



OUTLINE

A. Anthropological Presuppositions

B. The Nature and Objective of Christian Education

C. The Ultimate Objective of Primary and Secondary Education

1. The Dilemma of Humanistic Education

2. The Nature of Theoretical Thought



In order to determine the nature and content of a particular course of studies and the pedagogical procedures necessary to achieve the objectives of any part of the curriculum of the elementary and secondary school, we are in need of a frame of reference. For any particular course of studies is always the more or less conscious and more or less logical outworking of a specific view of man and education. The purpose of this paper is to explore the implications of a Christian view of man and education for a specific course of studies.

A. Anthropological Presuppositions

Every theory of education presupposes a certain anthropology. From Montessori's methods to Dewey's creedal statements, every educational theory is founded upon a religiously slanted theory concerning human nature. It would not be difficult to demonstrate the truth of this thesis. All discussions of detailed educational questions, therefore, ought to be preceded by a consideration of our anthropological starting point. Especially when we start to work out a specific course of studies, the need for a more thorough analysis and a deeper foundation becomes apparent.

To ask what the aim, curriculum and methods of a particular program of studies ought to be like, is to ask what man's task is like and what role the school ought to play in preparing the child for this calling. These practical questions concerning an aspect of the curriculum and methodology immediately confront us with the question concerning man: his nature and calling.

There is a certain view of man abroad on the North-American continent that has permeated the great majority of books and articles on psychology and education. It is this common view of man that has shaped the great variety of learning theories, principles of education, and, ultimately, the scope and content of most curricula. Before we focus our attention upon a Christian theory of man, we should briefly summarize this commonly accepted anthropology and the religious views upon which it rests. For if we do not keep this anthropological a priori in mind, we shall be constantly led astray by the educational principles, teaching techniques and curricula based upon this view of man.

For most psychologists and for many educators, man is nothing more than a "biological organism". Through a process of evolution this organism has been endowed with a very complex nervous system, which, through a complicated learning process, has enabled the organism to elevate itself above the level of the other animals. According to this conception, there is no essential difference between the animal and man. Like all other animals, man begins life as a biological organism. And like all other organisms, man is subject to various natural forces and stimuli, both inner and outer. These stimuli create many tensions or needs, which the organism tries to reduce or satisfy.

Slowly on, through a complicated process of learning (cf. the many learning theories), the child, or rather, the organism develops a number of habitual responses to the inner and outer stimuli affecting him. All together these habitual ways of responding to different forces become the organism's personality. Basically the child remains an organism, but through the learning process he can become a person, or, rather, develop a personality. Within this perspective the term "person" and "personality" are used interchangeably. Man's personality is never anything more than a function of the organism. It functions to satisfy basic and learned needs.

Within this anthropology the complexity of human behavior is reduced to a few basic drives. All man's wants, all his decisions, and all his actions are considered to be completely determined by these natural forces. Conscience, religious ideals, political behavior, economic practices, moral values are all conceived as the outcome of the interaction between the organism and the environment. Whatever social or cultural characteristics man may have, they are all secondary or acquired traits that serve to satisfy his basic needs. At best man is a social animal.

When a particular response to a certain cue is properly rewarded, a child will learn to behave in the desired way. If he is rewarded after cleaning up his desk or finishing his lesson, he will most likely respond in a similar way next time he is required to perform the same task. And every time a particular response is rewarded, the desired behavior becomes more fixed. Thus a child learns to be neat and prompt. Neatness and promptness are conditioned responses. A particular way of behaving is not a question of obedience, or of learning to submit oneself to certain norms. Learning the correct responses is a completely natural process.

Good teaching is a matter of skillfully manipulating a system of rewards and punishments. If a child does not respond in the desired way, he has simply not been motivated properly. Within this perspective, therefore, it is of the utmost importance to have a detailed understanding of the natural needs of the child and the different stages of the learning process. For once these needs and this process are understood, the behavior of the child can be more directly influenced and controlled. Just as animals are trained, so, in time, through skillful manipulation, it can be possible to condition children to respond in the desired way.

Summarizing, we can say that man is a bio-social organism, a complex animal that has a number of basic natural urges that he wants to satisfy. Moreover, since man is a herd animal, he also has some learned needs. His different needs and urges, therefore, must be satisfied in the approved way. Such is man in North-American perspective.

Over against this hedonistic, completely secular, reductionistic view of man as a biological organism and human learning as a natural process, we can only pose the Christian confession concerning man as a religious being, created to respond to God's Revelation. Because this Humanistic conception of man is not a mere theory or a model designed to interrelate a limited set of experimental data.

secular psychologists and educators are religiously committed to this view of man. To free ourselves from the powerful grip of this religious force, it is not sufficient to dissociate ourselves intellectually from this concept of man. It is only when we commit ourselves with all our heart to what God reveals to us about man, and it is only when we daily persevere in our faith, that we can hope, by God's grace and the power of his Spirit, to overcome this demonic force that is busy destroying our North-American civilization.

According to the Scriptures, man has been created by God in such a manner that he can hear and respond to God's Word. Through his Word, God speaks to the heart of man, to the religious center of his existence. Daily, all mankind is addressed by the living God. Man cannot escape this powerful Word of God. (cf. Rom. 1) Being born anew by God's regenerating Word, man once more serves his Creator and Redeemer, or, daily suppressing the Truth, man serves some imagined Absolute. Thus man's entire life is religious service either of God or an idol.

This Scriptural Revelation concerning man's religious nature means that all human relationships, all events, all human activities, including teaching and learning, are of a religious nature and are done either unto God or some pretended god. Both teaching and learning are normed and responsible activities.

B. The Nature and Objective of Christian Education

The anthropological perspective referred to above is determinative for a Christian theory of education. First of all, it prevents us from misinterpreting education as a bio-social process, in which the educator's primary task is to create the best possible environment for the growing organism and to provide the right learning opportunities and stimuli at the various stages of development. Educational progress is indeed founded upon, thus, presupposes the organic and physical development of the child, but development or progress in an educational sense belongs to a different category. Educational development is a pedagogical concept which can only be measured by educational norms. Such development cannot be compared to an organic process, because educational progress or growth does not take place according to biotic laws. Human development is not a natural process. Human development requires pedagogical influence and interaction. It requires real guidance and the exertion of real formative power.

If the term nurture or education is to have any meaning at all, we must maintain that education always implies a conscious and deliberate attempt on the part of the educator to lead the child or the adult in a particular direction according to certain norms. To nurture always means to exercise formative power over the individual development of people's lives. The term power or control, however, as used in this connection, must not be taken in the sense of physical force or psychical influence. Education is fundamentally different from forcing someone to submit to one's will, from emotional overpowering, from "mental engineering", or from persuading someone by logical argumentation.

In the exercise of formative power we are bound to the nature of our object. This is true when we mould a piece of clay or technically shape some other material, and it is also true when we attempt to train an animal. In all such forming, if it is to be successful, we are bound to the peculiar features and possibilities of the material, or, in the case of animals, to their peculiar psychic nature.

A human being, however, man's personality, can never be an object in this sense, since he always remains a subject, even when he is being formed. To treat a person like an object, or to train him like an animal, would be a violation of his human nature. Such mental engineering, of which we see the more or less faint traces in all upbringing and teaching, and which has become an awful reality in the brainwashing of political prisoners, constitutes a demonic temptation for all educators.

Education requires a fundamental respect for those we seek to educate, because they are human beings made in the image of God, created to respond to his calling. Man as such, as a unique individual human being, as a religious unity, can and ought never to be the object of our pedagogical moulding. Our forming can only direct itself lawfully to the various aspects of a person's existence, in order that he may be the better prepared for his life's calling.

Any teaching-learning process which does not respect and appeal to a person's religious selfhood, must be considered a violation of his human nature. In a manner that is in keeping with the age level of the child, parents and teachers should always appeal to the personal responsibility of the child. Children are called to seek guidance and to submit themselves to the education given. Depending on their age level, they are responsible for the manner in which they react and submit to the guidance they receive. As religious beings, children ought to be given the freedom to relate * God-given calling. Education, therefore, always ought to take place within the context of personal responsibility and co-operation. Forming must always lead to self-forming, for those who are being nurtured always remain free, responsible, human subjects.

Just as the child is responsible for taking to heart the guidance he receives, so the teacher is held responsible for the way he guides. The power which he exercises over people in pedagogical forming is not a personal privilege or a particular skill that he may use as he pleases. He may not just follow his own whims or wishes, nor is he free to use whatever means he considers suitable to achieve his purposes. He can act contrary to these norms and pursue an unpedagogical line of conduct, but he ought not to do so. Education which does not help pupils to become more independent and responsible, invariably turns into a pure demonstration of power and domination, or it becomes a subtle form of manipulation and mechanical conditioning which differs only in degree from brainwashing. Such anti-normative guidance can only result in stubborn rebellion, fearful submission, or it gives rise to mechanical, mass-behavior. In the long run, such violation of human nature leads to a decline of a society or to complete totalitarian control of the masses which sooner or later gives rise to a revolutionary reaction.

* the guidance they receive to their inner selfhood and to their....

Summarizing we can say that both teaching and learning are normative and responsible activities, for which a person is accountable to God. The pedagogical desire to form on the part of the educator ought to demonstrate itself in his respect for and appeal to the religious selfhood of the one being formed, and the pupil ought to have the freedom and the responsibility to take the guidance that is given to heart.

After this description of the nature and limits of all forms of education, our description of the ultimate objective of education can be rather brief.

Since the Christian has no other task in life than to love God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself, all forms of education should ultimately serve to give guidance with respect to this religious calling. Genuine Christian education should always lead to radical discipleship. Wherever the adult is placed, whatever the child's abilities or limitations, whatever his peculiar personality traits, he must learn to submit his life to God's will. His one and only task is to serve God according to his ordinances, unfolding and developing his creation for the benefit of all mankind, witnessing to and raising signs of the coming of God's kingdom. He has no other calling than to testify in all his activities to the newness of life in Jesus Christ. This is his reasonable service: to offer his very self, the worship of his mind and heart, his total creaturely existence to God and thus to become God's co-worker. The educator is bound to this revelation concerning man's vocation in life. To prepare the child for this radical discipleship and to give the adult guidance with regard to this calling must be the ultimate aim of all types of forming, including the instruction that takes place within the Christian school.

This Scriptural revelation concerning the meaning of man's existence in this in-between-time excludes every idealistic or humanistic goal for education. Neither the skilled or cultured person, nor the integrated or socially adjusted personality, neither the self-reliant person, nor the responsible citizen, neither the converted individual, nor the devout and pious Christian can serve as the ultimate goal for education. All such personality ideals are basically humanistic and incompatible with the Scriptural witness concerning man's religious nature.

As soon as one of the aspects of man's functional existence is absolutized, whether this man's faith life or the development of his personality, his communal life or his basic organic drives, when one of these limited sides of his life becomes the final aim of education, the meaning of human life is falsified and distorted. In that case education becomes an instrument for the self-glorification of man or his society, which, ultimately, can only lead to his condemnation and to the disintegration of his society. Man has only one calling and that is to serve God with his entire existence and his neighbor as himself.

C. The Ultimate Objective of Primary and Secondary Education

If the ultimate goal of all forms of nurture is to prepare the child for his religious calling in life and not, for example, to foster Christian, human growth, how does this goal come to expression in the ultimate objective of the primary and secondary education? Perhaps the best way to indicate the ultimate objective in the school is to focus the attention upon the different responsibilities each person faces when he reaches adulthood. Regardless of whether or not a person goes on to college and regardless of a person's specific future vocation, all people share certain common responsibilities in life. Since all children are required to complete primary and (most of their) secondary education, the school ought to prepare its pupils for these common tasks and not first of all for a specific vocation or college.

Very briefly, these common life tasks can be described as follows. Each person is called to take up his responsibilities within the fellowship of believers. Each person hopes to be married, start a new family and raise children. Each person is called to give sexuality its rightful place within an abiding truth relationship. Each person is faced by and tempted by un-free love. All persons, once they have come of age, are called to take up their responsibilities as citizens of a particular country. They must all make choices with regard to what constitutes justice, freedom, equality, or, whether or not (if ever) a war is justified, and a great many other questions related to the task of the state. In the same way, every person is called to engage in some kind of work and to make decisions with regard to the use of resources, possessions, the problem of poverty and the fair distribution of income. Each person is confronted by the dominating role of technology and planning within the economic sphere. All people bear responsibility with regard to recreation, the mass media. All are confronted by different forms of art. All must give a certain style to the arrangement of their house and their way of living. All will be neighbors to someone. All will live in a certain area or neighborhood. All will establish many inter-personal relationships. All bear responsibilities with regard to the relations between the different races. Furthermore, every one is called to seek and further emotional health. Everyone has a calling to care for different types of handicapped people. Every one ought to seek and further physical well-being and care for the aged. All are confronted by sickness and death. Finally, all people bear responsibility for their physical environment and the planning of neighborhoods and cities. Together these common tasks and responsibilities constitute a person's religious calling in life, and it is with respect to this calling, which is basically one calling (to love God above all else and our neighbor as ourselves), that the school ought to provide fundamental guidance.

Although the ultimate objective of the nurture during childhood and adolescence by different institutions and organizations can be described in similar terms (the one religious calling), yet each educational agency has its own peculiar task in the total upbringing of the child. The church, for example, must help the young person to take up the full responsibilities of his church membership when he comes of age. The entire program of the church's educational ministry during this period* when the church instructs, it ought to do so in keeping with its nature as a fellowship of believers. Thus, both with respect to its specific aim and the peculiar nature of its instruction, the church has its task in the total upbringing of the child.

The same holds true for parental nurture, to give another example. The parents task can perhaps be described best in terms of leading the child to independence. They ought to lead their children in such a way that they can take up their responsibilities independently when they reach adulthood. All the guidance the child receives ought to be geared to this ultimate goal of parental nurture. Parents must work themselves out of their job as it were. The nurturing within the home also has its own peculiar character, which it derives from the intimate love (troth) relationship which constitutes the family. Again, both with regard to the specific aim and the peculiar nature of its education, the family has its own special task in the total upbringing of the child.

In the same manner the elementary and secondary school have their own special place within the child's education, limited both by the specific aim of the school and its peculiar character as an academic community.

If all the nurture and instruction the child receives from different educational agencies has the same religious direction, there can be and there ought to be a harmonious integration and a wholesome co-operation, with each agency making its own special contribution.

Within the total upbringing of the child, it is specifically the school's task to form the child's analytical functioning in order that he may gain a deeper understanding of his many-sided religious calling in life. The child's thinking must be opened up to the great diversity and the integral unity of God's creation. He must be opened up to the structural norms that hold for creation in order that he may come to a deeper understanding of his place and task in life. Like the church and the home, the school goes about its task in its own peculiar way as an academic institution. It seeks to form in a systematic, disciplined manner, always helping the child to discern the regularities (regula) of God's creation as they are given (Creational Revelation) in experience. In view of the history of educational theory and practice and the influence of Pragmatism (Dewey) upon education, the above description of the peculiar nature and task of the school's instruction may give rise to considerable misunderstanding. It may be useful, therefore, if not mandatory, to present a somewhat more detailed exposition.

* of a person's life must be geared to this specific goal. Moreover....

1. The Dilemma of Humanistic Education

There is a perennial problem that plagues educational theory and practice. In one way or another, the teacher is continually confronted with the question whether a school ought to be subject orientated or child orientated. This dilemma has characterized education since the time of the Reformation and the Renaissance. Within the educational sphere this dilemma is an expression of the general antinomy underlying all Humanistic thought and practice in greater or lesser degree. From the Humanistic point of view the problem is indeed insoluble and the Humanist has no choice but to move back and forward between the two poles of the antinomy. Unless we become more clearly aware of this basic question and find a Christian answer, we too will continue to be swept along by the force of this religious dilemma. If we can work out a Christian solution to this problem, however, we will also have found the perspective needed for developing a genuinely Christian curriculum that is truly in keeping with our starting-point. It is the Christian philosopher who can help us see these issues more clearly and who can set us on the right track for solving the problem.

Let us explore this matter in somewhat greater detail. Humanistic thought has always been driven by the religious motive of nature versus freedom, which comes to expression in the dilemma between the science ideal on the one hand and the personality ideal on the other hand, or, within the educational sphere, in the dilemma between the subject orientated school and the child orientated school. Humanism keeps wavering back and forward between these two polar opposites. If the one pole is emphasized, the other pole suffers, and vice versa. The one absolutization automatically calls forth its polar opposite. Today, North-American education is dominated by the personality ideal and as a result the subject matter has been pushed to the background. This emphasis on the child, his developmental needs, his growth in present-day education was called forth by the one-sided emphasis on the subject matter during the previous century.

The intellectualism within education during the previous century manifested itself quite concretely in the tendency to identify the abstract concept with the real thing. Whenever this happens the children are required to identify all the bones of the bird, for example, without every studying the real birds. Then not the blue heron, the hawk, or the owl is the important thing, but only the abstract biological concept "bird". In this manner I learned about birds in highschool. If I remember correctly, we had to draw the skeleton of a chicken. Whatever the bird, it really made no difference. We could have cared less. During the summers, when we were out roaming the woods, that is when we learned about the real birds. As a result of those experiences, I became so interested in birds that I bought several books on the subject, and up till today I greatly enjoy observing the chickadees, nuthatches, finches, woodpeckers, wrens, blackbirds, brown creepers, and thrushes that visit our backyard.

way
In the same way that chickens and chickadees become merely birds within this perspective, water becomes merely H₂O, and lightning nothing more than an electrical discharge. This tendency to identify reality with its logical or physical aspect can truly be called intellectualism, or, a grade worse, verbalism, when the abstracted concept becomes more important than the real thing. When this happens, then children are made to memorize the names of cities and rivers, or kings and prophets, without ever relating these names to the real countries and the real meaning of the Bible stories, as is done for example in all the Bible stories of the NUCS for grades 4,5 and 6. In such instances, pupils often merely learn to say and memorize the words, without any content or meaning, just mere words.

The opposite pole, the personality ideal, which is so prominent today, manifests itself in the tendency to make the child and the development of his personality the main concern. It can be seen as a reaction to the intellectualism and verbalism brought about by the domination of the science ideal during the previous era. Sad to say, the Christian schools have by and large been under the influence of the driving motive of Humanism. When public education was intellectualistic, so was Christian education. When the public schools began to react to this cold, lifeless intellectualism, the Christian schools in many instances followed suit, or, perhaps more often, they stuck to and defended the old rationalistic ideal, thinking it to be more Christian. Seen in this light, the modern developments have a great deal to say, also to our Christian schools, permeated as they were, and in many instances still are, by the old science ideal with its rationalistic approach.. And it is understandable that many Christian educators today are deceived by this situation. Compared to the intellectualistic approach, the modern child centered school indeed seems like a great improvement.

However, neither of these two types of education is in keeping with the Christian perspective, for in both man is the measure of things. It really makes very little difference religiously whether the norm is man's scientific knowledge or man's personality. If we are truly going to develop a Christian educational system in North America, we must radically break with the inwardly contradictory tendencies of Humanistic thought and practice. When I say this, I do not mean to imply that we cannot learn anything from secular education; that would be a foolish conclusion. In fact, I am of the opposite opinion, but that is a different matter. The point that I want to make right now is that if we are going to develop an integrally Christian curriculum, we must radically break with secular thought and map out a new course that is directed by God's Revelation.

2. The Nature of Theoretical Thought

One of the guiding principles for the development of a Christian course of studies must be our understanding of the nature and function of theoretical analysis. If the school's task is to be described as the forming of the child's analytical functioning, we ought to be very clear about this matter.

Within a truly Christian perspective, analytical distinguishing will always have a very limited place. All of creation indeed has a "knowable" side, or better, an analytic side. However, this analytic side is only one of the many aspects of concrete things, events, relationships or activities. Things, plants, animals, events, or activities can be analytically distinguished from one another. We can perceive differences and gain insight into complex situations. But our knowledge of creation is much fuller and richer than that which we can analytically distinguish and comprehend. We cannot analytically explain the nature of love or faith or justice, for example, yet we truly know what it means to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ or to love someone or to do justice. Believing, loving, doing justice have an analytic side, but our experiential knowledge of these things cannot be reduced to their analytic side. Knowledge can never be identified with analytic thought. To know someone or something is not the same as to be able to analytically distinguish some things about a person or thing. The knowledge we have of created reality and people simply cannot be grasped and mastered by analytic thought. We can only thoughtfully approach reality with wonder and respect, but we shall never be able to comprehend reality.

In spite of this analytically incomprehensibility of human knowledge, we do truly know what it means to love, to believe, or to act justly. And in our analytically qualified acts of thinking we can systematically reflect upon our experience and knowledge. We can formulate our thoughts and communicate these thoughts to others, and when we do so, we are not just talking about "abstraction" but about genuine state of affairs. In our systematic reflection upon reality we are indeed limited to its analytical side, but that does not make our thoughts abstract in the unfavorable sense of unreal or speculative.

In our description of the nature and function of analytic thought we must guard ourselves against both rationalism and irrationalism. Instead, we must increasingly come to see the rightful but limited place of analytical distinguishing. This perspective is of the utmost importance for our classroom teaching. For once we have seen the rightful place of (theoretical) analysis, we shall neither deify analytical knowledge nor depreciate its significance. Instead we shall see it as one of the ways in which knowledge is deepened. This means that in truly Christian education, water, for example, could never be presented as merely H₂O, for that is only one aspect of concrete water as we experience it, namely the analytical account of its chemical composition. Real water has many more sides. Water has an organic function and as such it is a prerequisite for organic life. But water also has an economic function. People have to pay for the water that comes out of the tap. It has a recreational function. As soon as the lake water becomes polluted we take note of this fact again. The sight of a river or an ocean can make us feel sad or happy. Water can be a symbol and seal of the forgiveness of sin in baptism. The same things could be said about lightning, or any other concrete phenomena, activity or relationship.

Created reality has a richness and a fulness that we can never exhaust, comprehend or master analytically or in any other way. Even the so-called natural world cannot be conquered this way by the scientists. For there is no such abstracted, autonomous natural world subject to natural law.

No one can create the world after his own scientific image. Humanistic thought has tried to do so, but in vain. In order to master, comprehend reality, it first had to reduce reality to its so-called natural sides. For a while that seemed to work, and Western man was proud and believed in the future. It seemed he had conquered the world. Today we know better, for now we are reaping the bitter fruits of this disastrous reductionism. Modern man has lost the meaning of life and does not know where to turn. Even nature cannot comfort him any more, for water is only H₂O and lightning is merely an electrical discharge, and love is nothing more than the result of a sexual urge or a chemical imbalance.

Our understanding of creation and the place we give to scientific analysis is determinative for the education we provide for our young people. In our thinking we can thoughtfully reflect upon God's creation, no more and no less. We can analytically distinguish its different sides, but we cannot supplant reality with our concepts. To gain a true insight into reality, our thinking must be constantly guided by the divine norms that hold for all of creation. If it is to be truthful, far from grasping, subduing, and controlling created reality with our mind, our thinking must follow the lead of the structural laws and faithfully reflect the order of God's creation. In our analytical distinguishing we merely discern, observe, notice, perceive, and take cognizance of what presents itself in our experience. Scientific analysis has a very limited place and function. This principle must be one of our guiding principles in the development of an integral Christian course of studies.

This understanding of the limited nature and function of scientific analysis delivers us once for all from the inner antinomies of the educational theories and practices of Humanism. The specific aim of the Christian school is far from the science ideal of the older Humanistic type of education. It does not teach him to analyse for its own sake, nor does it absolutize analysis. There is indeed something truthful to be distinguished, but not for its own sake. The child must learn to distinguish truthfully in order that he may deepen his understanding of his place and task before the face of the Lord and thus be prepared for radical discipleship. Christian education does not find its focus in the forming of the child's thinking, but neither does it go in the other direction of making the child's growth the aim of its instruction. The child and the young person must be formed, but again, not for its own sake. The purpose of Christian education is never to foster the child's growth as an end in itself. The child's growth in and by itself is not so important, but whether or not the child learns to submit and surrender its life to God's ordinances, that is the important question.

Within this perspective the school indeed has a very limited place and task. Its primary task is to form the child's analytical functioning in order to prepare him for his many-sided religious calling in life. The reason for this limitation is to be found in the process of historical differentiation. It is a mistake to think of the school merely as a product of human civilization and not as divinely normed societal relationship, as the Synod of the C.R.C. did in 1955, but, nevertheless, the school in its present form could not arise until scientific analysis began to play a dominating role in society. As a result of this process of historical differentiation and individualization, the school now takes its limited place among many other educational institutions and organizations that prepare the child for his life task. The school, therefore, can and ought to limit itself to the forming of the child's analytical functioning as one dimension of the total* in keeping with its internal structure and the law structures that hold for other educational agencies.

If the school achieves its limited objective, it has achieved a great deal. Whatever else the child may gain by going to school, like respect, politeness, friendliness, co-operation, a sense of responsibility, the general development of his personality, a deepened faith, emotional maturity, and whatever else, these are the happy "by-products" as it were of good "academic" instruction, that is, of deepened insights in God's norms which he has taken to heart. The school need not and ought not to make any of these other matters the specific aim of its teaching. Moreover, things like values, attitudes, maturity, etc. should never be taught explicitly. The norms for different aspects of life should be taught, but not the specific subjective response to the norm. When* violated and the teaching invariably becomes moralizing.

It is primarily under the influence of the irrationalistic tendency of Pragmatism (Dewey) in reaction to earlier forms of Rationalism that Humanistic education has lost sight of the school's task as the forming of the analytical functioning of the child. In reaction to intellectualism, so-called progressive education has turned to "practical" knowledge life experiences, making the needs and the growth of the child the criterion for the curriculum. However, it is only when the limited place of theoretical analysis is acknowledged and its inseparable relation to concrete reality (analysis of concrete states of affairs) that the intellectualism of a rationalistic education can be truly overcome. The child orientated school has not really escaped this evil, at best it gives a less prominent place to analysis. To the extent the school gets away from the forming of the child's analytical discerning, it becomes a pseudo Sunday school, a pseudo family, or a club of one sort or another. As a result of this tendency many schools do not educate, they merely socialize.

If the rightful nature and function of analytic thought is recognized, we do not have to choose between a rationalistic education or an education that involves children in carefully selected life experiences. When we reflect on real life and when we do not reduce reality to our scientific concepts, there is no danger of intellectualism.

* upbringing of the child. This limited place of the school is...

* this is done the child's religious freedom and responsibility are.....

And when our analysis is truly analysis of created reality and real human experience and not mere speculation or autonomous abstractions, then there will also be genuine interest, for what is more fascinating than creation and human experience. The truthful discerning of the richness of God's creation has built in excitement and stimulates further study.

Once the limited objective of the school is recognized, we can also do full justice to the child's "needs", or rather, to his developmental limitations and possibilities. To further analytical discerning could never be an end in itself within the Christian perspective. For whether or not children learn to discern more adequately in and by itself is not important. The only important question is whether or not this particular child learns to understand his place and task in life. These pupils, with these peculiar personality traits, these family backgrounds, in this developmental stage must deepen their understanding of their religious calling before God. The scope of the curriculum and the methodological approach should rightly be geared to these "needs". In this respect too we must dare to be radical. Doing justice to these different factors would lead to a very different type of Christian school than we have at present.

Summarizing we can say that for the development of an integral Christian curriculum there are three inseparable givens. There is something truthful to be discerned; there is content; God's creation is ordered. The child is subject to a developmental law and this divine law also ought to be obeyed. Finally, there is a norm governing the teaching-learning process. None of these three givens may be absolutized. This child must be helped to discern the Truth. In the development of any part of the curriculum, we should not rest until we have done justice to all three givens.