 1987. Education in the perspective of the kingdom of God. (In Van der Walt, B. J. *Educational challenges in Southern Africa in a Christian-Reformational perspective*. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (IRS F3-30). P.15-22.)

VAN DER WALT, J. L. 1989. Exchanging ideas with Stuart Fowler. *Koers*, 54(3):395-403, Sep.

VAN DER WALT, J. L. 1992. *Fundamentele opvoedkunde en die ontisiteit van opvoeding*. Pretoria: RGN Uitgewers.

VAN DER WALT, J. L. & DEKKER, E. 1983. Fundamentele opvoedkunde vir onderwysstudente. Pretoria: Media Publikasies.

VAN DER WALT, J. L., DEKKER, E. I. & VAN DER WALT, I. D. 1985. Die opvoedingsgebeure: 'n Skrifmatige perspektief. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (F3-18).

VAN DER WALT, J. L. & POSTMA, W. 1987. Strominge in die opvoedingsteorie. Vol.2. Hillcrest: Owen Burgess Publishers.

VAN DYK, J. 1972a. Building a curriculum with the kingdom vision. (In Vriend, J., et al. To prod the "slumbering giant": crisis, commitment, and Christian education. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation. p. 93-115.)

VAN DYK, J. 1972b. Towards a basic framework for a Christian general education curriculum. (In Vriend, J., et al. To prod the "slumbering giant": crisis, commitment, and Christian education. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation. p. 171-189.)

VAN NIEKERK, A. A. 1996. Postmodern thinking and education. (Unpublished article in Seminar on Postmodernism and Education at the PU for CHE.)

VAN WYK, J. H. 1974. Die implikasie van 'n Christlike mensbeskouing vir die opvoedkunde en opvoeding. (Unpublished notes.) Potchefstroom: PU for CHE (57/74).

VAUGHAN, W. H. 1970. Toward an anarchistic theory of education: a systematic examination of the educational thought of Paul Goodman. Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky. (Ph.D. dissertation.)

VENTER, I. S. J. 1985. History of education: origin, fundamental structure, nature and being. Durban: Butterworths.

VITZ, P. 1977. Psychology as religion: the cult of self-worship. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

VON MEYENFELDT, F. H. 1978. The Old Testament meaning of heart and soul. (In De Graaf, A. H. & Olthuis, J. H., eds. *Toward a Biblical view of man: some readings*. Toronto: Institute for Christian Studies. p. 67-76.)

VRIEND, J. *et al.* 1972. To prod the "slumbering giant": crisis, commitment, and Christian education. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation.

WATERINK, J. 1980. Basic concepts in Christian pedagogy. Ontario: Paideia Press.

WEINSTEIN, G. 1971, Trumpet: a guide to humanistic psychological curriculum. *Theory into Practice*, 10:196-203, June.

WEINSTEIN, G. 1974, Trumpet: a guide to humanistic psychological curriculum. *Theory into Practice*, 13:335-432, Dec.

WEINSTEIN, G. 1975. Self-science education: the trumpet. (In Read, D. A. & Simon, S. B., eds. *Humanistic education sourcebook*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. p.373-382.)

WEINSTEIN, G., 1987a. Erziehung des Selbst. (In Fatzer, G., *Ganzheitliches Lernen: humanistische Padagogik und Organisationsentwicklung*. (trans., Fatzer, G.). Paderborn: Junfermann -Verlag. p. 161-167.)

WEINSTEIN, G. 1987b. Die richtigen Fragen stellen. (In Fatzer, G. *Ganzheitliches Lernen: humanistische Padagogik und Organisationsentwicklung*. (trans., Fatzer, G.). Paderborn: Junfermann - Verlag. p. 281-285.)

WEINSTEIN, G. & FANTINI, M., ed. 1970. *Toward humanistic education: a curriculum of affect*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

WEINSTEIN, G. & FANTINI, M. 1975. Affect and learning. (In Read, D. A. & Simon, S. B., eds. *Humanistic education sourcebook*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. p.101-112.)

WELLER, R. H., ed. 1976. **Humanistic education: visions and realities.** Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

WERNER, H. D. 1982. **Cognitive therapy; a humanistic approach.** New York: N. Y. Free Press.

WILDS, E. H. & LOTTICH, K. V. 1970. **The foundations of modern education.** New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

WILLERS, J. C. 1975. Humanistic education: concepts, criteria and criticism. *Peabody journal of education*, 53:39-44.

WILLIAMS, A. J. & FOSTER, L. B. 1979. The rhetoric of humanistic education. *The journal of educational thought*, 13(1):37-46.

WOLTERS, A. M. 1985. **Creation regained: Biblical basics for a Reformational worldview.** Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.

WOLTERSTORFF, N. 1980. **Educating for responsible action.** Grand Rapids: Christian Schools International Publications.

WOODWORTH, R. S. & SHEENAN, M. R. 1964. **Contemporary schools of psychology.** London: Methuen.

WYNN, R., DE YOUNG, C. A. & WYNN, J. L. 1977. **American education.** New York: McGraw-Hill.

YAFFE, E. 1980. Public education: society's band-aid. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61(3):452-454.

YOUNG, W. 1952. **Toward a Reformed philosophy.** Grand Rapids: Piet Hein Publishers.

YOUNGUE, E. N. 1977. **Proponent's views of humanistic education as a factor in fostering learning.** Pittsburgh University. (Ph.D. dissertation.)