

## Hope for what's new: Creation and Hannah Arendt's concept of Natality

Ilse Geerinck  
Tilburg University  
The Netherlands

*"Initium ergo ut esset, creatus est homo, ante quem nullus fuit" ('That there be a beginning, man was created before whom there was nobody'), said Augustine in his political philosophy. This beginning is not the same as the beginning of the world; it is not the beginning of something but of somebody, who is a beginner himself.*

Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*

In this essay we would like to elaborate some points of view on what could be the vocation of religious education today. Inspired by the political philosophy of Hannah Arendt (1906-1975) and the Christian theology (of creation), we wonder whether there is still 'space' in religious education to 'act'. In a first point we will outline the background of our statement: the 'crisis' in (religious) education in Europe, especially in The Netherlands and Belgium. With all due respect to the people who support the innovation of education, we question their ultimate goal: to teach pupils to be an 'any-thing'. As we will see, this does not agree with the theology of creation. Human beings are not created as an 'any-thing' but to be a 'some-one', created in the image of God. From this perspective the question arises whether or not theology doesn't imply its own pedagogy.

### 1. The crisis in religious education

In Europe and especially in The Netherlands and Belgium, religious education isn't self-evident anymore. Bridging the gap between the Christian inheritance and the youth of today, or between the past and the future has become a problem. "For a very long time in our history, actually throughout the thousands of years that followed upon the foundation of Rome and were determined by Roman concepts, this gap was bridged over by what, since the Romans, we have called 'tradition'" (Arendt 1968, p. 14-15). As the modern age progressed, the tradition has worn thinner and thinner.<sup>1</sup> When the thread of tradition finally broke, the self-evidence of our 'action' in education and particularly in religious education, was lost.<sup>2</sup> The Christian tradition was for a long time the leader in the field of giving answers to the 'original' questions people ask themselves. The 'bankruptcy' of the 'great narratives' has led to the absence of traditional answers to these questions (cfr. Boeve 1999). Never have educators been in the dark so much about their action as today. Never have they felt the pressure of their task so hard as nowadays. Education has become a problem.

In her book *Between Past and Future*, Hannah Arendt speaks of a 'crisis in education'. Like every crisis, she said, this crisis confronts us with the loss of 'prejudices'. A crisis can help us find the essential aspects. According to Arendt, every crisis therefore demands answers, which can be old or new, but must in any case be 'judgments'. These are the 'original' answers on daily questions. When we answer these questions with already shaped 'judgments' – 'prejudices' – then the crisis becomes a 'disaster'. To answer these questions in this manner takes away every possibility of a (direct) experience of the world. What takes place then is 'alienation from the world' (Arendt 1968, p. 174). That we are no longer able to answer these questions – 'to judge' – has to do with our attitude towards the past. According to Arendt, three convictions have

<sup>1</sup> There is a difference between the 'modern age' and the 'modern world'. The modern age was the period between the seventeenth and the twentieth century. The world we live in today, is the modern world. It started with the first atomic explosions (Arendt 1959, p. 6).

<sup>2</sup> Totalitarianism (anti-semitism and imperialism) is the point where the thread broke: "The totalitarian attempt at global conquest and total domination has been the destructive way out of all impasses. Its victory may coincide with the deconstruction of humanity; wherever it has ruled, it has begun to destroy the essence of man. Yet to turn our backs on the destructive forces of the century is of little avail." (Arendt 1976, p. viii).

contributed to the fact that we are forgetting the past in our efforts to rethink the gap between the past and the future (Arendt 1968, p. 180-181). These assumptions concern the emancipation of the child, teaching and learning.

In our attempts to emancipate the child, we created “a child’s world and a society formed among children that are autonomous and must insofar as possible be left to them to govern.” (Arendt 1968, p. 181). And she goes on: “Adults are only there to help with this government. (...) (They, i.g.) can only tell him to do what he likes and then prevent the worst from happening.” We find the same thoughts in the writings of the philosopher R. Debaene when he gives a view of education today. Education has become a rendering of service. It is a service to the individual pupil. The educator appears as a ‘facilitator’: he or she coaches the pupils in their ‘learning process’ (Debaene 2002, p. 676). The ideal is that every human being can govern<sup>3</sup> his or her own learning process. Like every process, a learning process follows its own way. It is a perpetual movement with an open end. Therefore, it is best that educators interrupt very carefully in this learning process and adapt themselves as good as possible to this process. In other words, education is ‘cut down to the size of the individual’ (Debaene 2002, p. 676).

The second assumption concerns ‘teaching’. When the pupil and his or her individual learning desires take up a central position in the learning process, it becomes necessary that we pay attention to his or her ‘begin-situation’. By begin-situation we must understand: his or her education, character, milieu, talents, environment, ... . Specifically for religious education we can add: his or her religious background. The process of learning functions optimally if it is adjusted to the begin-situation of the pupil. By examining this begin-situation it is possible to get a good picture of where the learning process could start. To lay emphasis on the ‘individual’<sup>4</sup> changes the significance of pedagogics. According to Arendt we can state that ‘under the influence of the modern psychology and the tenets of pragmatism, pedagogy has developed into a science of teaching in such a way as to be wholly emancipated from the actual material to be taught.’ (Arendt 1968, p. 183). Not the question of ‘what’ but the question of ‘how’ has become more and more important. This explains the rise of qualitative and quantitative empirical researches on (religious) education. These methods are used to explore the didactical begin-situation of pupils. One can think for example of the quantitative researches of the practical theologian J.H. Van der Ven, the ‘didactics of correlation’ (G. Hilger) and ‘abductive correlation’<sup>5</sup> (H.-G. Ziebertz, A. Prokopf) developed in Germany. The correlation method for example searches for the optimal correlation between religion (the Christian tradition) and the ‘life-world’ of young people today. Only when they correlate with each other, the learning process will function efficient. When there is no correlation the learning process won’t function, even worse, there won’t be any learning process at all.

The third kind of assumptions follows out of the second: education is reduced to doing. Children will only know and understand what they can do or experience by themselves. Learning is ‘learning to learn’: by repeating the ‘activity’ they acquire skills. They achieve a general competence for understanding complicated problems and for solving them as efficient as possible (Hellemans, Kelchtermans, Masschelein, Vandenberghe & Vanderstraeten 1995, p. 74). The point is to canvass competences and attitudes which are necessary to produce knowledge.<sup>6</sup> Not the (acquirement of) knowledge is important but the production of technically suitable information. The

---

<sup>3</sup> Our actual thinking about the teacher and the school as positioned in an environment, and about ‘quality’ in general, is linked up with transformations in governmental strategies, according to the fundamental pedagogic M. Simons (Simons 2002, p. 106-123). About self-government in education: Simons & Masschelein (in press).

<sup>4</sup> What we mean is that we no longer think about education from the perspective of the class (as a group of individuals) but from the development of the whole person (Standish 1995, p. 121-135). Or, in the words of van der Zee, ‘we learn to be a complete person’ (van der Zee 1996, p. 169)

<sup>5</sup> The term ‘abduction’ comes from the scientist Charles Pierce: *Prozess, eine erklärende Hypothese zu bilden. Er ist die Einzige logische Operation, die irgendeine neue Idee einführt* (Prokopf & Ziebertz 2000, p. 31). Abduction is a method that combines induction and deduction.

<sup>6</sup> ‘(...) the central mission of the school will be to teach the pupils to learn, to train them to assimilate new knowledge of their own’ (Strain & Field 1997, p. 149).

selection of contents is only necessary, so it seems, to serve the functionality of the learning process, namely to make the development of the formal capacity – the capacity of learning – easier. (Hellemans e.a. 1995, p. 73; Simons 2001, p. 119). In this logic the common identity lies in the fact that we are a ‘learning society’: we participate when we have enough capacities and attributes to be flexible enough in this ever changing world (Decorte 1996; Ranson 1992; Van der Zee 1998; Boekaerts & Simons 1995; Heimbrock; Scheilke & Schreiner 2001). What we do in education today is to teach pupils these capacities so that they can participate on our society. Active learning in the classroom needs, therefore, to be informed by and lead towards active citizenship within a participative democracy, according to S. Ranson (Ranson 1992, p. 79). In this way, we still fulfil one of the most important goal of education, which is ‘to build children to participate in society’. Because of these new strategies, we must rethink the role of the educator as well. As we already said the educator has become the facilitator: he or she helps the pupils in acquiring the necessary competences. We oblige the educator to repeat the activity of learning over and over again, to prevent them from passing on ‘dead knowledge’.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, Arendt, explains: ‘A teacher (...), is a man who can simply teach anything; his training is in teaching, not in the mastery of any particular subject’ (Arendt 1968, p. 182-183). It is clear that education is no longer consist in ‘learning to think’ but in ‘learning to learn’ and preferably ‘lifelong’. “Teachers and educational managers, with their deep understanding of the processes of learning, can, (...), play a leading role in *enabling* such a vision to unfold not only among young people but also across the public domain.” (Ranson 1992, p. 79).

The learning society is a reaction on the ‘information society’ as the society of the future.<sup>8</sup> The word ‘learning’ refers to the ‘acquirement of knowledge’ (‘learning’), instead of the ‘availability of information (‘knowledge’) (van der Zee 1996, p. 163). Therefore, education has become a ‘learning process’. A process that continues for life: A process that we have to start, but once it is started it is everlasting. Everywhere and at every moment we must learn. Learning belongs to all of us: pupils and adults. It is a process with no certain end: it has become a goal in itself. Although ‘education’ still exists as an institution, it seems that ‘to educate’ will disappear as an ‘act’ (Debaene 2002, p. 676). The human action of ‘educating’ will disappear when we ignore the border between the pupil and the adult. In the innovation in education the border between the pupil and the adult becomes blurred. Everybody, pupil and adult has to learn. We have all become ‘pupils’ – for life.

Our time is signed by the absence of a universal and absolute truth and a fast evolving world. The reaction of education is to teach pupils to be flexible and efficient. Pupils must become ‘constantly adapting personalities’. It seems that knowledge has become the enemy of education: the more you know, the more you will be a personality, a ‘some-one’ (Debaene 2002, p. 684). Or even better, knowledge is the opposite of flexibility. An intelligent person is not prepared to change so quickly, if he doesn’t see the sense or value of it, thus Debaene. Flexibility and efficiency are therefore empty concepts. And if these are the goals of education today, then we must conclude that we ‘educate’ pupils to become ‘any-thing’: they are every-thing and no-body.<sup>9</sup> This has serious consequences for religious education.

## **2. Religious education is not about ‘anything’**

It seems like the main goal of religious education is to teach pupils ‘religious competences’. “Religious education can contribute to religious competence by enabling students to become aware

---

<sup>7</sup> Learning has become a game and education ‘occupational therapy’.

<sup>8</sup> C. Hughes and M. Tight explain that ‘the learning society is set alongside four other myths upon which it builds: those of productivity, change, lifelong education and the learning organisation’ (Hughes & Tight 1995, p. 290).

<sup>9</sup> The identity crisis is a consequence of this. If we forget the future, we can’t understand the present and we no longer know ‘who’ we are. In embracing the future it seems that ‘bare life’ (*zoé*) becomes a goal. In bare life, as the opposite of human life (*bios*) and ‘whoness’, there is only ‘whatness’ (cfr. Masschelein 1998).

of elements of healing and reconciliation on the one hand and contradictions and protest against inhuman behaviour on the other” (Heimbrock, Scheilke & Schreiner 2001, p. 15). To handle the diversity of religion children will learn to be flexible. It seems that the diversity and plurality in religion has led to a functional religious concept: pupils achieve competences in function of the awareness of religious elements. The aspect of ‘knowledge’, the substantial and particular aspect of religion, is of subordinate importance: it will only serve as ‘inspiration’ for the functionality of the learning process. In this view, there is no doubt that also in religious education, pupils will be taught to be ‘any-thing’: or, they have to become and Christian and Jewish and Islamite and Buddhist and Hindu, ‘a bit of any-thing’. Or, they are not Christian, not Jewish, not Islamite, not Buddhist, not Hindu, ‘not any of these things, nobody’.

In earlier times we ‘initiated’ children in a (world or) belief. Initiation is the introduction of pupils in a certain world (or belief). This introduction was necessary to let them know what this belief consisted in. Not how it works or what it does, but what it ‘is’. We initiated pupils so that they could participate in this belief. Participation means to act as a part of the group or community. Action, in the most general sense of the word, means to take an initiative, to begin. We initiate pupils in a belief so that they could be ‘beginners’: to take an initiative.<sup>10</sup> Because pupils need to know the world (or belief) first, it is necessary that an educator represents this particular belief. An educator who can say: ‘This *is* our world (or belief)’. These educators represent a world ‘for which they must assume responsibility although they themselves did not make it and even though they may, secretly or openly, wish it were other than it is.’ (Arendt 1968, p.188). Educators must present the world (or belief) to their pupils. Every educator is thus a ‘leader’. The Hebrew word for leader is *nagid*. A *nagid*, leader, is literally someone who stands in the front, someone who represents a certain group of people (Van Wolde 1999, p. 81). His or her responsibility is best interpreted as ‘authority’.<sup>11</sup> By ‘authority’, Arendt not only understands ‘knowledge’ but in the first place, the capacity of taking responsibility for this world. Every educator must have knowledge about the world (or belief). This is the knowledge about the part of the world he will represent in education. But knowledge doesn’t seem to be enough to be an educator. He must also be capable to take ‘responsibility’. In the word ‘responsibility’ we can read the word ‘respons’. In the act of education, educators respond to the question of birth. The question of birth is an opportunity to ‘begin’: to take an initiative or to act. In action we ‘disclose’ ourselves. In words and deeds we can tell ‘who we are’. Through the act of educating, educators become true leaders: they represent the world as a place where we can ‘begin’ or take initiative. Initiating children means literally, to prepare them to make ‘a beginning’. We introduce children in this world so that they can ‘disclose’ who they are. By answering the question ‘Who are you’, newborns can renew the world. By expressing themselves in word and deed – action – they renew this world. Without being introduced in the (old) world (or belief), pupils can’t be ‘creative’. For Arendt, natality is the essence of education: ‘the fact that we have all come into the world by being born and that this world is constantly renewed through birth’ (Arendt 1968, p. 196).

The problem with the emancipation of the child is the fact of ‘disclosure’: we ask our children to ‘disclose’ themselves in a world, without being ready for it. We neglect the necessary preparation for children before they enter the world of adults.<sup>12</sup> Or even worse, we create a world for children where they are only being ‘subjected to a much more terrifying and truly tyrannical authority, the tyranny of the majority.’ (Arendt 1968, p. 181). They can’t rebel against this majority, nor against the adults because this world is barred to them. Conformism or juvenile

---

<sup>10</sup> To introduce children in a world – the responsibility of the world – expects a ‘conservative’ attitude: we have to conserve, protect or beware the child against the world and the world against the child.

<sup>11</sup> The word ‘authority’ comes from the Latin word *auctoritas*. It is linked with the verb *augere* which means ‘to enlarge, to increase, to extend’. A person gets ‘authority’ when his ‘action’ is linked with the beginning to increase the creation.

<sup>12</sup> The emancipation of women is totally different from the emancipation of children: women are no-children but ‘adults’. With the emancipation they were able to enter the public world where they could ‘disclose’ themselves as a ‘who’.

delinquency, or frequently a mixture of both is usually the reaction of children to this pressure of the majority.

Every child must be born in a sphere of intimacy and safety. 'Because the child must be protected against the world, his traditional place is the family, whose adult members daily return back from the outside world and withdraw into the security of private life within four walls.' (Arendt 1968 p. 186). It is in this family life that children get the chance to 'grow up'. Like animals, they stay at home until they are strong enough to face the world. At first, children must be protected against the world. Without this protection and security children are exposed to this world with the consequences that their vital quality is destroyed.

Facing the world is not without danger: 'everything that appears in public can be seen and heard by everybody and has the widest possible publicity'. That makes human beings so vulnerable. In the world we 'disclose' ourselves: in the presence of others we can be a 'who' instead of a 'what': we can appear as a unique and distinct human being. This is in opposition to the private sphere: 'To live an entirely private life means above all to be deprived of things essential to a truly human life: to be deprived of the reality that comes from being seen and heard by others, to be deprived of an 'objective' relationship with them that comes from being related to and separated from them through the intermediary of a common world of things, to be deprived of the possibility of achieving something more permanent than life itself.' (Arendt 1959, p. 53-54). In acting the human being participates in the world where he can distinguish himself from others. The world is the space where everybody can speak and act. The basic condition of both action and speech is the human plurality (Arendt 1959, p. 155). Plurality means equality (to understand each other) and 'distinction' (to become an other 'who'). We need the presence of others who can see what we see and can hear what we hear. In other words, we have the capacity to hear and see what others say and do. "With word and deed we insert ourselves into the human world, and this insertion is like a second birth, in which we confirm and take upon ourselves the naked fact of our original physical appearance. This insertion (...) springs from the beginning which came into the world when we were born and to which we respond by beginning something new on our own initiative." (Arendt 1959, p. 156).

When we look at the story of creation in Genesis, we can find the same thoughts. We read: "God said let the water swarm with swarms of living creatures and let birds fly above the earth across the expanse of the sky. God created the great sea creatures and every living and moving thing with which the water swarmed, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind. God saw that it was good. God blessed them and said be fruitful and multiply and fill the water in the seas, and let the birds multiply on the earth. There was evening, and there was morning, a fifth day. God said let the land produce living creatures according to their kinds: cattle, creeping things, and wild animals, each according to its kind. It was so. God made the wild animals according to their kinds, the cattle according to their kinds, and all the creatures that creep along the ground according to their kinds. God saw that it was good. Then God said let us make humankind in our image, after our likeness, so they may rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move on the earth. God created humankind in his own image, in the image of God he created them, male and female he created them. God blessed them and said to them be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it." (Gen. 1, 20-26). All the animals are created according to their kinds. God gave them all the same task: be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth. A special role is granted to the human beings. They are not created according to their kind, but as an image of God, resemble Him. He or she finds his or her point of reference outside himself. To be an image of God is to be a beginner. The human being is created as a creator him- or herself: he or she is a beginner. Through Gods 'word' ('He said') and 'deed' (He creates – He calls) everything comes to life. In word and deed human beings can 're-create' the world.

The physical life or *zoé* is the life as life: to be fruitful, to multiply and to fill the earth are different aspects of this life. Man and woman as an animal is born in this life: the life of the

'whatness'. Instead of the animals, human beings can act and create a world – a human world. They can transcend the 'physical life' to human life, to *bios*. The life of the human being is the life of 'someone'. The last task of the human being is linked with this life: they must subject the earth and dominate the animals. Animals are not created to 'act', only human beings can act: this task refers to action (to subject and to dominate). The animals and the earth refer in the first place to the life as *zoè*: in the struggle of life, he or she will subject the earth and dominate the animals with a view to his or her own survival. But as a someone he or she will 'act': in word and deed he or she will recreate the world. Every form of 'lordship' contains a lot of possibilities (Van Wolde 1995, p. 43). Through the times we can see the diversity of human actions concerning the earth and the animals.

In the story of Genesis, we can read *that* the human being must act, but the story doesn't tell us *how*. God introduced us in this world, but he didn't introduce himself (Van Wolde 1995, p. 33). In the New Testament we find the words and deeds of Jezus Christ. In his action he 'disclosed' who he was. He answered the vocation of God: 'Who are you?' – the principle of beginning. Jezus was neither any-thing, nor every-thing - he was 'some-one'. People have called him Son of God because he became an image of God. Jezus 'imaged' God as love. In the stories about him we find some criteria of how we can be an image of God: to give people time to begin, space to live in and a road to walk on.<sup>13</sup> The human being is not a sign of God, but becomes a sign at the moment he or she acts: in word and deed (Van Wolde 1997, p. 42). The human being is 'someone' because God is 'someone'.

### 3. The vocation of religious education: 'the seventh day'

Hannah Arendt concludes her essay about education with the widely known words: 'Education is the point at which we decide whether we love the world enough to assume responsibility for it and by the same token save it from that ruin which, except for renewal, except for the coming of the new and young, would be inevitable. And education, too, is where we decide whether we love our children enough not to expel them from our world and leave them to their own devices, not to strike from their hands their chance of undertaking something new, something unforeseen by us, but to prepare them in advance for the task of renewing a common world.'" (Arendt 1968, p. 196). Renewing the world is enduring the gap between the past and the future. This is to say that there has to be a crisis in education.

The crisis in education is not a modern phenomenon: education is since ancient history characterized by 'crisis'. The word 'crisis' comes from the Greek word *krinein* which means 'time and space to judge'. Education is the space and the time a community gives itself to reflect on the world (Hellemans, Kelchtermans, Masschelein, Vandenberghe & Vanderstraeten 1995, p. 70). The space and time refer to the 'gap' between the past and the future, between the old world and the new world. Education finds itself *in* the gap, more precisely, on the border between past and future, between the old world and the new world, between the private sphere (*zoè*) and the public sphere (*bios*).

In the Latin word for 'school'- *schola* - we can find exactly the same thought: it is the 'free time': the time to act as human beings. In the Christian theology, the 'Sunday' has become symbol of 'free time'. It is the seventh day in the creation of God. In the second chapter of the book of Genesis, we read: "The heavens and the earth were completed with everything that was in them. By

---

<sup>13</sup> These three criteria refer to the first three days of creation. The first day God created 'time' to begin: "God said let there be light. And there was light. God saw that the light was good. God separated the light from the darkness. God called the light day and the darkness night. There was evening, and there was morning, marking the first day." (Gen. 1, 3-5). The following day is about the creation of 'space or room' to life in: "God said let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters and let it separate water from water. So God made the expanse and separated the water under the expanse from the water above it. It was so. God called the expanse sky. There was evening, and there was morning, a second day" (Gen. 1, 6-8). The third day, he expressed the necessary of a road to walk on: "God said let the water under the sky be gathered to one place and let dry ground appear. It was so. God called the dry ground land and the gathered waters he called seas. God saw that it was good." (Gen. 1, 9-10).

the seventh day God finished the work that he had been doing, and he ceased on the seventh day all the work that he had been doing. God blessed the seventh day and made it holy because on it he ceased all the work that he had been doing in creation. This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created-when the Lord God made the earth and heavens” (Gen. 2, 1-4a). Although we agree that Genesis 1, 1-2,4a must be read as one composition, we can't ignore the break between the six day and the seventh day. On the seventh day, God completed creation. “The point of the matter is that the ‘completion’, which indeed every enacted event must have in the minds of those who tell the story and to convey its meaning, eluded them; and without this thinking completion after the act, without the articulation accomplished by remembrance, there simply was no story left that could be told.” ‘Action’ comes from the Latin verbs *agere* (to set into motion) and *gerere* (to bear). It seems as though each action is divided into two parts, the beginning made by a single person and the achievement in which many join by ‘bearing’ and ‘finishing’ the enterprise, by seeing it through (Arendt 1959, p. 168). The word ‘action’ expresses the break between the six days and the seventh day, between the beginning of the begin (*beresjit*) and the beginning of the continuation of this begin (*toledot*).

From this background, the significance of the ‘Church’ can be clearly understood. The theologian E. Schillebeeckx makes clear that this word comes from the Greek *kuriakon*, the day of the Lord (Schillebeeckx 1990, p. 165). The Latin and Greek word *ekklèsia* – the collected community who calls itself Church – has its roots in secular Greek. *Ekklessia* was ‘the community of free (masculine) civilians of a polis or city to hold elections or to take important decisions’. The first writers explicitly used this word in opposition to the term ‘sunagògè’. They wanted to express that the first Christians came together in a certain city to ‘reflect on the community’. It is the space and time the first community of Christians gave themselves to reflect about their action.

In the innovation of education there is ‘no space and time’. No space or time to take responsibility. No space or time to reflect on the world. Only an everlasting process. There is no beginning and no end, but only a (learning) process that has to endure for life. If the act of education will disappear, the space and time to reflect on the society will disappear as well. Without this reflection, the human world won't exist. What remains is life as life: everything will be evaluated in function of the promotion and preservation of the process of life. In this process, things will lose their durability and particularity. What remains is the life of life: every-thing and any-thing.

We conclude, that education must be inserted into time, otherwise time would become a continuum, a flow of uninterrupted succession. With the insertion of time, a ‘begin-situation’ appears: not in the way of a starting point for a process, but as a place and time ‘to judge’ the world. The question of judgment is the question of meaning. The first question in a human world, or the life as someone, is not happiness and well-being, but meaning (Masschelein 1998, p. 375). To support the innovation of education is to fulfil the gap between the past and the future or to prevent that the question of meaning is asked. Education is not so much a matter of bringing young people values, but above all of avoiding that the time and space in which the question of meaning arises be filled (occupied or closed) (Masschelein 1998, p. 382). Therefore, the vocation of religious education is ‘to be on the seventh day’: to remember that every human life is the life of someone, who is a beginner himself.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> A special thanks to Jos Devijver, Jef Vanhout, Maarten Simons and Job De Meyere. My conversations with them, inspired me to write this article. I would also like to thank Yves Schouwaerts for his translation of this article.

## Bibliography

- Arendt, H. (1978), *The Life of the Mind. Willing*, New York and London, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Arendt, H. (1959), *The Human Condition*, Garden City, New York.
- Arendt, H. (1968), *Between the Past and the Future. Eight Exercises in Political Thought*, The Viking Press, New York.
- Arendt, H. (1979), *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Harcourt Brace & Company, San Diego/New York/London.
- Boekaerts, M. & Simons, P.R.J. (1995), *Leren en instructie. Psychologie van de leerling en het leerproces*, Van Gorcum, Assen.
- Boeve, L. (1999), *Onderbroken traditie. Heeft het christelijk verhaal nog toekomst?*, Kok Agora, Kapellen.
- Debaene, R., *Onderwijs op maat van het individu: een mythe*, in *Streven*, 67/8 (2002) 675-696.
- Decorte, E. (1996), *Actief leren binnen krachtige onderwijsleeromgevingen*, in *Impuls* 26/4 (1996) 145-156.
- Heimbrock, H.G.; Scheilke, C. Th.; Schreiner, P. (2001); *Introduction*, in Heimbrock, H.G.; Scheilke, C. Th.; Schreiner, P., *Towards Religious Competence. Diversity as a Challenge for Education in Europe*, Lit Verlag, Münster, 9-20.
- Hellemans, M.; Kelchtermans, G.; Masschelein, J.; Vandenberghe, R. & Vanderstraeten, R. (1995), *De school: gebroken spiegel van de samenleving*, in *Kultuurleven* 62/6, 66-75.
- Hellemans, M. (1982), *Pedagogische verantwoordelijkheid*, in Spiecker, B. & Levering, B. (red.), *Theoretische pedagogiek: opstellen*, p. 137-138.
- Hermans, C.A.M. (2001), *Participerend leren. Grondslagen van religieuze vorming in een globaliserende samenleving*, Damon, IKO.
- Hughes, C. & Tight, M. (1995), *The myth of the learning society*, in *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 43/3, 290-304.
- Levinson, N. (2001), *The Paradox of Natality: Teaching in the Midst of Belatedness*, in Mordechai, G., *Hannah Arendt and Education. Renewing our Common World*, Westview, Colorado, p. 11-36.
- Masschelein, J. (2000), *Schöpfung und absoluter Anfang. Einige Bemerkungen über die christlich-theologische Erbschaft nach Hannah Arendt*, in Abelt, S. & Bauer, W. (Hg.), *'...was es bedeutet, verletzbarer Mensch zu sein'. Erziehungswissenschaft im Gespräch mit Theologie, Philosophie und Gesellschaftstheorie*, Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, Mainz, p. 410-420.
- Masschelein, J. (1998), *World and Life or Education and the Question of Meaning (of Life)*, in *Interchange* 29/4, 371-384.
- Masschelein, J. (2001), *The Discourse of the Learning Society and the Loss of Childhood*, in *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 35/1, 1-20.
- Prokopf, A. & Ziebertz, H.-G., *Abduktive Korrelation – eine Neuorientierung für die Korrelationsdidaktik?*, 44, 19-50.
- Prins, W.B. (1990), *Op de bres voor vrijheid en pluraliteit. Politiek in de post-metafysische revisie van Hannah Arendt*, VU, Amsterdam.
- Ranson, S. (1992), *Towards the Learning Society*, in *Educational Management and Administration* 20/2, 68-79.



- Roebben, B. (1995), *Een tijd van opvoeden. Moraalpedagogiek in christelijk perspectief*, Acco, Leuven/Amersfoort.
- Schillebeeckx, E. (1990), *Mensen als verhaal van God*, H. Nelissen, Baarn.
- Simons, M. (2000), *Onderwijs in de ban van 'het leven': een verkenning van de waarde van een bestaansethiek*, in Smeyers, P. & Masschelein, J. (red.), *Pedagogisch Tijdschrift. Postmoderne tendensen in de pedagogiek. De pedagogiek en de representatiecrisis* 25/3-4, 267-292.
- Simons, M. (2001), *Kwaliteitszorg in het onderwijs: de 'wil tot kwaliteit' in een gewijzigd veld van bestuurlijkheid*, in *Pedagogiek* 21/2, p. 106-123.
- Simons, M. & Masschelein, J., (in press) *An adequate education in a global world? A note on the immunization of being-together-with*, in *Journal of Philosophy of Education*.
- Standish, P. (1995), *Postmodernism and the Education of the Whole person*, in *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 29/1, p. 121-135.
- Strain, M. & Field, J., *On 'The myth of the learning society'*, in *Britische Journal of Educational Studies* 45/2, p. 141-155.
- Van Wolde, E. (1997), *Verhalen over het begin*, Ten Have, Baarn.
- Van Wolde, E. (1999), *Leiden als luisteren*, in Beck, H. & Nauta, R., *Over Leiden. Dynamiek en structuur van het religieus leiderschap*.
- Zee, H. van der (1996), *The learning society*, in Raggat, P; Edwards, R. & Small, N. (eds.), *The Learning Society. Challenges and Trends*, London, Routledge, p. 163-183.
- Ziebertz, H.-G.; Schweitzer, F., Häring, H. & Browning, D. (eds.) (2001), *The Human Image of God*, Brill, Leiden/Boston/Köln.