

# Part I: Images of the Child



# 1. The Dignity of the Child as Human Person

The human being has different images of himself. Different people have different notions about the child. The basic foundation and the starting point as well as the goal of this research is the assertion of the dignity of the child as a human person. This fundamental basis, that every child is a person – in its entire ramification, will influence the approach and education we give to children. Such a positive image will help us appreciate the young, with the view to according them their due. Fundamentally, man sees himself as a being with dignity, although he enters into existence unfinished. He comes very weak on board but is loaded with full potential powers and capabilities. This is the reason why he needs upbringing and education for the actualization of his potentialities. H.O. Pappe pointed out that: “Man’s subjective image determines what he makes of himself. Animals are as nature has created them, but man must complete his character; nature has supplied only the rudiments of it. Man must form his own personality, and he does so according to his image of what he can and should be.”<sup>1</sup> The goal of the personality development of the child, as a being with dignity, transcends the individual, immediate/local societal interests, and must serve the interest of global humanity. This is our target.

A historical typology of man’s self-images shows that man first saw himself as *homo religiosus* – a view based on the Judaeo-Christian legacy of supernaturalism and its ensuing feelings of awe and of inherited guilt. Man next saw himself as *homo sapiens* – a rational being, but in harmony with the divine plan. The period of enlightenment gave birth to a naturalistic and pragmatic image of *homo faber* – man as the most highly developed animal, the maker of tools (including language), a being who uses a particularly high proportion of his animal energy in cerebral activities. The human body and soul are regarded as a functional unity. Human being and human development are explained by the primary urges of animal nature – the desire for progeny and the desire for food, possessions, and wealth. Man is basically seen as a working animal.

These three self-images of man have in common a belief in the unity of human history, and in a meaningful evolution towards higher organisation as being. People like Nietzsche and Feuerbach later invented the image of man as *homo creator* – the superman with absolute responsibility over his destiny. Meanwhile, the Nietzschean superman has been transformed into a stricter philosophical conception by Nicolai Hartmann, Max Scheler, and the Sartrean existentialists. Scheler called this view a postulatory atheism of high responsibility. In the new view of man, there must be no God – for the sake of human responsibil-

---

<sup>1</sup> PAPPE, H.O., “Philosophical Anthropology” in: *Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* (ed, P. Edwards), London 1967, 162.

ity and liberty. Nietzsche's well-known phrase "*God is dead*"<sup>2</sup>, which may have been primarily prompted by his wishes and feelings over this God who lets him suffer so much, as well as his critic on Christian civilization, is philosophically meant to express the ultimate responsibility (moral or otherwise) of man. Where there is a planning, all-powerful God, there is no freedom for man's responsibility to work out his destiny – he means.

Now, reacting to this view, one wonders how Nietzsche could be thinking about the liberty of human potentialities without giving a thought over the origin of these potentialities. In any case, man's awareness of his own self-images illuminates the whole range of his genuine potentialities so that his choice of an authentic form of life is not and should not be restricted by the narrowness of any view. The different views concerning the image of man can only represent, in my opinion, the different possible avenues, in which man can see and develop himself with the challenges of his existence. No individual view is absolute. This is also reflected in the variable views of the image of the child as a human being. Rousseau, on the one hand, and Kant, on the other hand, have introduced different images of the child. We shall transcend their different views and formulate our image of the child, which will guide our procedure in this work.

## 1.1 *The disparity between Rousseau and Kant*

*Rousseau's image of the child and how it affects upbringing:*

In his book, *Émile, ou de l'éducation* (1762) – *Emil, oder Über die Erziehung*, Rousseau (1712-1778) did not waste any time in formulating his theses. "Alles ist gut, wie es aus den Händen des Schöpfers kommt; alles entartet unter den Händen des Menschen.... Nichts will er haben, wie es die Natur gemacht hat, selbst den Menschen nicht".<sup>3</sup> Every thing is good the way the creator made it. Things degenerate in the hands of human beings. The human being doesn't want to accept anything, not even man himself, the way the creator made it. Man takes laws into his hands and tries to change everything into forms that will suit him. Rousseau's image of the human being generally is that the human being is good, but is basically corrupted by the society. He sees man as not performing well in sociability.<sup>4</sup> If the human being is "*zoon politicon*" as Aristotle claimed, Rousseau means that there should have been a peaceful harmony among men. Instead, men hate, cheat, betray, deceive and kill each other. These render man an unso-

<sup>2</sup> NIETZSCHE, F., *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft („la gaya scienza“)* 1882, zweites Buch, Aphorismus 125 „Der tolle Mensch“, *Sämtliche Werke*, Kritische Studienausgabe in 15 Bänden (KSA 3, 480.), hrsg. von Giorgio Colli und Mazzino Montinari, München, 1980.

<sup>3</sup> ROUSSEAU, J.J., *Emil oder Über die Erziehung*, (Herstellung: Ferdinand Schöningh), Paderborn 1971, 9.

<sup>4</sup> BACZKO, B., *Rousseau. Einsamkeit und Gemeinschaft*, Wien, 1970.

ciable being and derail him from the goodness of his natural state. That is why education must restore the goodness meant for the natural state of man.

On the one hand, the human being is good the way he is created; but on the other hand, he is wild in society. The human being comes too weak (at birth) into the world, but needs to be strong in order to survive in his wild environment. He needs sociability, but is confronted with aggression. He knows nothing and needs to reason. He comes with nothing and must face challenges; thus he must struggle. Therefore, he needs help. In short, what we lack from birth, but need as full-fledged human beings, is what we get through upbringing and education.

Plants are grown up. Animals grow up. But human beings are helped to grow up. Even when the potentials of strength are inborn in the human, he needs help to learn how to actualize and implement them positively. So, as Rousseau also submitted, the human being has three outstanding teachers: Nature, fellow humans and things in the environment. “Die Natur oder die Menschen oder die Dinge erziehen uns. Die Natur entwickelt unsere Fähigkeiten und unsere Kräfte; die Menschen lehren uns den Gebrauch dieser Fähigkeiten und Kräfte. Die Dinge aber erziehen uns durch die Erfahrung, die wir mit ihnen machen, und durch die Anschauung.”<sup>5</sup> This means that: Nature, Humans and Things around us educate and bring us up. Nature develops our capabilities, potentials and strength. Fellow human beings teach us the use of these capabilities. But things around us educate us through the experience we gain from them while looking at them, and coping with them in the environment. The three must be harnessed together before they can achieve the desired result of proper upbringing and education.

In the natural order, all men are equal. And it is the collective vocation of all men to be human. The privileges surrounding one’s birth and one’s choice of profession does not obliterate this natural order of being human in the first instance. And the greatest vocation of all is to live the life of a human being. The best upbringing entails the ability to bear the joys and sorrows involved in living the life of a human being. This flows automatically and naturally from learning, not just the words of the educators, but from their practical examples. That is why the role of parents and the family in the task of upbringing cannot be underestimated. We start learning from the first moment of our lives. Education begins from birth.

Although one must protect the child from danger and embarrassment, Rousseau, in addition, is of the opinion that the realities of life must be laid bare to him. One must teach the child to face the challenges of being human; and the ability to bear the different destinies of life: the acceptance of riches or poverty, city or a village life, life in the tropics or temperate regions of nature, good health or sickness, and even the reality of death. The art of living must be learnt. Living is not just breathing; living is the art of existing with all its ramifications. “Living is having the feeling of existing. What matters in life is not who becomes

---

<sup>5</sup> ROUSSEAU, J.J., *Ibid*, 1971, 10.

old, rather who has really lived. Some are buried one hundred years after they have really seized to live".<sup>6</sup>

Based on these many challenges, every young person needs a good teacher. The task of bringing up someone is not a light one. Thinking about a qualitative education calls into discussion the quality of the educator. He requires experience and firmness of character. The basic qualities of an educator should be: One who is himself well brought up. It cannot be imagined that someone who is not well brought up should take the responsibility of bringing up someone else. *Secondly*, the educator should always uphold the values of upbringing. He must possess such a character that enables his not being bought over with money to easily give up the qualities of good education. In other words, he must be someone who cannot be bribed to change his goal. In the words of Rousseau, „kein käuflicher Mensch zu sein.”<sup>7</sup> *Thirdly*, he must possess good knowledge and wisdom to be able to give the young a good sense of direction. Furthermore, he must have such a personality and dignity that should command the respect of the young. Also, the educator must possess the qualities of the young in order to earn their admiration and attention. Above all, he must have experience and technique to be able to carry the young along with his programme.

What about the things we learn without a teacher? It is the view of Rousseau that every child is from the first day of birth a pupil, not of any human teacher, but of nature. Every child has, from birth, the capability to learn. He has potentially everything a full-grown human person has, but these still need to be developed. His intelligence and rationality must develop. He has needs, but does not yet have or know the means to satisfy his needs. So he needs help, and his self-helplessness does not make him less human. As already said, the upbringing of a human being begins from birth. As early as he begins to feel, hear, see, talk, he has already begun to learn. These experiences precede any teaching.

If one could analyse his knowledge into two categories: what one knows from nature and experience on the one hand, and what one is taught by a teacher on the other hand, one would be surprised at the enormity of our natural experience. We learn more from experiencing our nature than from a teacher. But because we acquire much of the experience from nature even before we develop our intellect and reason, we take them for granted.<sup>8</sup> It is therefore not surprising that we can consciously recall more of the things we have acquired after the activation of our consciousness. Moreover, we are only able to make such analyses after our reason has been developed through teaching. So, the experiences we acquire directly from

<sup>6</sup> ROUSSEAU, J.J., *Emil oder Über die Erziehung*, (Herstellung: Ferdinand Schöningh), Paderborn 1971, 16.

<sup>7</sup> ROUSSEAU, J.J., *Ibid*, 23.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid*, 38.

nature notwithstanding, the young person still needs the direction of a more experienced person in order to harness his learning into the right direction.

Furthermore, education is necessary because experience can deceive if not rightly informed and well directed. Also, considering Rousseau's hypothetical natural state of man confronted with his unsociability; the major human instinct is that of self-love (*amour de soi*). With education and the awakening of conscience, this instinct will then be in the position to command the individual to seek his welfare with the least possible damage to others. In his direct words: "Sorge für dein Wohl mit dem geringstmöglichen Schaden für die anderen"<sup>9</sup> – care for your welfare with the least possible damage on the other. This is possible because in addition to self-love, Rousseau also sees empathy (*pitié*) and conscience as human qualities.

Following the fundamental thesis of Rousseau, no child is bad per se. The mistakes of childhood are merely signs of weakness and ignorance. Only reason enables us to distinguish the difference between good and bad. And as long as a child has not attained this age of reason, he cannot be held accountable for his mistakes. He only needs help and education. Only a developed conscience in alliance with reason can judge actions; and prior to its development, the child can take action without knowing if it is good or bad. At this stage, his actions still lack moral evaluations and judgment. So, it is not unusual to ask an adult why he is behaving like a child when he acts without reason and conscience. The Abbé de Saint-Pierre is for long accredited with the statement that 'the adult is just a bigger child'. We may here assert the opposite: the child is nothing less than a smaller adult. From this point of view, we can understand Rousseau's assertion that the child is good as he is created. The child wants to be active, and it is not evil if the results of his activity sometimes appear to be destructive or catastrophic. The creator of nature, who enables the child this activity, gives him also the ability to learn the right thing and correct himself with the actions and teachings of the adults and the surrounding environment. As the child grows, he is endowed with strength, and then his hyper-activity begins to reduce itself. He begins to learn comportment of self. The body and soul begin to balance each other and nature begins this time to demand only the necessary movements and activities.

The act of knowing and deciding what is necessary and what is not is still, at this stage, beyond the competence of the child. That is why the company of an educator is of absolute necessity. On the whole, Rousseau sees four steps as a necessary mental concept in the art of the upbringing of the child:

1. Children do not have enough strength to face the challenges of nature. In their trial and error, therefore, one must allow them (as long as this does not lead them to danger) to exercise the much strength they have from nature.

<sup>9</sup> ROUSSEAU, J.J., *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* (Abhandlung über den Ursprung und die Grundlagen der Ungleichheit unter den Menschen), Amsterdam, 1755.

2. One must assist and help them by augmenting what lacks in their strength to meet their needs.
3. In offering this help, one must concentrate on the important and responsible needs of children and avoid encouraging in them irrelevant wishes.
4. To achieve this aim, one must 'speak their language' and show understanding for their age. Through this, one can help them distinguish the levels of their wishes, and then enable them fulfil only those wishes which, by nature, correspond to and are good for their age.

Rousseau explains the reasons for this regulation. "Der Sinn dieser Regeln ist, den Kindern mehr wirkliche Freiheit und weniger Macht zu geben, sie mehr selbst tun und weniger von anderen verlangen zu lassen. So gewöhnen sie sich früh daran, ihre Wünsche ihren Kräften anzupassen, und fühlen weniger den Mangel dessen, was nicht in ihrer Macht liegt."<sup>10</sup> He means that the importance of this regulation is to give children real freedom and less authority; to let them do more and demand little from others. This is the way to help them from the early years of life to get used to synchronizing their wishes to their abilities. This helps them also not to remain perpetually in want for those things which are beyond them. This is the very important reason why one should give the young people freedom and room to live their lives and only control them when one believes they are pursuing irrelevant goals or getting into danger.

It is a mistake not to remember that a child remains a child until he grows. We should neither overburden them with the expectations of the adult nor undermine their capabilities as a result of their weaknesses. Rousseau adds: "Der Mensch ist sehr stark, wenn er nur ist, was er ist. Er ist sehr schwach, wenn er sich über sein Menschentum erheben will."<sup>11</sup> He means that the human being is strong if he remains that, which he is. But he is weak when he elevates himself above his humanness. One's real strength is in effect the strength of his ability. And every age has a corresponding ability. The adult must be seen as an adult and the child as a child. The child has the right to be a child and enjoy his freedom as a child. The highest property of the human being is the possession of freedom and not the possession of strength.<sup>12</sup> What distinguishes the human from lower beings is reason and freedom.

Regarding the freedom of the child, however, Rousseau does not advocate for an absolute freedom. He advises that the child must enjoy his freedom in relation to his natural state, just as the adult enjoys his in relation to the community. And because the child does not possess adequate knowledge, the exercise of his freedom should be directed. "Das Kind kennt seinen Platz nicht und kann sich

---

<sup>10</sup> ROUSSEAU, J.J., *Emil oder Über die Erziehung*, (Herstellung: Ferdinand Schöningh), Paderborn 1971, 46-47.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*, 58.

<sup>12</sup> RANG, M., *Rousseaus Lehre vom Menschen*, Göttingen, 1959.

nicht darin behaupten. Es findet tausend Ausbruchsmöglichkeiten. Es ist die Aufgabe derer, die es leiten, ihm die Kindheit zu erhalten. Diese Aufgabe ist nicht leicht. Es soll weder Tier noch Erwachsener sein, sondern Kind. Es soll seine Schwäche fühlen, aber nicht darunter leiden. Es soll abhängig sein, aber nicht gehorsam. Es soll bitten, aber nicht befehlen. Es ist anderen nur wegen seiner Bedürfnisse unterworfen, und weil sie besser wissen, was ihm nützt und für seine Erhaltung zuträglich oder schädlich ist. Niemand, auch sein Vater nicht, hat das Recht, dem Kind etwas zu befehlen, was nicht zu seinem Nutzen gereicht.“<sup>13</sup> Rousseau means here that the child does not know enough to claim his rightful place. And he finds readily thousands of escape routes. It is the responsibility of those who direct him to conserve his childhood. This is not an easy task. The child should neither be made an animal nor automatically an adult; rather he should be handled like a child. He should feel his weakness, but not suffer because of it. He may be dependent, but not to be subjected to obedience. He may ask, but not command. Because of his needs and because his director knows better what is good for him, or what could be dangerous, the child should therefore remain under authority. However, nobody, not even his father, has the right to command him to do what is not good for him.

Nature wants and also has a place for children in the structure of things. So children must be seen as children and not otherwise. If we try to change the order, we may only harvest unripe fruits in the name of adults. In this case we may call them: ‘adult children’: *educated children* (in terms of high education), or *old children* (in terms of advanced age). Such cannot be the wish and ultimate goal of any education. Therefore, as Rousseau observed, “Das Meisterstück einer guten Erziehung ist, einen vernünftigen Menschen zu bilden.“<sup>14</sup> – The masterpiece of a good upbringing is to rear up a responsible and reasonable human adult.

We said above that the child may be dependent, but should not be subjected to unnecessary obedience or made inferior because of his dependence. This is an attempt to protect his freedom.<sup>15</sup> The idea of dependence here has two aspects: dependence on natural things, and on human beings as representative of the society. Dependence on nature is outside the moral sphere and does not interrupt freedom. But the dependence on human beings has moral implications and is most often adversary to the natural order, breeds burden and can hinder freedom. To demand absolute obedience from children could limit or tamper with their freedom. It is a mistake to apply force or threat in order to achieve obedience in the child. The consequence is that the child feels subjected and intimidated. He may learn to pretend or tell lies to cover up. There are two types of lies: First, denial of a committed act, or the assumption of an uncommitted act. In other

<sup>13</sup> ROUSSEAU, *op.cit.*, 62.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 68.

<sup>15</sup> FORSCHNER, M., *Rousseau*, Freiburg, 1977.

words, it simply means turning down the truth. Second, promising what one has no intention of doing. The first relates to the past, and the second relates to the future. The follow-up is that: Either the child plays cool and waits for the time he feels strong enough to revolt, or he learns to play sycophancy all through his life. If the child is the strong type, he may unconsciously lose the art of convincing the other and later in life tend to apply force and aggression to achieve his goals.

The best way and method of applying authority in the upbringing of the young is not force but convincing him. What he must not do, must not be presented as a command but rather, as a recommendation. However, the educator must be consequent with his recommendations, backing them up with reasons that would convince the child to accept him as authority. Often, the child does not know the real difference between ‘possibility’ and ‘impossibility’. For the child, everything is possible and should be tried out. If not, why not? This “Why not” should not be silenced with force; but rather explained by the educator with reasons that have enough responsible authority behind them. This is not so easy, and may unnecessarily prolong the time of teaching. But I strongly believe, just as Rousseau also recommended: (“Opfert im Kindesalter eure Zeit, die ihr später mit Zinsen wiederbekommt.”<sup>16</sup>) that one should sacrifice his time, in bringing up the child; because one will definitely reap the fruits with additional interest later.

#### *Kant's image of the child and its influence on upbringing:*

For Kant as well as Rousseau, the human being needs education. But their basic differences lies in the images they have of the human person. As said above, Rousseau sees the human person as good just as he is created; but Kant represents a more radical image. He sees the human being as a being created “inhuman” (animal), and can only be made human through education. This image is similar to the view of Thomas Hobbes who interpreted human nature mainly at its animal level: “Man is wolf to man.”<sup>17</sup> This view would naturally suggest consequently more drastic measures in the upbringing of the child. That is why Kant underlined ‘extreme discipline’ from the beginning of his theory as one of the key methods of upbringing and the first goal of education. Kant sees the human being as something that has no concrete image until it has been brought up. Only upbringing or education makes man human. And for him, the human being is the only creature among other animals that needs education. „Der Mensch ist das einzige Geschöpf, das erzogen werden muss. Unter der Erziehung nämlich verstehen wir die Wartung (Verpflegung und Unterhaltung), Disziplin (Zucht), und Un-

---

<sup>16</sup> ROUSSEAU, *Ibid*, 73.

<sup>17</sup> HOBBES, T., *Leviathan*, (Of Man), in: *Great Books of the Western World*, Vol. 21, (ed, M.J. Adler), Chicago 1996, 49-98.

terweisung nebst der Bildung“.<sup>18</sup> Kant means here that human being is the only creature that must be trained or brought up. An upbringing guarantees feeding, housing and general maintenance, as well as discipline and education. Animals do not need all that. Basically, animals need food, warmth and protection but not such profound maintenance, servicing, care, discipline and education as is the case with human beings. Discipline changes and directs the animal instinct in man. The animal needs an external reason to direct its instinct; but the human being has his own rational capacity that needs to be educated and developed. That is why the human species must educate itself from generation to generation.

Discipline ensures that the human being does not derail from his destiny: i.e. being human. Discipline as part of upbringing helps the human being not to go wild. Discipline directs and regulates the animal instinct in man and makes him human. For Kant also, “Der Mensch kann nur Mensch werden durch Erziehung. Er ist nichts, als was die Erziehung aus ihm macht. Es ist zu bemerken, dass der Mensch nur durch Menschen erzogen wird, durch Menschen, die ebenfalls erzogen sind.“<sup>19</sup> He argues that the human being is made really human through upbringing and education. He is nothing outside what he is brought up to be, or what education can make out of him. Since it is evident that only the human person can educate a fellow human, the task of educating the other must be taken by only those who themselves are properly educated and trained. Otherwise the lacks in the educator or his ignorance would be eventually transferred to those being educated.

Whoever is not cultivated is raw, but whoever is not disciplined is wild. The former is less dangerous because culture can be learnt at any stage in life. But the latter is far more dangerous because any omission of discipline at the early stage in life is no longer easy to be inculcated. To wipe out wildness is not an easy task, since habits formed early in age are hard to be dropped. Regarding the formation and the deformation of habits, a prominent behaviourist – J.B. Watson – acknowledged the difficulty because it is a vast organised system that is intended to be disorganised. “It would be difficult if you only have to learn these things, but it is doubly difficult when you have to unlearn a vast organised system of old habits before you can put on a new one. And yet this is what the individual faces who wants a new personality.”<sup>20</sup>

Any form of good upbringing is a step towards perfecting human nature. Behind the concept “education” lies a big secret avenue to perfection – to humanness. Education is a guarantee to a future happy and successful human species. There are so many potentials in human nature, and education is the root to their discovery and actualisations. The human species keeps perfecting itself from one

---

<sup>18</sup> KANT, I., *Über Pädagogik* (Hrsg. von T. Dietrich), Bad Heilbrunn, 1960, 7.

<sup>19</sup> KANT, I., *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>20</sup> WATSON, J.B., *Behaviorism*, Chicago, 1963, 301.

generation to another. In the words of Kant, “Die Erziehung ist eine Kunst, deren Ausübung durch viele Generationen vervollkommen werden muss. Jede Generation, versehen mit den Kenntnissen der vorhergehenden, kann immer mehr eine Erziehung zustande bringen, die alle Naturanlagen des Menschen proportionierlich und zweckmäßig entwickelt und so die ganze Menschengattung zu ihrer Bestimmung führt.”<sup>21</sup> That means: Upbringing is an art, whose practice lingers and perfects itself through many generations. Every generation tries to perfect the process by adding something new to the knowledge of the earlier generations. And every new addition is geared towards the development of the natural constituents of the human person which leads to his destiny as human. The human being should be able to develop – through the help of upbringing – the tendency towards goodness in human nature. And because the egoistic instinct in human nature tries to hinder this tendency towards goodness, education as an art is then employed to tackle this challenge.

Furthermore, Kant upholds ‘a better future’ as the basic principle in the art of education. “Kinder sollen nicht dem gegenwärtigen, sondern dem zukünftig möglich bessern Zustande des menschlichen Geschlechts, das ist: der Idee der Menschheit und deren ganzer Bestimmung angemessen erzogen werden. Dieses Prinzip ist von großer Wichtigkeit.”<sup>22</sup> Children should not be brought up with the view to the present alone, rather the future – i.e. for a future better condition of the human species, with a complete idea of the destiny of humanity. A good upbringing is the basis for a better world. This idea of a better world for all will play a determinant role in forming the concept of global values (in our work) to which we aim in the education of our present day children. Kant has an anthropological vision of humanity which calls for a better form of living together in the future. His anthropological interest is not so much in the physiological aspect (what nature makes out of man); rather, he is more interested in the question: what man (as a free being) makes or can make, or should make out of himself.<sup>23</sup> This is the reasonable sense for educating the child. In line with this futuristic motive of education – aiming at achieving better human beings for a collective better world, Kant outlined the following as the goals of education<sup>24</sup> or upbringing:

- To be disciplined – “*diszipliniert werden*”. To discipline means: seeking to ensure that the animal instincts in man do not disrupt the human and social order.
- To be cultivated – “*kultiviert werden*”. Cultivation involves teachings and instructions. This is all about the acquisition of skills that are necessary for the survival of human conditions.

<sup>21</sup> KANT, I., *Über Pädagogik* (Hrsg von T. Dietrich), Bad Heilbrunn 1960, 10.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>23</sup> KANT, I., „Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht“, in: *Ausgabe der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1900ff*, AA VII, 199.

<sup>24</sup> KANT, I., *Über Pädagogik* (Hrsg von T. Dietrich), Bad Heilbrunn 1960, 13-14.

- To be civilized – “*zivilisiert werden*”. This is to ensure that man fits in well in the society. The human being should be attractive, lovable, intelligent and influential. Above all, he should acquire good manners.
- To be moral – “*moralisiert werden*”. The human being should have good character. He should be brought up to having the cast of mind of choosing only the good means to achieving his goals.

I must here however add that care should be taken to ensure that the discipline in question does not reduce the child to the status of a slave; rather the child must have the feeling that the discipline prepares him towards achieving his freedom. Nothing can destroy the personality of the child more than a slavish discipline; and this loses the acceptance and the respect of the child sooner or later. The reason why it is later possible for the child to reject any non-proportionate discipline is because of his development of the capacity to reason. The child as a person is an intelligible being, and as such, with his development, he achieves the capability to a meaningful independent reasoning, thinking and deciding. He is, in virtue of his being a reasonable being, not just heteronymous (determined from outside), but rather autonomous (self-determined). In other words, he is a free being with reason and free will; he decides for himself what is good for him. According to Kant, “*der Wille ist ein Vermögen, nur dasjenige zu wählen, was die Vernunft unabhängig von der Neigung als praktisch notwendig, und als gut, erkennt*”.<sup>25</sup> The will is the capability to choose only that, independent of inclination, which reason acknowledges as practically necessary and good. This implies that when the child is of age, he is in the position to decide as subject for himself; because as Kant believes, even though “*moral demands*” is an ideal which no human being can fulfill completely, yet basically every human being possesses the standard of morality in him, and with his free will and reason, should know the right things to do following the laws of morality. This formed the basis for his categorical imperative which he at different stages reformulated:

- Act only with the maxim, which you can, at the same time, wish that it becomes a general law.
- Act in a manner as if the maxim of your action, through your will, should become a general natural law.
- Act in a manner that you regard humanity, both in your person and in every other person, always as an end and never as a means.
- Act so, that all maxims from your own rules should correspond to a possible realm of ends as a world of nature.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> KANT, I., „*Kritik der reinen Vernunft*“, in: *Ausgabe der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin 1900ff, AA IV, 412.

<sup>26</sup> KANT, I., „*Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*“, in: *Ausgabe der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin, AA IV, 421-436.

On a general level, following Kant's goals of education, *discipline, culture, and civilisation* are often easy to be accepted and inculcated. But *morality* is often misunderstood and ridiculed because of its affiliation to religion. However, a good upbringing should be able to equip the child with the conviction that virtues are good and helpful in actualising human values. I think that none of the above mentioned goals should either be undermined or overemphasized. I believe that any good education should be able to combine all these avenues – discipline, cultivation, civilisation and morality – since they are all different relevant aspects of upbringing that can contribute towards making the child really human.

Now we can see that, like Rousseau, Kant also gave enough room for freedom in the education of the young. The child must be brought up in freedom – however not as object to any other goal, but as subject in itself. One of the greatest challenges of education, therefore, is to reconcile the fact that the child must be *forced* to learn living in *freedom*. The two words – “force” and “freedom” – seem to be opposites and irreconcilable. But following the nature of man and the contingents of interest, a life in freedom must be enforced.

Kant confronted himself with the question: “Wie kultiviere ich die Freiheit bei dem Zwange?”<sup>27</sup> How can I cultivate freedom by force? As solution to this question, he suggested that in any reasonable upbringing, the following three steps must be observed:

1. One must give the child – from the early days of his childhood – the feeling that he is free; as long as this freedom neither causes him damage (e.g. Playing with a sharp knife), nor obstructs the freedom of another (e.g. Shouting in a manner that disturbs the silent relaxation of another person).
2. One must show and convince the child that he cannot achieve his goals through any other means than guaranteeing others the chance to achieve their goals.
3. One must prove to the child that the exercise of force (when required in his upbringing) is to help him acquire the habits that lead to freedom.

Freedom cannot be dichotomized from pedagogy (teachings on education), which is either physical or practical (moral) as the case may be. Education is physical, on the one hand, when it is concerned with the faculties that the human being shares with the animals, for instance: eating, sleeping, walking, etc. And this is not the sphere of upbringing with which we are concerned in this work. On the other hand, our pedagogy is practical or moral, when we are talking of the education that the human being needs as a person, to enable him live and act in freedom. This aspect of education relates to all parts of life that lead to freedom. It means education towards personality; education towards achieving a free being that can withstand himself and others, a being capable of living as member of the society

---

<sup>27</sup> KANT, I., *Über Pädagogik* (Hrsg. von T. Dietrich), Bad Heilbrunn 1960, 16-17.

and at the same time maintains his inner worth as person – a being among other beings in a collective global village. And in our thesis concerning bringing up or educating the child with values, our emphasis is more on the practical / moral aspect of education. This is the aspect that leads the child to a life of freedom as a human person – a being with dignity in all its ramifications.

## 1.2 Our Image of the Child

Looking at the above presentations of Kant and Rousseau, we realize the fundamental fact that, despite the disparity in their images of the child, the child remains, for both, a person, a human being with dignity and freedom.

For me, I do not intend to favour any of the extreme views of Kant and Rousseau on the image of the child; I would rather opt for a third position. I share the view that the child is good from nature and has dignity as a person, but at the same time, I see the necessity of the fact that he requires training and education to actualize his authenticity. So, like Rousseau, the child is good from nature, but I believe that the dynamism of human anthropology does not require stopping at that level. For the actualization of his personality, the child requires education. The human, being an imperfect and unfinished being as explained above, requires an improvement of the status quo.

The reality of this need for development, however, does not give credence to Kant's claim of the child's "animality" – which, according to him, necessitates education. The child does not need education based on his 'inhumanity/animality' as Kant claims or based on his being "a wolf" according to Hobbes<sup>28</sup>; rather, it is simply an anthropological fact that the human person needs up-bringing in order to actualize his authenticity. The child, being a 'person' with dignity, must be helped through education to actualize this 'personality'.

Arguing for this position, I would like to implore some philosophical, theological and Afro-theosophical anthropological worldviews to help us substantiate our moderate view. Theologically, the child is a creature of God; has the dignity and image of God (*imago dei*), but as a creature, he is imperfect and aspires perfection – and a good and all-round upbringing can be of assistance towards this perfection. Philosophically, the child, as human, has dignity; a being "born with substance"<sup>29</sup>, with all the inadequacies and limitations of human reality. This substance is the source of his identity, which constantly yearns for actualization and authenticity. To achieve this goal, upbringing and education are unavoidable. For Africans, on their part, the child is good, and as already noted, a

<sup>28</sup> HOBBS, T., *Leviathan*, (Of Man), in: *Great Books of the Western World*, Vol. 21, (ed, M.J. Adler), Chicago 1996, 49-98.

<sup>29</sup> LOCKE, J., *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, in: *Great Books of the Western World*, Vol. 33, (ed, M.J. Adler), Chicago 1996, 83-395.

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. As said earlier, the presence of a new child in the family is a sign of the continuity of life – without new births, humanity is threatened with extinction. Every new child is also an additional 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.

Summarily, therefore, the fundamental image we have of the child is that he is a human being; born completely as person; good in nature but open to all the deficiencies (which are to be augmented) as well as potentials (which are to be actualized) due to human nature. These deficiencies and potentials in the ‘good human nature’ of the child make education very relevant. I maintain, therefore, that the child, as a gift of God, has dignity and is in itself good, but, at the same time, needs to be actualized through education. This view reflects also the African image of the child. Let us now elaborate on some philosophical and theological discussions on the image and dignity of the human person that can give more insight into our position.