

0. Introduction

0.1 Exordium

We are one world. We all, as human beings, share the same natural destiny and as such must work towards coexistence and sustainable global solidarity. The motivating question to this research is: In today's multi-cultural, multi-national, multi-racial, multi-religious world, with a variety of interests, values and goals, do we really have the possibility of a just co-existence – with just political structures, a just distribution of world's resources, with the chances of education and maintenance for all, equal respect and a just participation in global economy and environmental sustainability, and above all, the possibility of collective survival?

My answer to this question is: Yes we do. I am motivated to sound positive since I place much hope on the young and in their potentiality towards influencing the future of humanity. I thereby propose a pedagogical approach of bringing the young up with global values. I see therein an avenue to the possibility of interculturality and global solidarity, sustainability and a just co-existence of humanity.

My hope in the young is not unfounded. The young is the future. A world devoid of children lacks humanity for its future dynamics. At the same time, human world devoid of values is doomed to experience a sort of anthropomorphic cataclysm. The younger generation of today is seen as the human "survival guarantor" for tomorrow; and investing in and acquainting them with real human values is to ensure the authentic survival of humanity – not just a part of it, but the entire global human order. The only prospect of success in the endeavor of protecting the global humanity is educating our young people with values, not just for the interest of particular regions, but rather, in view of the human being – globally.

In this work, our basic foundation (part one) will be to establish the dignity of the child as a human person, which qualifies him for the task of pursuing global human values. Our primary image of the child is that he is, although imperfect, a being with inalienable dignity; an intact but young human who is open for development; a being capable of receiving training, and a being entitled to an up-bringing into human freedom, values, authenticity and identity.

The task ahead demands clarity and as such requires a fundamental distinction of some existing images of the dignity of the child as a human person. Here, we shall try to examine the disparity between Rousseau and Kant. For the former, "alles ist gut, wie es aus den Händen des Schöpfers kommt; alles entartet unter den Händen des Menschen".¹ Rousseau sees the child as good enough when it comes

¹ ROUSSEAU, J.J., *Emil oder Über die Erziehung*, (Herstellung: Ferdinand Schoeningh) Paderborn 1971, 9.

into the world. Any attempt at training the child by human standards, is seen as a corruption of his original nature. For Kant, on the other hand, “der Mensch kann nur Mensch werden durch Erziehung. Er ist nichts, als was die Erziehung aus ihm macht”.² Kant means that the human being becomes really human only through upbringing. Man is nothing outside what he is trained to be.

I will argue for a third position, which will, in a way, synthesize the two existing extreme poles. That means: I believe that the child is good from nature and has dignity, but also requires training and education in order to actualize his authenticity. I will substantiate my position with some philosophical, theological and Africo-theosophical anthropologies and worldviews (*Weltanschauungen*). The child, for the African, is good; a gift from God; a blessing as well as a responsibility. The gift of a child is a signal that one enjoys the favour of and a good relationship with the ancestral gods. The presence of a new child in the family is a sign of the continuity of life, and also insurance for the parents that they would be taken care of in their old age. This future hope imposes the obligation and responsibility on the parents to do all in their power in order to bring up, educate and train the child adequately for the future. I therefore acknowledge the African belief that the child, as a gift of God, is in itself good (similar to the position of Rousseau), but also needs to be actualized through education (Kant’s position) to be adequately equipped during his development for the task ahead. This synthesis will influence our discussion on bringing up the child with global values.

In part two, we shall consider how educational psychology generally, (if allowed to wear African clothes – that is to say: indigenization of education for all regions of the world), can be a stepping stone towards equipping the young with global values. In different parts of the world, the education of the child has witnessed different tones in different ages: authoritative, unauthoritative and democratic forms of education. Looking into the original African traditional style of educating and bringing up the child, we realize that, in the African pedagogy, the basic and local guiding principle is participation and companionship; although, as a result of foreign contacts, some external influences usually set in as we shall see in the example with the successive development of the educational process in Nigeria.

Meanwhile, this pedagogy of participation and companionship involves the traditional educational method of learning by doing. The child takes active part in the life of the society and is allowed to exercise some minor functions, which help him learn. In most cases, the parents, elderly guardians or teachers are present mainly to control the progress of these learning exercises. Children are normally encouraged to do things themselves. However, sometimes, this process may be abused and turn to “child labour”. Furthermore, Storytelling/singing is a wonderful means of educating and transmitting values. The elderly narrate to

² KANT, I., *Über Pädagogik* (Hrsg. von T. Dietrich), Bad Heilbrunn 1960, 9.

children the old traditional stories furnished with wisdom and cultural and religious/moral values cherished in the society. The children often try (in their plays, for example) to implement the lessons they learn from these stories or songs. Above all, the objectives of traditional education – like the development of moral character, community participation, cultivation of values such as respect for authority, development of physical, intellectual, technological and vocational skills, etc – are goals that can/should serve not only the local but also the global community. With this African example, we advise and also expect the objectives of educating, in all regions of the world, to be geared not only to local needs, but also towards the solidarity of the global human community.

In part three, we shall discuss the child as a developing identity, bearing in mind that only the adequate development of the young in any part of the world can guarantee the adequate development of the entire global human community. The different facets of development – biological, mental/linguistic, emotional, social and moral – must be taken seriously as the major ways of unfolding the potentials loaded in the young human. Also we cannot lose sight of guaranteeing the needs and rights of the child as prerequisites for his proper development into self-awareness and self-actualization.

This wish for authentic development is today confronted by many challenges which form the fourth and last part of our work. *Firstly*, poverty is a reality and has become a quagmire. Many children in many parts of the world are subjected to the risks of barely struggling for survival under economic hardship and poverty. Some are condemned to poor living conditions; poor feeding, no good healthcare, some have no chances of education, and those who do, must sometimes learn without the relevant learning materials. In short, in most cases, children have nothing to live on. Why do we have this persistence of poverty (relative or absolute), all the efforts towards its alleviation notwithstanding? We shall suggest ways out of this quagmire, since its further toleration is catastrophic; bearing in mind that child poverty has a circle of sustainable shadow of effects. The absence of security in daily life and future exposes the young to all sorts of dangers. This is a great challenge of our time.

Secondly, the media poses a great challenge. We presume to know what we do with the media, but do we really know what the media do with us? We cannot underestimate the impact of what the media technology like television, computer and internet facilities, make on or out of the young people of our present age. It is a fact that the media is an indispensable part of human life. The media offer, no doubt, a wide range of help, when positively used, in socializing our children. But their abuses can be very catastrophic. The media and the internet could be called the “hidden educators” of our age. The “values” they transmit call for assessment and evaluation. We shall examine the associated dangers and suggest means towards a responsible use of the media. For the good of the human world, therefore, we call on those in charge of educating the young to em-

brace this challenge, and take their obligations seriously, as regards directing our future generation towards a responsible use of the media.

Thirdly, the greatest challenge of today is that: With the help of modern technological advancements, the world is becoming a “global village”. And since a community of humans cannot do without values, the quest for global values for the global human community is growing loud; and as such should today, nationally, internationally and interculturality, be a pedagogical priority. We must work towards the globalization of human family through education. We shall argue for the idea of global community and the possibility of global values. We are thereby faced with the challenge of creating a new form (not concentrated on economy) of globalization that should begin with people’s mentality and worldview; a mentality that feels and fights for all, one that sees the globe collectively as ours; one that seeks values which can serve local as well as global interests; a mentality that pursues sustainable justice for all; one that encourages the solidarity of humanity as value in our world, irrespective of colour, race, language, culture, religion or nationality. This solidarity we are yearning for embraces: partnership and fraternal solidarity (hospitality, friendliness and love of neighbour); gender solidarity; intergenerational solidarity; and accepting some sort of inter/multiculturality in our societies. The sense of justice is the key route to such a sustainable solidarity.

To actualize our ideals, the present world needs a “value-mental-set” that should unite and not disintegrate the different peoples of mankind. This is only possible through (re)educating ourselves; convincing ourselves that we are one world; and handing on to the young, a culture of *solidarity of humanity* with the present and future generations, “*Nachhaltigkeit*” – *Sustainability* in a habitable environment; we need a “mind-set” of culture towards “live and let live” – a culture of recognizing and respecting one another. This view, seen as the way forward, should and must be (in my opinion) the major task of intercultural pedagogy, which our age imminently can no longer do without. In such a present-day multidimensional global community, are these not enough challenges calling for action?

Before delving into these challenges, let us first reiterate the fact, as a matter of necessity, that the child, just like every human, is a being with dignity, good in nature, but unfinished (imperfect) at birth. This is an anthropological fact. And it is this human imperfection that makes education relevant for the actualization of human authenticity.

0.2 The Anthropological Facticity: Man enters the world as unfinished Being

“*Uwa-ezu-oke*” (the world is imperfect). This wise saying of the Igbo race in Africa is a perfect expression of the deficiency of earthly beings. Our world and everything in it is imperfect, including man. This imperfection, however, does not make the human being simpler or less complex. The human person is a being that no sci-

ence has been able to describe fully and completely – because of his complexity, namely: imperfection on the one hand and enormous potentiality on the other hand. According to W. Brede, in his article “*Mängelwesen*”, the unfinished nature of man is prominent in the comparison between man and animals, “...und bezieht auf die dem Menschen eigentümliche Verschränkung von biologischer Benachteiligung und geistigen Fähigkeiten.”³ He means that the unfinished nature of man becomes more outstanding in the intermingling of the biological disadvantages with the intellectual/mental capabilities and potentialities in human nature.

Man has the capability of taking care of and bringing himself up, as well as making something better out of himself. This capacity endowed on man has turned into a responsibility for him to develop himself and his world. Guido Pollak associated this element of anthropology to Karl Popper’s concept of “the fallible human individual that is endowed with reason and responsibility, and thus, obliged to reason and responsibility.”⁴ The actualization and transfer of this endowment into an obligational responsibility remains the assignment of education and upbringing. No other earthly being has the privilege like man, despite his imperfections, to determine or change his world, and has the impetus to talk about himself, evaluate himself and evaluate other beings.

It remains an anthropological fact that the human person needs up-bringing in order to actualize his authenticity. Etymologically, anthropology means the science of man and aims at describing and explaining man on the basis of the biological and socio-cultural characteristics of his nature, without ignoring the related differences and variations in human society. Meanwhile, before the invention of anthropology as a concept by the philosophical faculties of the German universities at the end of the 16th century to refer to the systematic study of man as a physical and moral being, man had always thought about himself and tried to describe himself – giving himself an image. Following recorded history, already the 5th century BC witnessed great assertions of man concerning himself. The Sophist – Protagoras⁵ articulated the principal formula of what we today call anthropology thus: *Man is the measure of all things*. Not long afterwards, Socrates adopted and incorporated into his teaching the saying borrowed from the oracle of Delphi: *Man know thyself*. He added later that man should think about himself to discover ways of improving himself: *the unexamined life is not worth living*.⁶

The questions about and the investigations into the human nature was also not ignored by the medical writings of Hippocrates, the biological and political

³ BREDE, W., “Mängelwesen”, in: *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, Vol.5, (hrsg. K. Gründer, et.al), Darmstadt 1971- 2007, 712-713.

⁴ POLLAK, G., “Critical Rationalism and Educational Discourse”, in: *Kritik* (ed, G. Zecha), 1995, 123.

⁵ See PROTGORAS, *The Dialogues of Plato*, in: *Great Books of the Western World*, Vol.6, (ed, M.J. Adler), Chicago 1996, 38-64.

⁶ SOKRATES – APOLOGY (38), *The Dialogues of Plato*, in: *Great Books of the Western World*, Vol.6, (ed, M.J. Adler), Chicago 1996, 200-212. (see also ALCIBIADES)

writings of Aristotle, or even Plato. Even in the writings of the Neoplatonists, the discussion about the unfinished nature of man was a glaring issue. Here the human realm was inferior to the transcendent in dignity; its truth was degraded and obscured by bodily existence. As a result, man was not self-sufficient; he did not form an autonomous region of being because in the final analysis, his destiny was governed by extrinsic influences. This extrinsic influence was theologized in the medieval era – where the human being did not and could not have existed in and for himself; his status and image was that of a creature of God, whose thoughts and actions were to be ordered in such a way as to reflect the supremacy of God and of religious values.⁷

Blaise Pascal, a French scientist and religious writer of the 17th century, described man as a wonderful and mysterious being, with self-contradictory potentials; a being capable of surpassing his natural limits in quest of authenticity.⁸ For him, man is neither an angel nor a beast; therefore, it is fruitless trying to understand man either as a fallen god or as an animal raised to a higher state. Pascal however, attempting to place man in his proper perspective, denounced the ego as loathsome. In any case, we can deduce from his arguments the fact of human complications and the undeniable imperfections in human nature despite his enormous potentials.

J.G. Herder of the 18th century also gave a lasting interpretation of man. He emphasized that man is similar but stronger than the animals. The lack – “Luecken und Maengel” – cannot be the last characterization of human nature. In the centre of this “lack” lie the alternatives. “Unser Mangel an natürlicher Kunstfähigkeit wird wettgemacht durch Vernunft, unser Mangel an Instinkt durch Freiheit”.⁹ This means that the human lack in natural art and skill is augmented through reason, and the lack of instinct is augmented through freedom. Along this line, Herder correlated the philosophy of man with biology and was cited by H. O. Pappe as having invented “the conception of man as a deficient being who must compensate for his lack of natural tools and weapons by the creative use of weapons and technology.”¹⁰

Following the same viewpoint of human inadequacy, the British philosopher – John Locke stated, in his *Essay concerning Human Understanding*, that man should recognize himself as an “intellectual native of this world”; but however not an absolute subject; rather an incarnate consciousness with all the inadequacies and

⁷ GUSDORF, G.P., *Anthropology, Philosophical*, in: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol.1, (ed, M.J. Adler), Chicago 1979, 975-985.

⁸ PASCAL, *Religiöse Schriften* (Hrsg. von H. Luetzeler), Kempen 1947, 52.

⁹ HERDER, J.G., “Über den Ursprung der Sprache”(1772), in *Werke*, 5 (Hrsg. von B. Suphan), 1891, 22-28.

¹⁰ PAPPE, H.O., “Philosophical Anthropology” in: *Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* (ed, P. Edwards), London 1967, 159-166.

limitations of human reality.¹¹ Man is born with “substance” – which is the source of his identity; and this substance constantly yearns for actualization and authenticity. To achieve this goal, upbringing and education are unavoidable.

Man’s awareness of his unfinished nature and at the same time of his high potentiality and the ability to aspire towards his actualization could also be identified from such fundamental questions from Immanuel Kant (the 18th century philosopher): What can I know?¹² What ought I to do?¹³ What may I hope?¹⁴ In his Ethics, Kant emphasized that the human being, irrespective of his limitations and imperfections, should not be treated as a means to be used in the service of obscure and contradictory interests that disjoint the human image, rather the human person should be considered an end in itself. Kant tried to distinguish physiological Anthropology, which is the study of man’s natural limitations, from pragmatic Anthropology, which deals with man’s potentialities, and what he as a free agent makes of, or is able to make of, or ought to make of, himself. J. Ennemoser also emphasized the dual extremes of human nature. For him the lack lies in the physical strength of man, but mentally, the human being is above nature and the lord of the earth “*ja! Herr der Erde*”.¹⁵ Man is a creature, but also creates. The totality of the double tendency of man: ‘man as a creature’ and ‘man as creator’ of his cultural values (at least) is the study of philosophical anthropology – but gives us the insight regarding the fact of man’s unfinished nature ‘as a creature’; and his challenges ‘as creator’ towards his authenticity. Man’s ability to create his cultural values confirms our belief that he has the capacity also to create global values if he wants and is ready to see the global community as one entity.

Meanwhile, in the process of his development towards authenticity, man must be looked at as a human-person *in toto*. Man is a being *sui generis* as opposed to the Cartesian dualism of body and soul.¹⁶ Man is a being with aspirations; essentially a *homo absconditus*, inscrutable, and still remains an open question. This image of man is contrary to the traditional extremisms of dividing body and soul (which typically emphasizes the ineluctable natural limitations of man and the determined aspect of his nature, and thus ignores his freedom and historicity); and of empiricism and subjective idealism (which has almost lost itself in meta-

¹¹ LOCKE, J., *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, in: *Great Books of the Western World*, Vol. 33, (ed, M.J. Adler), Chicago 1996, 83-395

¹² KANT, I., *The Critique of Pure Reason*, in: *Great Books of the Western World*, Vol.39, (ed, M.J. Adler), Chicago 1996, 1-250. (See also *The Critique of Practical Reason*, Ibid, 289-361).

¹³ KANT, I., *The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics*, Ibid, 363-379.

¹⁴ KANT, I., *The Critique of (Teleological) Judgement*, Ibid, 459-613.

¹⁵ ENNEMOSER, J., *Anthropologische Ansichten*, 1828, 38f.

¹⁶ Descartes analyzed the human being as an entity composed of two substances: the thinking substance (*res cogitans*) and the relational substance (*res extensa*); and these for him summarize the human existence: “*cogito ergo sum*”.

physical speculations). The open nature of man is such that he must formulate his destiny so that he is not held rigidly in one role but safeguards his creative freedom. Man's choices regarding the direction, in which this freedom permits him to fulfill himself, depend on his philosophical understanding of his own position in the world. According to Pappe, "an infinite variety of choices is open to man. What distinguishes man's nature is not how he chooses, but that he does choose – that he is not determined by his biological and physiological constitution, but is formed in the light of cultural values he himself has created and internalized."¹⁷ This process of internalization of values begins already from birth and childhood, and deserves assistance through education so as to achieve the authentic human.

The fundamental image we have of the child (which would influence our discussions on how to educate him) is that he is a human being; born completely as person; and open to all the deficiencies (which are to be augmented) as well as potentials (which are to be actualized) due to human nature. Based on this, the child or every young person has human dignity in all its ramifications. And since they will form the basic subject of our discussion, the child or the young¹⁸, represents a typical example of the unfinished nature of the human being. Man arrives in the world as person, after about nine months of gestation, but certainly not powerful enough to face the difficulties of existence. According to Friedrich Nietzsche, another German philosopher of the 19th century, "Man is an unfinished animal"¹⁹. In this unfinished nature, man lacks the capability to face the challenges confronting him as human being. He tries to create a world that will enhance his authenticity. He then becomes really human mainly through education and upbringing (Kant).

In the 20th century, people like M. Scheler began to interpret the human deficiency in a positive direction. He understands the lack in human nature as a means for man to liberate himself from the pressure of his organic nature.²⁰ And A. Gehlen sees the lack as an avenue to find compensation. He does not mean compensation for human reason and self-determination, rather compensation in the sense of formation and discipline. And that is the essence of education. Man is not only a cultural being, but also has addictions, and as such needs discipline. "So ist der Mensch schon rein physisch angewiesen auf Disziplinierung, Zucht, Training, auf eine geordnete Beanspruchung von oben her."²¹ That explains why

¹⁷ PAPPE, H.O., *Ibid*, 162.

¹⁸ These two terms – Child and Young – would be interchangeably used in this research, without much emphasis on their terminological differences, to represent all young people in dare need of intercultural upbringing and values.

¹⁹ NIETZSCHE, F., *Beyond Good and Evil*, in: *Great Books of the Western World*, Vol. 43, (ed, M.J. Adler), Chicago 1996, 459-545

²⁰ SCHELER, M., *Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos*, in: *Werke* 9 (Hrsg. M. S. Frings), 1976, 38-71.

²¹ GEHLEN, A., *Anthropologische Forschung*, 1970, 38. (see also: *Der Mensch*, 1976).

the human physically needs and depends on discipline, breeding and training from a higher (older) being.

For the human being, upbringing is inevitable, even though he is good from nature. We can learn from observations that young animals, although not self-sufficient at the time of their birth, are much closer to self-sufficiency than the newly born human child. The human species has longer period of gestation than other beings and has the longest infancy, which still seems insufficient in equipping man. The human gestation period is prolonged by an extra-uterine gestation during which the infant builds up its bodily organs and at the same time undergoes the fashioning effected by the family and social environment. And “prior to any conscious and organized education, even before the beginnings of articulated language, the infant undergoes an initial education that establishes patterns of sensorimotor coordination and sets into action a training process in accord with the values of the surrounding environment. By the time of self-consciousness, an individual has already been structured by years of continual fashioning, which have left him with only restricted latitude for self-initiative.”²²

Every new born child learns to speak with the words of others existing before him. He learns to feel as well as to act in terms of the pedagogical schemes imposed by the environment. Even before birth, the intra-uterine existence of the human embryo is to a great extent influenced by the mother’s style of life. To this effect, the respective confines of biological and cultural existence cannot be exactly determined, but the idea of some form of biological inscriptions of culture onto the human species of being cannot be completely rejected. This is why the Swiss biologist – Adolf Portmann said that human heredity, in its own proper way, is not essentially genetic, but social.²³ It is true that the human person composes of genes of previous generations. It is also true that the human being is the product of culture; just as it is equally true that men produce culture. These truths balance themselves, and each includes and complements the other. *Man is both the creator and creature, producer and product of culture.* In the same way, *man’s worldview is both the creator and creature of his values.* This fact and its awareness play a very important role in influencing the upbringing of the child.

When we talk of bringing up the young with global values, we refer to the values that are relevant for him to lead his life as a global citizen – a life authentic and befitting to him as a human person; a life that can guarantee living together in the society with other human beings; a life along with the global humanity. Such values could be socio-political, cultural or religious in nature. However, they are not sharply dichotomized from each other. They are all interwoven in their daily applications. Important is that they lead towards a just solidarity of humanity. The child, on his part as individual human being, according

²² GUSDORF, G.P., *Anthropology, Philosophical*, in: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol.1, (ed, M.J. Adler), Chicago 1979, 981

²³ See PORTMANN, A., *Biologie und Geist*, Basel, 1956

to G.P. Gusdorf, is also “considered the subject of fundamental values. He does not create these values; rather he receives them from the various pressures of the world in which he lives. Nevertheless, they only have authority over him to the extent that he commits himself to them. This commitment to values serves as a framework for the exercise of a freedom that differs significantly from the theoretical and speculative freedom of traditional philosophy.”²⁴ The freedom in question must be practical enough to enable him fit into the human society.

One thing is clear: To the extent that the individual has not given himself existence, and finds himself thrown into the world, where he does not live alone, the individual cannot possess complete and absolute freedom without limit. His freedom must not and may not endanger the freedom of others. Human freedom is interdependent. Complete freedom may only be reached by way of conditional freedom – that is, a search for a certain amount of order, in which the individual attempts to imprint his personal mark on the circumstances that surround him and seem to determine the course of his life in his freedom. This can only be realized through a proper educational process and value-loaded upbringing.

Guido Pollak²⁵ elaborates an educational process in line with W. Brezinka²⁶ who differentiates between the statements of: – *science of education* (scientific system of statements according to the analytical theory); – *philosophy of education* (the non-scientific but nonetheless meaningful and important statements expressing the goals of education and their justification); – *Praxeology of education* (non-scientific but nonetheless meaningful and important statements for all aspects of educational practice). Any proper education should be in the position to combine these processes and maintain their standards – it must be *scientific*, *philosophical* and at the same time *practical*. This is the methodological approach we are going to take in discussing how to bring up the young with global values. In this methodology, in addition to the philosophical, we shall also apply some psychological, theological, Africo-theosophical principles, as well as the pedagogical principle of recognition and respect to argue our case. Naturally, we shall carry on this task without losing sight of our image of the child as a being with human dignity. A more detailed deliberation on this image is here appropriate.

²⁴ GUSDORF, G.P., *Anthropology, Philosophical*, in: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol.1, (ed, M.J. Adler), Chicago 1979, 983.

²⁵ POLLAK, G., “Critical Rationalism and Educational Discourse”, in: *Kritrat* (ed. G. Zecha), 1995, 116-149

²⁶ Confer BREZINKA, W., *Philosophy of Educational Knowledge: An Introduction to the Foundations of Science of Education, Philosophy of Education and Practical Pedagogy*, Dordrecht, 1992.